

Legislature of Ontario Debates

Wednesday, February 14, 1968 - Thursday, April 4, 1968

No. 1

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

First Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Wednesday, February 14, 1968

Speaker: Honourable Frederick M. Cass
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1968

5

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Wednesday, February 14, 1968

Appointment of the Hon. Frederick M. Cass as Speaker of assembly 3

Speech from the Throne, His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor 4

Perpetuities Act, 1966, bill to amend, Mr. Wishart, first reading 7

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to 7

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

Wednesday, February 14, 1968, being the first day of the first session of the twenty-eighth Parliament of the province of Ontario for the despatch of business pursuant to a proclamation of the Honourable W. Earl Rowe, Lieutenant-Governor of the province.

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 14, 1968

The House met at 3.00 o'clock, p.m.

The Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor, having entered the House, took his seat upon the Throne.

Hon. R. S. Welch (Provincial Secretary and Minister of Citizenship): I am commanded by His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor to state that he does not see fit to declare the causes of the summoning of the present Legislature of this province until a Speaker of this House shall have been chosen according to law; but today, at a subsequent hour, His Honour will declare the causes of the calling of this Legislature.

His Honour was then pleased to retire.

Clerk of the House: Members of the legislative assembly, it is my duty to call upon you to elect one of your number to preside over your deliberations, as Speaker.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister) moves, seconded by the hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Nixon), that the hon. member for the electoral district of Grenville-Dundas (Mr. Cass), take the chair of this House as Speaker.

Clerk of the House: Are there any further nominations?

I therefore declare the nominations closed and declare the Hon. Frederick M. Cass to be the Speaker of this assembly.

Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Speaker: Honourable members, the office of Speaker of this assembly is within your gift alone. I am deeply appreciative of the confidence evidenced in me by your choice.

I thank the Prime Minister and the leader of the Opposition for their nomination and very kind words, and each of you for your vote.

I am not unaware of the ancient history and traditions of the office, nor of the duties and responsibilities conferred upon me by my election. It has been my pleasure to have served my people of Grenville-Dundas and the people of Ontario in this House in various capacities and I trust, sincerely and competently. I shall endeavour to do likewise in this important office.

I would also express the appreciation of my people of Grenville-Dundas to the members for the honour conferred on our riding by my election. In the past, Grenville-Dundas has furnished our province with two outstanding Prime Ministers: Sir James P. Whitney from Dundas and G. Howard Ferguson from Grenville, and with two members of the executive council. But never before has the member representing the people of Grenville-Dundas been accorded the honour of being elected to Mr. Speaker's chair.

Assured of the understanding co-operation of each member of this House, I look forward to an effective session in which the business of our great province may be conducted with efficiency and despatch and with full recognition of the responsibilities, duties and rights of each member.

This House will now adjourn during pleasure.

The Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor then re-entered the House, and took his seat upon the Throne.

Mr. Speaker: May it please your honour, the legislative assembly have elected me as their Speaker, though I am but little able to fulfill the important duties thus assigned to me.

If, in the performance of those duties, I should at any time fall into error, I pray that the fault may be imputed to me and not to the assembly whose servant I am and who, through me, the better to enable them to discharge their duty to their Queen and their country, hereby claim all their undoubted rights and privileges, especially that they may have freedom of speech in their debates,

access to your person at all seasonable times, and that their proceedings may receive from you the most favourable consideration.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded by the Honourable, the Lieutenant-Governor, to declare to you that he freely confides in the duty and attachment of the assembly to Her Majesty's person and government, and not doubting that the proceedings will be conducted with wisdom, temperance and prudence, he grants and upon all occasions will recognize and allow the constitutional privileges.

I am commanded also to assure you that the assembly shall have ready access to His Honour upon all suitable occasions, and that their proceedings, as well as your words and actions, will constantly receive from him the most favourable construction.

The Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor was then pleased to open the session with the following gracious speech.

Hon. W. Earl Rowe (Lieutenant-Governor): Mr. Speaker and members of the legislative assembly of Ontario.

I extend warmest greetings and a sincere welcome to each of you.

In the days since the Parliament of Ontario last met we have experienced a renewal of pride in the accomplishments of Canadians and a reinforced confidence in the future of Canada. This fresh and vigorous patriotism was generated in large measure by the many, various and wonderful events, celebrations and observances of the Centennial year. It has been exemplified in the forthright and productive discussions about the future of the country by the leaders of the provincial governments in Toronto in November and by the Prime Ministers and Premiers of the federal and provincial governments in Ottawa last week.

I extend to the people of Ontario my congratulations on the warmth with which they embraced the Centennial of Confederation. I join with my government in sharing the joy of the people of Ontario in the visits to Canada, and to Ontario, during the Centennial year, of our beloved Sovereign, Queen Elizabeth II, His Royal Highness The Prince Philip, and by other members of our Royal family. It was a great privilege to be host to members of other Royal families and the distinguished heads and representatives of many nations.

We were pleased by the enthusiastic participation of the people of Ontario in the largest of Canada's birthday celebrations, Expo 67, through personal visits by tens of thousands of our residents; by the outstanding Ontario pavilion and the extraordinary and inspiring motion picture "A Place to Stand"; and by that most memorable event, Ontario day, when twenty-six groups, representing the multi-cultural mosaic of Ontario, stood before the world in an expression of their profound pride in our province and in our country.

It is appropriate that my government is now making plans to be represented in the 1970 world exposition at Osaka, Japan, where the theme will be "progress and harmony for mankind".

The Centennial of Confederation was a turning point in the life of Canada. The very special responsibilities of the people and the government of Ontario within our federation became very apparent. My government demonstrated that it is not only willing and prepared, but committed, to the acceptance of this responsibility. This was evident in the leadership given at the Confederation of tomorrow conference and in the positions and proposals the government placed before the recent federal-provincial conference of Prime Ministers and Premiers in Ottawa.

Canada is in the midst of an internal crisis of its will and determination to survive as a cohesive nation. While my government is deeply aware that we are far from resolving all our difficulties, it is confident that Canadians possess the courage, the ability and the determination required to accomplish the task of building a greater, stronger and more united Canada. My government also recognizes the existence of two linguistic communities and many cultures within Canada and appreciates that this diversity is the source of much of our strength and the enrichment of our life. My government is committed to the assurance of full and equal citizenship for all residents of Canada, regardless of their national or linguistic origin. Nowhere in this broad country is the diversity of our people more obvious than in Ontario.

My government has accepted its responsibilities to our new residents and is committed to further action to ensure that such equality will continue both within the province of Ontario and throughout Canada. This is in keeping with the plans of my government to initiate a series of conferences throughout Ontario to foster interest in community affairs and to improve communication between the newcomer and the established residents of our province.

While we are in the midst of a national evolution, we have accomplished much and travelled far toward achieving solutions to our difficulties. New order in our Confederation is emerging from our deliberations. The promise of the future was evident at the constitutional conference in Ottawa last week. Succeeding meetings will produce further positive results of benefit to all of the people of Canada. My government is pledged to a continuing creative role in that process.

It is the intention of my government to present to this assembly a full report on matters related to the future constitutional development of Canada.

The government of Ontario has demonstrated its willingness to consider constitutional change, the distribution of powers, the nature of our federal institutions, the proposed charter of human rights, and to ensure, where practical, the linguistic equality of French-speaking residents of Ontario.

As a specific response to the spirit of linguistic equality, my government will propose that any member of this assembly shall have the formally recognized right to address the Legislature in either English or French. A resolution will be brought forward to make this an order of this assembly.

Although the events of the Centennial year are now behind us, it is most appropriate that the inspiration provided by that marvellous experience be carried with us as we go forth, with boldness and firmness, into the second century of federal partnership. The Ontario of 1968 is far more numerous in people, far richer in capital assets and natural resources and has far greater potential than the Ontario guided by the government of the Hon. John Sandfield Macdonald as he took Ontario into the first years of Confederation. Today, my government enters the second century of Confederation accepting and welcoming the challenges of the Canada of tomorrow.

During this first session of the twenty-eighth Parliament of Ontario, proposals will be brought forward to ensure further the strength and ability of our people to meet their responsibilities to our country and to our dynamic province. Priorities have been established and are being followed. A broad and complete educational programme and the provision of adequate housing at reasonable cost continue to command the urgent attention of the government of Ontario. The rapid growth of urban centres, accompanied by demands for economical, high-speed transportation facilities, the provision of adequate water and sewage facilities, urban redevelopment and outdoor recreation are of immediate importance. My government will continue to pursue excellence in the provision of services for the health and human betterment of all residents of the province. Programmes will be accelerated to improve the purity of the air we breathe, the water we drink and the efficient multi-purpose use of our land. In company with such commitments, my government will provide financial relief to our municipalities and to individuals who pay real estate taxes. The government of Ontario will propose decisive action in each of the areas I have just mentioned.

A systematic and staged reform of the taxation and revenue system of the province of Ontario, its municipalities and school boards has begun. Two major recommendations of the report of the Ontario committee on taxation have been accepted by my government. Proposals will be placed before you to provide for a basic shelter grant and for the assumption by the province of the cost of the administration of justice. In co-operation with individuals, private organizations, municipalities and municipal associations, the government of Ontario is undertaking a comprehensive evaluation of all the recommendations of the Ontario committee on taxation in order that reforms may be introduced.

My government will continue to move forward with its programme to rationalize the system of municipal government in Ontario. At this session, you will be asked to consider legislation to provide for the organization of a system of regional government in the Ottawa-Carleton area, where a regional council with representation from local municipalities will be proposed.

Legislation will be introduced to provide for the establishment of larger units of school administration. These will permit the development of educational programmes to the end that all the children of Ontario will have an equal opportunity to develop their maximum potential. To ensure this, my government will also place before you legislation to provide French language secondary schools, within the framework of the public education system of Ontario, in those areas of the province in which there are sufficient French-speaking students to warrant such schools.

You will be requested to consider the establishment of the Royal Ontario museum under an independent board of directors. The museum will join the art gallery of

Ontario and the centre of science and technology as provincially-financed cultural, educational and research institutions.

The report of the Ontario law reform commission on the basis for compensation in expropriation has been given detailed consideration by my government. Legislation will be placed before you to ensure that owners of property which must be acquired in the public interest will be dealt with fairly and will receive compensation on a reasonable and equitable basis.

You will be asked to approve amendments in The Workmen's Compensation Act to provide appropriate levels of benefits and allowances paid under this Act. In addition, my government will further increase its efforts to reduce injuries and fatalities in employment. To assist in the protection of the work force of the province, you will be asked to approve new labour standards legislation.

The broad health services programme of the government of Ontario will be further extended by measures to expand the benefits under the hospital services plan. It is also proposed to include essential ambulance services as a benefit under the hospital plan, thus providing a more uniform province-wide ambulance service. Air ambulance facilities will be developed in sparsely populated areas of northern Ontario.

Under the Ontario medical services insurance plan, there will be further extensions of benefits, including the examination of eyes by refraction when carried out by a physician or an optometrist.

The health services programme of the government will be further extended through an arrangement which will have a significant and beneficial effect on the cost of prescription drugs and drugs used in hospitals and welfare institutions.

My government will embark on vigorous programmes to further maintain adequate levels of food produced by Ontario's agricultural industry while at the same time ensuring that the producers of food are adequately compensated for their investments in labour, management and capital. As an illustration of my government's determination, you will be asked to consider special legislation to strengthen the position in the market place of the producer of beef.

The recommendations of four select committees, dealing with youth, aging, company law and conservation authorities, have been carefully considered by the government. This assembly will have placed before it for consideration and approval courses of action arising from the work of these committees.

My government proposes to establish an Ontario roads to resources programme to further promote the development and use of the abundant natural wealth of our province. This programme will include the planning and development of transportation systems to and from the main arterial routes. These will be based on the resources of forestry, mining, fish and wildlife, tourism and the requirements of the residents of northern Ontario.

My government will also introduce a provincial airports Act, under which municipalities in northern Ontario may be assisted financially in acquiring and developing airports and airstrips.

This assembly will be asked to approve an impressive programme of highway improvements and expansion in all areas of Ontario. The programme will include the start of Highway 417 to connect Ottawa with a new Quebec freeway.

Among other proposals you will be asked to consider will be legislation dealing with all aspects of the incorporation, operation, management and dissolution of ordinary commercial corporations in Ontario. You will have placed before you legislation dealing with the operation of insurance companies and loan and trust corporations. You will be asked to consider proposals to further extend consumer protection legislation, based on the operational experience of the consumer protection bureau.

Legislation will be introduced to give to our magistrates and juvenile and family courts the status of provincial courts. Legislation will provide for the appointment of provincial judges who will preside in these courts.

As part of the continuing review of the efficiency of government, legislation will be introduced to strengthen the basic administrative structure of the government's financial operations, as recommended by the Ontario committee on taxation. You will be asked to approve the creation of two distinct departments to replace the present Department of Treasury. A Department of Finance and Economics will provide a unified organization to deal with economic, financial, fiscal and taxation policy and federal-provincial affairs. A Department of Provincial Revenue will carry out the responsibilities of administering all tax statutes and the collection of all revenues.

My government will also establish a central purchasing authority within The Department of Public Works to assure greater economy and efficiency in the procurement of goods and services.

Extended efforts will be made to sustain the tourist momentum fostered by events of the Centennial year. This will be assisted by the development of a master plan for tourism and outdoor recreation in Ontario.

The year 1968 has been designated throughout the world as International Human Rights Year. The principles of the United Nations universal declaration of human rights have found expression throughout the statutes of the province of Ontario, most notably in the Ontario human rights code. Agencies of the government will co-operate to observe the twentieth anniversary of the declaration.

The programmes, policies and proposed legislation of my government, which I have outlined and which will be presented to this assembly for consideration, will ensure that your achievements will be noteworthy.

May Divine Providence guide you in your deliberations.

The Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor was then pleased to retire from the chamber.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: I beg to inform the House that to prevent mistakes, I have obtained a copy of His Honour's speech, which I will now read.

(Reading dispensed with.)

Introduction of bills.

THE PERPETUITIES ACT, 1966

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Perpetuities Act, 1966.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs (Mr. Rowntree), that the speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor to this House be taken into consideration tomorrow.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: I beg to inform the House that Mr. Nixon, the member for Brant, is recognized as leader of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition.

The Clerk has received from the chief election officer and laid upon the table, the roll of the members elected at the general election of 1967.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 3.45 o'clock, p.m.

No. 2



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

First Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Thursday, February 15, 1968

Speaker: Honourable Frederick M. Cass
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1968

5

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Thursday, February 15, 1968

Reading and receiving petitions 11

Motion for provision for printing reports, Mr. Robarts, agreed to 12

Motion to appoint standing committees, Mr. Reilly, agreed to 14

Motion to appoint select committee re standing committees, Mr. Reilly, agreed to 30

Questions to Mr. Robarts re the Ontario Centennial museum of science and technology, Mr. Nixon 30

Question to Mr. Robarts re use of the French language in the Ontario civil service and Legislature, Mr. T. Reid 30

Question to Mr. Randall re the Ontario housing corporation, Mr. Trotter 32

Question to Mr. Wishart re complaint of police brutality, Mr. Paterson 32

Questions to Mr. Simonett re water pollution, Mr. MacDonald 32

Question to Mr. Bales re the Canada and Dominion Sugar Company, Mr. Paterson 33

Questions to Mr. Welch re the Pellar Brewery Company, Mr. Shulman 33

Questions to Mr. Robarts re OMSIP, Mr. Sargent 34

Questions to Mr. Wishart re Mrs. Viola MacMillan, Mr. Sargent 34

Question to Mr. Wishart re the Canadian bar association, Mr. Sargent 35

Questions to Mr. Davis re the Mackay commission on religious education, Mr. Pitman 35

Questions to Mr. Davis re the Hall commission report, Mr. Pitman 36

Question to Mr. Davis re the commission on higher education, Mr. Pitman 36

Questions to Mr. Davis re school bus transportation, Mr. Worton 36

Question to Mr. Simonett re pollution of Lake Ontario, Mr. R. S. Smith 37

Questions to Mr. Gomme re sanding trucks, Mr. Makarchuk 37

Questions to Mr. Randall re the Ontario housing corporation, Mr. Peacock 38

Question to Mr. A. F. Lawrence re staking in the Elliot Lake area, Mr. Farquhar 38

Questions to Mr. MacNaughton re payroll deductions of civil servants, Mr. Jackson 39

Tabling report, Mr. Wishart 40

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to 41

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 1968

The House met at 3 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are always pleased to have visitors to the Legislature, and today we welcome guests from the following schools: In the east gallery, Gladstone Avenue senior public school, Toronto, and Hillfield college, Hamilton; and in the east and west galleries Earl Grey senior public school, Toronto.

Petitions.

Clerk of the House: The following petitions have been received:

Of the Canadian conference of The Evangelical United Brethren Church praying that an Act may pass confirming its union with The United Church of Canada.

Of the corporation of the town of Thessalon praying that an Act may pass permitting it to exempt from taxation certain property occupied by the Thessalon curling club.

Of the corporation of the city of Belleville praying that an Act may pass authorizing it to enter into agreements with suppliers of cable television.

Of the Oshawa Young Women's Christian Association praying that an Act may pass exempting it from municipal and school taxes.

Of the corporation of the city of Oshawa praying that an Act may pass authorizing it to provide for in the current estimates, sums to cover deficits of the public transportation system operated by the public utilities commission; and for other purposes.

Of the corporation of the city of Sault Ste. Marie praying that an Act may pass permitting it to acquire land and buildings by agreement of lease; and for other purposes.

Of the corporation of the county of Renfrew praying that an Act may pass validating a bylaw of the said county which established the Cobden-Eganville high school district.

Of the corporation of the village of Chalk River praying that an Act may pass confirming the boundaries of the said village.

Of the corporation of the city of Kingston praying that an Act may pass permitting it to establish certain conditions precedent to the development or redevelopment of land.

Of William W. Grant, J. Lawrence Pergau and George Edgar Heasman praying that an Act may pass making the Brockville club a corporation without share capital.

Of the corporation of the city of Hamilton praying that an Act may pass authorizing it to extend tax credits to owners or shareholders of co-operative apartments and condominium units.

Of the board of trustees of the Roman Catholic separate schools for the city of Ottawa praying that an Act may pass permitting the election of trustees in staggered terms.

Of the corporation of the city of Eastview praying that an Act may pass continuing the city in the name of the corporation of the city of Vanier, and la corporation de la cité de Vanier in the French language.

Of the corporation of the town of Smith's Falls praying that an Act may pass changing the name of the town to town of Smiths Falls and making such spelling as legal and lawful in the past as if spelled with an apostrophe at that time.

Of the corporation of the township of Nepean praying that an Act may pass authorizing it to require distributors of cable television to enter into financial agreement with the corporation.

Of the corporation of the city of Peterborough praying that an Act may pass authorizing the Peterborough utilities commission to enlarge and improve the botanical park.

Of the corporation of the city of Peterborough praying that an Act may pass authorizing election to public office on the ward system.

Of Herbert R. Balls, George R. Berry, Mrs. F. S. Browne, Anthony C. Butler, G. M. Demers, D. Donald Diplock, Stuart Godfrey, E. W. I. Keenleyside, Raymond C. Labarge, His Honour Judge Peter J. Macdonald, Miss Velma Reid, R. S. Rooney, I. Norman Smith, Robert W. Southam, Henry Stubbins, Fletcher Troop and Lloyd Vineberg praying that an Act may pass establishing the community foundation of Ottawa and district.

Of the corporation of the city of Ottawa praying that an Act may pass authorizing it

to regulate and license coin vending machines; and for other purposes.

Of the board of the combined Roman Catholic separate schools of Renfrew praying that an Act may pass authorizing the board to borrow upon debentures the sum of three hundred and fifty thousand dollars.

Of the corporation of the county of Ontario praying that an Act may pass increasing the voting power of reeves and deputy reeves of some of the local municipalities.

Of the corporation of the city of Barrie praying that an Act may pass establishing a parks and recreation commission.

Of the corporation of the town of Bowmanville praying that an Act may pass authorizing the issue of debentures for public works.

Of the Owen Sound Young Men's and Young Women's Christian Association praying that an Act may pass exempting it from municipal and school taxes.

Of the corporation of the county of Peel praying that an Act may pass authorizing it to issue and sell sinking fund debentures.

Of the corporation of the city of London praying that an Act may pass abolishing the London railway commission; and for other purposes.

Of the board of education for the city of London praying that an Act may pass confirming certain payments of retirement allowances; and for other purposes.

Of Lilith Standish, Thomas T. Standish and Gerrard S. MacLean praying that an Act may pass reviving the company known as Wool and Gift Shops (Toronto) Limited.

Of the corporation of the town of Palmerston praying that an Act may pass dissolving the Palmerston hospital commission and transferring the assets and liabilities to the Palmerston general hospital.

Of the corporation of the city of Niagara Falls praying that an Act may pass authorizing the continuation of the Greater Niagara transit commission; and for other purposes.

Of the corporation of the township of Rayside praying that an Act may pass authorizing it to issue and sell debentures for school purposes.

Of Melvin M. Anaka, Helen Anaka and Joseph Dexter praying that an Act may pass reviving Cardinal Insulation Limited, a private Ontario company.

Of the corporation of the county of Welland praying that an Act may pass authorizing the county of Welland and the cities of Niagara Falls, Welland and Port Colborne to enter into agreements for the erection and maintenance of homes for retarded persons.

Of the corporation of the city of Welland praying that an Act may pass providing for the establishment of a parks and recreation board.

Of the corporation of the city of Windsor praying that an Act may pass authorizing it to enforce compliance with the standards of fitness for human habitation of dwellings; and for other purposes.

Of the Lutheran Church-Missouri synod praying that an Act may pass authorizing it to acquire and hold lands in mortmain.

Of the Canadian Order of Foresters praying that an Act may pass authorizing it to apply to the Parliament of Canada for a special Act continuing the society under the name of Canadian Foresters Life Insurance Society, and in French, Forestiers Canadiens Société d'Assurance Vie.

Of the corporation of the township of Pelee praying that an Act may pass authorizing it to establish, operate and maintain a farm for raising pheasants; and for other purposes.

Of the trustees of the Toronto general burying grounds praying that an Act may pass authorizing it to acquire lands for burying grounds outside of the county of York.

Of the corporation of the city of Toronto praying that an Act may pass to annul the condition that lands known as Clarence Square should be held forever as a public square; and for other purposes.

Of Rev. Gordon V. Crofoot, Dr. Edward S. Fish, Mr. J. A. Northy, Mr. Harold D. Poole, Mr. Lawrence M. Stark, Miss Ivy M. Bunt and Miss Marjorie E. Finch praying that an Act may pass reviving the letters patent of incorporation of the Toronto city mission.

Of Abraham Martin, Ruth Martin and Howard Martin praying that an Act may pass reviving the charters of Imperial Sewing Machine Company Limited and Imperial Sewing Machine Company (Kitchener) Limited.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Hon. J. P. Robarts moves, seconded by Hon. H. L. Rowntree, that during the present session of the legislative assembly provision be made for the taking and printing of reports of debates and speeches, and to that end that Mr. Speaker be authorized to employ an editor of debates and speeches and the necessary stenographers at such rates of

compensation as may be agreed to by him. Also, that Mr. Speaker be authorized to arrange for the printing of the reports, in the amount of 2,000 copies daily; copies of such printed reports to be supplied to the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor, to Mr. Speaker, to the clerk of the legislative assembly, to the legislative library, to each member of the assembly, to the reference libraries of the province, to the press gallery, to the newspapers of the province approved by Mr. Speaker, and the balance to be distributed by the Clerk of the assembly as directed by Mr. Speaker.

Clerk of the House: Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry?

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, just a small matter in connection with that motion which has come to my attention over the past two or three years. I understand that the editor of *Hansard* has been instructed, presumably by Mr. Speaker's predecessor, that from time to time he may make small corrections in the interest of precision. I have been exposed to these small corrections myself when, on occasion, I referred to the leader of the government as Premier rather than Prime Minister.

This normally comes back from *Hansard's* office corrected and I, of course, stroke it out and put Premier back in, but it always comes out as Prime Minister. It seems to me that we might clear up some of these difficulties if, Mr. Speaker, you would see that the editor is instructed to use the words that we use in this connection. I know that the leader of the government himself has recently said that he has no strong feelings on the matter, and I suppose the two can be used interchangeably here as they are elsewhere.

Although I know that the leader of the government himself may have noticed some small confusion at the Confederation of tomorrow conference, and at the federal-provincial conference last week—when there seems to have been a profusion of Prime Ministers, more from time to time, since Mr. Bennett has decided that he will have that word printed on his door—and while there is very strong historical background for the use of that word here, surely, as we change the status of our province in Confederation and we deal ever more closely with the other leaders of provincial jurisdictions and the leader of the federal administration, it might very well be in the interests of precision and clarity that we adopted more and more the term "Premier" to refer to the head of the government here.

The only reason I rise at this particular time is that we are approving the printing of *Hansard* and there has been this difficulty in getting them to use the term that is actually used in debate.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, in answer to the leader of the Opposition—as you know I was speaking in Niagara Falls recently and I said, "Call me Prime Minister, call me Premier, or call me John, as long as I have the job." I have no feeling one way or the other. But as I explained to that audience when I took this particular position, "Prime Minister" was written on the door and it was printed on the letterheads.

I have done a little checking and I find that John Sandfield Macdonald, a hundred years ago, called himself "Premier" as I see in the recording of these things, and his follower, I believe, was Blake, and he called himself "Premier". But it was the leader of the Opposition's predecessor, Sir Oliver Mowat, who introduced the term "Prime Minister", and I do not know that we necessarily have to cast away everything here that has the gloss of tradition upon it.

I certainly have no intention nor is there any need of doing anything to formalize this one way or the other. Over the years, it has been used interchangeably. Certainly, I hope that the editor of *Hansard*, whoever he may be, hears my remarks. It was not on my direction that the hon. leader of the Opposition's words were changed in *Hansard*, nor would anything you ever said in *Hansard* be changed at my request. I would consider that highly improper and if the hon. member chooses to refer to me as "Premier" and it is so printed in *Hansard*, that is perfectly all right as far as I am concerned.

I just rise to speak to this point in order to assure my hon. friend that it was not done at my request. That was a unilateral action as the hon. member has mentioned on the part of the *Hansard* editors.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, a rose by any other name—the first Minister is the first Minister—I do not intend to pursue that point, but I did want to raise another point with you in connection with the motion which is now before the House.

I understand that the quantity of *Hansard* printed last year was sufficiently restrictive that there had to be very great care exercised

in making them available. For example, when I came into this Legislature some years ago, I was presented with what I thought was a very useful document—namely the bound volume for the previous year.

New members, I understand this time, are not getting a bound volume because they are not available. I wonder if it might not be useful for you to examine whether or not the 2,000 figure—which I understand is 200 more than last year—might not be increased. I think the cost is rather a small one for the extra copies, to make sure that we do have adequate to meet our needs, whatever they may be, in the year that lies ahead.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr Speaker, may I ask the Prime Minister—or the Premier I should say—to include in the list of individuals or organizations that are to receive copies of *Hansard*, university libraries and the libraries of colleges of applied arts and technology, in addition to high schools that do have courses set up in political science?

Mr. Speaker: I might assure, first of all, the member for Windsor-Walkerville that, under the Speaker's direction, it has been customary for university libraries, and those libraries in colleges of applied arts and technology, to receive copies, as well as those schools which request the copies of *Hansard*—so that I think that may well be left with the Speaker and the Clerk.

With respect to the question raised by the leader of the Opposition, I will ensure that the words are not changed by the editor of *Hansard* when uttered by the leader of the Opposition in this House.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Or anybody else.

Mr. Speaker: Or anyone else, indeed, yes. So far as the question raised by the member for York South is concerned, I would like to assure him that it is the considered opinion of the advisors to the Speaker, who have knowledge of this, including the Clerk of the House, that the printing of some 2,000 copies for this session, at least, will be ample for reasonable distribution of *Hansard*.

It is always a problem, as every member will understand, because there are very few members who would not like to have, at least on the occasion when they make an address in this House, many hundreds of copies to send to their interested constituents, and yet that is something which is beyond, I think, reasonable prudence — financial prudence — so far as the House and the money of the people of Ontario are concerned.

I will assure the member that not only have we carefully gone over the list, but we will do so again, and if we find that it is not sufficient I am sure there can be arrangements made, and the necessary motion introduced at a later date.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, I move that until further order, this House will meet at 2.30 p.m. on each Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday, and at 10.30 a.m. on each Friday.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. L. M. Reilly moves, seconded by Mr. R. G. Hodgson, that standing committees of this House for the present session be appointed for the following purposes: 1. On agriculture and food; 2. On education and university affairs; 3. On government commissions; 4. On health; 5. On highways and transport; 6. On legal bills and municipal affairs; 7. On labour; 8. On natural resources and tourism; 9. On private bills; 10. On privileges and elections; 11. On public accounts; 12. On standing orders and printing; 13. On welfare and reform; which said committees shall severally be empowered to examine and inquire into all such matters and things as may be referred to them by the House and to report from time to time their observations and opinions thereon with power to send for persons, papers and records.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House the motion carry?

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few remarks on this motion which is the standard one for the appointment of committees of the House, particularly the phrase "those matters referred by the House", which is in the motion you have just read, sir.

As far as that is concerned, in the most recent years since 1962, of which I have personal knowledge, the committees have dealt largely with bills only that have been before the House and have been sent to these committees for more detailed examination. Now it is my considered view, sir, and I hope I can make it yours, that these committees might deal much more extensively with the matters in the public area at issue or of general interest in the area of their immediate concern.

Now this really means that the usefulness of the committees can be expanded considerably. Since 1961, in my view, these committees have deteriorated in their usefulness and their effect on legislation.

Now there have been many instances—

Mr. J. H. White (London South): Liberals never know!

Mr. Nixon: —there have been many instances that we have discussed previously, and I notice that the date 1961 is more significant for some in the House than others, particularly the hon. Premier, because I believe it has been under his leadership that the use of these committees has fallen into disrepute to some extent.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Nixon: It seems to me that these committees, as they are presently set up in the list read to us by the chief government Whip, cover the large area of matters of urgent public importance. There is not specifically a committee for housing, but certainly at least one of those committees could take as their chief concern an investigation into this matter.

But, of course, we know that we are here for at least four years in the general order of things. It may well be that the government would be defeated on a matter of importance before that time—it does not seem to be on the books just at the moment.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Nixon: On the other hand, during the four years that lie ahead, surely we can order ourselves in committees so that by the choice that we as individual members make at the present time in becoming members of a specific committee, that by regular meetings, and of course careful attention to attendance and what goes on there, and by regular participation in the work of committees, we can build ourselves into groups of experts on particular subjects.

As the Minister of Education (Mr. Davis) knows, I have attempted to pay some special attention to the work of his department; and I shall not repeat for your benefit, sir, some things that I have said about the education committee in the far past. But in the immediate past, in the last three or four years, this committee, which in my view is the most important one in the House—I believe it is the largest, it deals certainly with the largest appropriation that we as a Legislature put at the disposal of the government—has met very infrequently indeed.

It has become the Minister's habit to bring down his major legislation very late in the session, with perhaps a little flurry around the Easter vacation when the Ontario educational association is meeting, and for this reason we as members of the committee may very well go for four to five months without having an opportunity to discuss in committee, matters of importance with regard to education.

Now normally the Clerk exercises his responsibility in convening the first meeting, and at that time the government majority selects a chairman who, with a few appropriate words of thanks for the honour bestowed upon him, adjourns the committee until further notice.

In the case of the education committee particularly, this has recently been for periods as long as three to four and, I believe, two years ago, almost five, months. Now surely we can, as we begin a new Legislature, put the responsibility on the chairman of these committees and on those of us who assume committee responsibilities seriously, to have an orderly series of meetings in which we not only get the views, particularly the factual background of the work of the particular department from the civil servants, but we have on opportunity to call before the committee those from the community at large who may have either special knowledge or special views as to that particular area of government responsibility. So that I would say that over the period of four years, if we set our minds to this, the members of the various committees can build up among themselves, among ourselves, considerably more expertise in these particular areas than we have in the past.

Now, I believe this matter of continuing investigation in matters well beyond individual bills that are brought before the committees for detailed examination, sir, is an important one.

Certainly in matters of health the good doctor, the Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond), knows that involvement of citizens across the province is something essential. This might very well be the vehicle by which the Ontario medical association can keep a closer liaison with the policies of government as they evolve; or perhaps even as they become entrenched and immovable, as they have in the past.

The federation of agriculture, the farmers' union, Canadian union of students, teachers' professional organizations, many other groups, frequently request an opportunity to meet behind closed doors with the government caucus; frequently with the Opposition caucus and the NDP.

But surely we would be doing them a favour as well if these committees were set up in such a way that these particular groups —and I do not call them lobbies because they do not contain within themselves the seeds of self-interest usually associated with lobbying—these groups who are adequately prepared to bring forward a specific position and put it before the government, or better than that put it before the Legislature, would have a forum in which they could accomplish this very thing.

I was walking down the hall the other day and noticed there were two security guards outside committee room No. 1, and when I asked what was going on in there I was told that a delegation was meeting the Cabinet and probably a part of the Conservative caucus. I do not know who was in there, it may well be that the same group will request an opportunity to talk to the Opposition, I sincerely hope so. It may have been the farmers' union because I read the next day that they were in the buildings conferring with the government. But I believe that it would be in the best service of those particular organizations, and in this case the farming community in general, if there were this opportunity for an open discussion with the Minister concerned there, and with his chief lieutenants in the department who would be free to express the factual background associated with the subjects under discussion. Then the Minister in many ways would be put on the firing line before those people for whom he acts, in the area of agriculture in this particular case.

So I say to you, sir, that I believe we can upgrade the committee system in this general sense and I urge the government through you, sir, that we undertake this as a project of some priority.

Now, beyond this, I believe that the committees as they will be constituted by passage of the motion before us, which I of course support, should undertake some more detailed discussion, that there should be more specific matters put before them. We attempted in the last two sessions to do this from our side of the House.

You may remember, sir, a discussion on this very motion a year ago when it was my contention, and the contention of a large number of us on this side, that one of the committees should undertake a careful examination of the role the government played in the Prudential Finance collapse at that time. Unfortunately, that amendment to the motion did not carry, and I still do not feel that we have had sufficient public discussion and examination of this particular affair.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Nixon: Now there were other instances.

Last year there was the difficulty associated with the Niagara parks commission in which most of the membership resigned, including the hon. member for Welland (Mr. Morningstar) who has since then reconsidered his position and gone back onto his onerous responsibilities under the chairmanship of the former Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Allan) who is now sitting in another position in the ministry. This is a matter that has never come out publicly to the satisfaction of the taxpayers, certainly not to the satisfaction of those who do not support the government in this Legislature.

At that time, the Premier himself refused to make public the correspondence that he had with the members of the commission who had resigned and there has not been an opportunity yet for full disclosure of the difficulties that had occurred at that time. The House refused under the leadership of the Premier, who is presently interjecting, to have one of the committees examine that very important matter, and apparently he is still refusing.

Now there is a similar matter that is pressing in on the government now—it should be pressing in on their attention—and that is the charges made by the president of Pigott Construction Company, which is the prime contractor dealing with our Centennial museum of science and technology, in which he said among other things that the project itself was, and I quote: "a provincial bloody disgrace," and the Premier of Ontario has undertaken to make a personal investigation of this matter.

I have a question that you approved, sir, that I will put to the Premier later in the afternoon about this matter in which he can tell us the results of his personal investigation, but I feel very strongly that if the committee system is going to be important and active in the work of this Legislature, this is the precise type of problem that should be put before them. It is not necessary, until other information is available, that we would have a Royal commission, but this a body that could carry out an independent investigation, an investigation that I think would be relatively objective—compared with the investigation that is presently going on, certainly—and which would bring into the open the facts associated with this ill-starred project.

So I feel, as my second point, Mr. Speaker, that the committees must be used more extensively than they have in the past, for areas of immediate investigation. And if this is going to be so, they must of course be provided with a certain amount of staff and assistance so that the chairman, who in every case so far has been a representative of the government party, would have at his disposal the facilities to undertake a good investigation, whether it is in the broader fields of the areas associated with the problem, or an immediate investigation of the type that might be associated with the Centennial museum.

It has often been suggested in this House that we follow the example set by other Parliaments, in that at least one of the committees be chaired by an Opposition member. That one is normally the committee on public accounts, and this, of course, is something to be recommended. It fosters the objectivity of the discussions that would take place there and removes from any thought of partisan influence, at least of government influence, the selection of the areas of investigation.

We have had a public accounts committee that in my view has been increasing in effectiveness in recent years. This is against the general trend that I brought to your attention earlier in my remarks, and I think that it would be made even more effective if a member of the Opposition might be elected as chairman of the committee.

I can see that the Premier might have some qualms about this matter, but surely, being the fair-minded man that he is and has proved himself to be in dealing with these matters in the past, he would give this careful consideration and when the public accounts committee meets for the first time, the government Whip would be instructed to support a nominee from the official Opposition.

It may very well be, in the interests of fairness all the way around, that another committee might have an Opposition chairman as well. The one I would like to see with an Opposition chairman, as well as the public accounts committee, is the committee on government commissions, which surely must be strengthened in its powers to investigate the very many commissions that should be called before it in the course of the session of the Legislature.

I have just have two other points to make to you, Mr. Speaker, and the next one has to do with a matter that I believe would make the work of the House more effective and more efficient.

Now, it would not, in my view, sir, unfairly curtail debate in any way, and although I did not put this proposition to the chief government Whip when this was discussed among the various parties, I believe that we in the Legislature should carefully consider the establishment of a committee on the estimates. We know that as the discussions relating to the expenditure programmes of the various government departments are put before us, we spend many days, many weeks, in detailed and careful examination of the government spending proposals. While it would be greatly desired that a majority of the members, most of whom are present this afternoon, would be able to extend their interest into the detailed areas of government expenditure in all departments, we know that this is an unfair expectation and on the face of it really quite unreasonable. Even when we come down to the discussion of the estimates of my hon. friend the Minister of Education after the second or third day of this sort of discussion, the Minister finds himself with just a few of his supporters behind him.

I am in the same position here, and the same is true of the NDP. We find that there are six or eight people involved in detailed discussion, and there are a number of people perhaps doing other work in the House in order to maintain a quorum. I suppose there is nothing in itself wrong about that, but surely it would be an advantage if we could work out for ourselves some method whereby this sort of careful dissection and investigation of the plans of a specific department might be moved outside the fairly rigorous rules that govern the discussions in this chamber.

I have said many times that I believe it would be much more effective if the Ministers' department advisers could speak for themselves on matters of fact, rather than having to sit at a table at the feet of the particular Minister and whispering information to him, or passing him notes. This works fairly well, but I do believe it holds up the efficiency of the discussion and we could move this sort of discussion outside the House entirely, where these people would have the right to enter into the discussion themselves.

If that were to be, I feel that a careful record of what went on there would be required. Certainly we would not give up the right to carry on the discussions in the House itself, but surely not the same discussions. We could work out a programme by agreement whereby the estimates could be considered *en bloc*. I would think the blocs would not

be too large, but if there were a matter of grave concern as between government policy and the views of the Opposition, this could come up for debate here.

Believe me, Mr. Speaker, I put this suggestion before you, not with any thought that we would curtail careful examination and public examination of government spending procedures, but only in the interests of a programme that would carry this out more effectively and more efficiently. I once again put this to you, sir, for your consideration, and for the consideration of the government members opposite.

I said to you a moment ago that I had only one or two other points to put to you. One that I want to mention, which I believe is very important, is that we have as yet not worked out a committee procedure for reviewing orders in council and regulations as effectively as I believe they should be. There is no thought that orders in council are secret in any way. They are posted publicly and the citizens of Ontario, the taxpayers and the members of the Legislature can have ready access to these. But surely the impact of these orders and the regulations that they frequently promulgate, if that is the correct connection, do not get the careful and intensive review that they should have, in my view, and in the views expressed by other members of the House on other occasions.

With these thoughts in mind, Mr. Speaker, it is not possible to offer an amendment that would be in order and that would cover the changes that I see would be to our advantage. But I suggest to you, sir, with great sincerity that this is a time when changes can be accomplished or at least we can make plans for these changes, if not in the immediate future, at least in the immediate session that would follow this one, this is in 1969.

I believe that there are many areas that control the conduct of the debates in this House that should come up for careful review as well. I can think of the comments that have been made on behalf of the Clerk of the Legislature in months gone by. I understand he is undertaking a review of Lewis' book of rules, which governs our activities here. I understand that this is being reviewed by the Clerk of the House, and I am sure that this would be of great advantage to us. But there have been changes that could be incorporated in this book of rules—a new approach to private members' hour, and the amendment that we go into committee of supply, which has been brought back into general usage in this House. I do believe that a review of our procedures in question period might be undertaken, and certainly the rules for the motion to adjourn the debate on matters of urgent public importance should be considered.

You, sir, have been following debates associated with that in recent years. You perhaps remember that it often develops into a donnybrook of shouting because the orders are perhaps not generally understood by all concerned, or in fact are in a form that is practically unusable if this is going to be something that is available through the use of this democratic Parliament.

So with these remarks, perhaps very extensive remarks, I would offer for the consideration of the House, Mr. Speaker, a motion, seconded by Mr. Singer, that would add to the motion put forward by the chief government Whip, that this House instruct the committee on standing orders pending orders to undertake forthwith a full study into the rules, precedents, customs and procedures of this House.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Speaker, I would like to comment very briefly on three points in connection with the motion which is before us. They are points which have been covered by the leader of the Opposition but they are ones which deserve emphasis, and deserve action, by the government.

The three particular points are: the appointment of a chairman from one of the opposition parties as chairman of the public accounts committee; it is a custom which has been honoured elsewhere and one which should be honoured in this House.

The second point is very simple: it is the question of the standing committee on government commissions. There are now some 100-odd commissions, agencies, and boards of this government, established by legislation, which are not responsible to any other body than this assembly. The only body of this assembly to which they can be responsible is the standing committee on government commissions.

Two years ago, we moved, in the standing committee, that a staff be appointed for that committee, consisting of a counsel and an accountant on a permanent basis so that members could be informed and would have the ability to ask, and have answered, meaningful questions about those various government agencies. I do not think that this needs to proliferate into other committees. I think it need be limited, but essentially limited, to the standing committee on government commissions.

The second part of our motion at that time was that the proceedings of that committee be recorded. And the third part of that motion, was that the 100-odd committees come before each session of this particular Parliament to answer, and to be responsive, as to what they have been accomplishing in the fields in which they are authorized to act.

We do not think that every one of the boards can come before the standing committee on government commissions every year. There are certain ones which should come before that standing committee each year; there are others where it would be quite satisfactory if they appeared once during each Parliament, but we have to have an orderly method to ensure that over the period of the four years, or better or less, of this Parliament, that each one of those boards will appear at least once before the standing committee on government commissions.

Surely it is not too much to ask the government to publish notice in an orderly way throughout the province, if necessary, as to when the particular boards are going to appear before the standing committee and to make certain that each of them appeared once during the course of the Parliament—and, for many of them, twice or three times, or four times for certain of them.

Now it may well be that the answer of the government will be: "We will raise that when the standing committee meets." We did raise it two years ago; it has been raised on many other occasions. Unless the standing committee or anticipated chairman of that standing committee is authorized by the government to accept that motion, it will be as meaningless as the motion which was accepted by that committee two years ago.

If, however, the government is seriously concerned about making the boards and agencies responsive to this assembly, then it will have no difficulty in providing the staff, the publication, and the reporting of the proceedings which is required to make that standing committee a meaningful one.

I would seriously ask, Mr. Speaker, that the government decides now that that standing committee will have the facilities, will have the planning, and will have the necessary publication to make it an effective committee. It is ridiculous, for all practical purposes, for that committee to sit unless it has the benefit of an informed staff who can assist the members to ask the kind of questions which are involved—for example, in determining how the Ontario Hydro Electric Power Commission is functioning. The only meaningful questions so far that have been asked about the Ontario Hydro has been because of the report of the federal power commission in the United States. There are many other such commissions where the members, no matter what their ability, no matter what the time that they can devote to it, are not able to ask any useful, intelligent questions about their operation.

The third matter is one to which the leader of the Opposition has referred, and that is the question of a standing committee on orders in council and regulations. It was just a year ago that the Prime Minister flourished a volume similar to this and informed us that the study which he had undertaken to have carried out would be completed; he stated that the study was then completed; he stated that it would be referred immediately to a standing committee of the Legislature so that early last session the committee could report back to the House about implementing recommendations and conclusions that the committee would decide upon, so that at the last session an additional standing committee could be appointed. Now, I ask, Mr. Speaker, that we do not go on through this session talking about the session in 1969, or the one in 1970. It was in 1960 that a select committee of this Legislature recommended the appointment of such a standing committee. Finally, in 1966, the Prime Minister undertook to have the study made; in 1967 he undertook to refer it to a standing committee; it was not referred. We were supposed to have dealt with it last session; let us deal with it at this session.

On the other points that the leader of the Opposition has raised, by and large we would support the generalities of them. We have tried to be specific, with one reservation, and perhaps later on in this debate there can be comment about the appointment of a committee to deal with estimates. The other points of the leader of the Opposition, by and large we agree with, but we want to focus attention on the three points—the appointment of a chairman from one of the Opposition parties as chairman of the public accounts committee; the second point, the need for a staff, adequate publication, and orderly review of the 100 or more boards and agencies of the province by the standing committee on government commissions; and the third point, the immediate appointment of a standing committee on orders in council and regulations.

Mr. Speaker, I therefore further move, seconded by the hon. member for Peterborough (Mr. Pitman), that the motion be further amended by adding thereto the words, "a standing committee on orders in council and regulations."

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): The hon. member should get his wife to look after his cold.

Mr. J. Renwick: Thank you.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, excuse me, I was just making a couple of notes. I would like to make a few comments before these amendments are put in the main motion. In the first place, I think the leader of the Opposition is quite wrong when he says that committee work has deteriorated since 1961. I have been the leader of the government since 1961 and the reference was obvious to me. All I can say is that I completely and thoroughly disagree with what he said, and I think there are a good many other members in this House, not only on my own side of the House, who would agree with that because we have made some very large strides indeed.

We went through these matters a year ago and I would like to point out to you that when you are thinking in terms of standing committees of this House, you must always think of them against a background of the form of government we have in this province, which is a responsible form of government. For instance, to suggest that we need a committee of this House to go into housing when you have a Minister sitting here—he sits down at this end of this row—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I can assure you he will be there when housing is being debated in this House; he will be right there in his seat and we are not operating—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, the baying has not even changed its note since the session ended last May, but I just point out that when you are talking about committees, you must remember that the standing committees of this House are part of a responsible form of government—they are not part of a congressional form of government—and the Ministers who are responsible are here.

This point has been raised in this House in this perennial debate about a committee dealing with estimates. I will come to that in a moment or two, but the standing committees of this House are set up to deal with specific matters referred to them by the Legislature itself; they are committees of the Legislature, but they do not, in any way, detract from the responsibility of the Minister.

The Minister must come in here and assume full responsibility for not only the policies of the government, but also for all the actions of the civil servants in his department. So I would suggest that you must think about our committees against that background, and I say further, that the efficiency and what will be accomplished by any committee really, in the final analysis, rests upon the men who make up the committee.

I am not going to get into recriminations or hassles about the attendance at committees—sufficient to say that it is not very good, and I think we are all aware of that. If the committees themselves, through their chairman, want—and I cannot believe that a committee of 11 or 12 men cannot produce the result it wants with its own chairman—if they want to request that certain matters be examined, certainly we, in the government, would never object to it in any way. As a matter of fact we have co-operated in every way possible, but I note—

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Just a moment. I note that this is a great topic for discussion on the second day but when the attendance in the committees runs down, nothing is ever said about it after that. I cannot recall last year, for instance, that any requests came from the committees. I would be delighted to have these bodies that you mention.

Now you made this same speech that you made today last year, practically word for word. That is the same speech this year as one year ago, but there the matter died. I would just say this to you: the committees that wish to come forward and ask—because they must get their direction from this Legislature, of course—and if you read the motion in front of you they will deal with such matters as are referred to them and this is the traditional role of the standing committee here. We have never made any attempt to limit those who appeared before any one of these committees.

Mr. Singer: What about the Niagara parks commission?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Who asked for that to be—was that your request that it be put? Well, Mr. Speaker, through you—

Mr. Singer: The House leader promised it would be done and in the usual manner quickly forgot about it.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I can go right into the Niagara parks commission matter if you like. If you recall all those letters were sent to me marked "confidential". Those men were completely free to tell the member or anybody else anything that was in the letters or any reasons they might have. They sent me resignations and I accepted them.

An hon. member: Utter nonsense!

Hon. Mr. Robarts: It may be nonsense to the member but we have a pretty good parks commission and it functions well. I will say this, that the committees work our programmes and they will receive every co-operation from the government that it is possible for us to give them because I think they can be very meaningful, but I do not expect the committees to usurp the functions of the Legislature because they will not. In practical application and working they will never usurp these functions and I will now turn to the question of the committee on estimates.

Here again this is a matter on which there is not unanimity. I rather doubt that the third party agrees—at least in conversations with members of the third party I have been led to believe that they do not necessarily agree with the idea of a committee on estimates. I doubt its efficacy myself unless we accompany it with some very strict rules.

Dealing with limitation of time taken in this Legislature, one may offer the pious hope that there would not be repetition, but even under the present system we get it two, three and four times, and I do not think we would save any time at all unless we accompanied that procedure with some form of limitation of debate in the estimates in the House.

Here, once again, you cannot do that because perforce the committee could only be composed of a certain number of people from the House and, of course, any other member who was not on that committee is perfectly free to come in here when the estimates are being considered in committee of the whole and make any comment he wishes. So I think the idea would be abortive. I am, however, prepared to suggest that I would be quite happy to sit down and discuss this to see if we could work out some arrangement to which we would agree and which would appear to have some possibility of success and produce a more efficient method of dealing with the business of the Legislature.

But just simply to set up a committee and say that we are going to refer estimates to it, will not accomplish what you want. In the first place our committees apparently work very hard now because it is difficult to get quorums at the committees. These are facts of life; I am laying no blame at anybody's doorstep, I am just telling the members that in the functioning of committees, as this session rolls along, they will all become aware of the fact that committee attendance simply is not very good. Therefore I rather dislike the idea of having the committees in any way supplant the function of the Legislature itself.

We are prepared to sit here and the Ministers are prepared to answer any questions for any given length of time as we have done in the past in the functioning of the departments. In my opinion it is a pretty good system of examining the full, complete functioning of the government, but if the member thinks there is some way we can work out a committee on estimates that will function, I would be more than happy to co-operate.

I would say this too, in regard to the amendment regarding the committee on standing orders, that I am not in agreement with the amendment offered by the leader of the Opposition. I am not in agreement for this reason: I do not think this is the proper body to undertake a full study into the rules, precedents, customs and procedures of this House. I think the terms of reference for that particular committee are much too broad —in fact for any standing committee of this House which would cease to exist, of course, as soon as the session is complete, and in addition we have a system of evolution going on in this Legislature continuously.

We have changed the procedures and the rules of this House every year I have stood in this place at the request of the Opposition parties, at the request of members of the government party, at the instigation of the government. We have a continuing review going on. The House leaders meet to examine the rules, the Whips are in constant communication, and I think we can do a good deal to change the rules.

The hon. member for Sudbury (Mr. Sopha) put forward the idea last year, or perhaps it was the year before last—I do not know, I lose track of the years—that we re-introduce the age-old spot for the address of grievances, or the statement of grievances, in the motion for supply. That was accepted and it is functioning.

We change year by year, and we are prepared to change in the future. This is the

way, in my opinion, that it should be done, when we can discuss these things together, because, frankly, we all seek the same objective, which is a more orderly and a more efficient method of doing the business of the people we represent.

I am prepared to accept the position you put in regard to the chairmanship of the public accounts committee. I would point out that the public accounts committee was really set up to function as it presently does only some four or five years ago—sometime since 1961 in any event. It was with some reluctance that step was taken because there is the very concrete and obvious problem that it can be made simply a place for a political witch hunt and this, of course, was in the mind of the government when we set it up.

However, I would say that this committee has discharged its duties and responsibilities in a very responsible manner. It has been a good committee. It has made recommendations which have led to improvements in the functioning of the government, and I think we have come to the stage now where we can take the next step and have, as a chairman of that committee, a member of the official Opposition, in order that we would be certain no taint, or no suspicion of government interference in the affairs of committees, could be inferred by anyone.

I might point out to you that in the United Kingdom, where a member of the Opposition chairs the public accounts committee, all its meetings are held *in camera.* I do not think that is necessary in this province. After examining the results the committee has achieved to date, and the method in which it has been conducted, I think we can proceed and we will provide the committee with the staff it requires from The Department of the Treasury, in order that it may continue as it has in the past.

That will be done at the time the committees are set up.

We come again to the question of staff for the committee dealing with boards and commissions, and I am not very happy about equipping the committees of the House with large, independent staff. We have given all these standing committees additional staff over the years. I remember the days when members of the press gallery used to serve as secretaries of the various standing committees. Well, those days are long since gone and we have built up—

Mr. MacDonald: Just five years.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I am sorry, I missed that interjection.

Mr. MacDonald: Just five years ago.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Well, since 1961.

Mr. MacDonald: You cut the press off.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: But we have, over a period of time, provided the staff considered necessary for these committees to do their tasks and we will continue to do that, but I do not think it is proper for us to get into a form of investigative committee work which, I am quite certain, that which the hon. member suggested would lead to.

However, we will see what staff the committee needs. I quite agree that if I were chairman of that committee, I would set down a four year programme, after the committee meets the first time, because that committee, all other things being equal, will be functioning for four years. The personnel will not change for four years, except for minor variations, and it should be, in my opinion, a relatively simple matter to take the list of boards and commissions—the ones you may want to examine—and divide them up and lay out a four year programme.

This, I believe, is what the public accounts committee has done in order that in a given period of time, it will have examined everything pretty completely that the government does in that area.

I think that it can be done, and should be done. The hours of sitting will be the limiting factor, of course. I quite agree it is very difficult to examine the Hydro Electric Power Commission for any stated length of time. It is such a large body it could take two or three meetings itself, or four or five, however many the committee wanted, but the committee is free to do that if it feels so inclined.

The commission will be there for as long as the committee wants it. The commission will answer the questions the committee wants asked and there is no reason in the organization of the committee, why these commissions could not be told before they are summoned, if they are properly timetabled, the questions they are going to be asked, and the areas of investigation of interest to members of the committee. This then could proceed in an orderly fashion.

I am quite prepared to see that these committees are properly staffed but I am not prepared, to go so far as to turn them into investigate committees a la congressional and senatorial committees in the United States. For every commission that this government has, there is also somebody in this House

who answers for it. There can be questions put about its operation and function and the committee itself can deal in whatever detail it wants with the particulars of their operation.

I do not think I have a copy of the final amendment—

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I asked the Premier a question—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Oh yes, I am sorry—

Mr. Nixon: Just before the Premier finishes, am I correct in gathering from his remarks then that he would not under any circumstances approve a committee of this House, either a standing committee, or on standing orders, or a select committee to look into the whole realm of updating the rules? He feels that this has got to be done in an evolutionary fashion and not by a committee of the House?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: No, I do not say that under any circumstances, no, but under these circumstances I am not going to support the member's amendment, for the reasons that I have stated, that there is an evolutionary movement. When the Clerk's book is complete, it may appear necessary that things are in such dire shape that we have to start right from the beginning and examine the whole matter. But that is what that motion says and I could not support it this afternoon.

Mr. Speaker: The amendment moved by the member for Riverdale, seconded by the member for Peterborough, was that the motion be further amended by adding thereto—I presume 14—"a standing committee on orders and regulations."

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Oh yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member for Riverdale was correct up to a point, but beyond that point I do not think his facts are quite correct.

I did undertake to have a study made and that study was made. He has a copy of it, I have a copy of it. It was distributed to both the other parties and it was referred to the legal bills and municipal affairs committee last year, as I undertook to do at the opening of the Legislature. It was considered by that committee at length and the committee did not see fit to make any recommendations regarding what was contained in it. The committee came to the conclusion that our procedures were adequate and satisfactory and so I simply point out to the House that—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The member's research is falling down.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: —what we undertook to do was done. There is one recommendation that was made some years ago in regard to regulations which I would be quite happy to arrange for, if the legal bills committee would like this done, and that was a suggestion made by that select committee which sat, perhaps in 1959 or 1960, dealing with some matters of government administration. The suggestion was made by that committee that the Registrar of Regulations appear before the legal bills committee or before a standing committee of this Legislature—and I presume it would be the legal bills committee—once a year to review regulations with that committee, with a view to pointing out to the committee any regulations which it might deem to be unusual or to be of some particular interest. I think that this procedure could very easily be followed.

As you know, the regulations are all published in the *Ontario Gazette*. Every member of this Legislature receives a copy. It is a very onerous task to read the regulations that are set out in each edition of the *Gazette*, simply because one generally does not have a broad enough interest to be able to comprehend what is in them because they cover such a wide variety of matters. On the other hand, it might very well be a useful exercise if the Registrar of Regulations were to appear before the legal bills committee, for however long it might take, to review all the regulations for the intervening year. You would have to leave something to his discretion in deciding what would be discussed there.

Our desire really is to give the regulations the widest possible dissemination to ensure that all those who might be in any way affected by them have a chance to read them. If that procedure is requested by the legal bills committee, the necessary arrangements can and will be made. But I simply do not accept the amendment calling for the creation of another standing committee when the procedures that we presently have were deemed, as far as I am concerned, to be adequate after the examination that was made a year ago.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I am rather disappointed that the Prime Minister has seen fit to reject completely out of hand the suggestion that would bring a better form of democracy to the proceedings in this House. He chooses to do this by drawing horrible parallels with what he says goes on in the United States, and says, "We do not want

this kind of investigation because we—" from the father image "—paternalistically will give you all of the information that is good for you." Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, this has been the attitude of this government for far too long, and it cannot be better illustrated than by what is contained on the pages of *Hansard* in last year's debate when we were dealing with The Niagara Parks Act. I do not know if the Prime Minister was present at that time, because the government position was defended by the House leader. The House leader's position, and the position of the hon. Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Allan) is indicated there. But the fact remains that under the present system of responsible government—the debate starts at page 2890—

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): What is the date?

Mr. Singer: The date of the debate is May 2, 1967. I would not want my friend, the House leader, not to have the full information available to him because I hope he will explain why he did not live up to the undertaking that he gave to the House at that time. But if you will recall, sir, at that time we first attempted to get from the hon. Minister without Porfolio, who had just been named as chairman of the Niagara parks commission, an explanation of the unusual and peculiar happenings that had gone on there. He would appear to have been, in the words of the Prime Minister, or the Premier, however he wants to identify himself—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: It is entirely up to the member.

Mr. Singer: He would appear to have been the responsible Minister of whom we could ask questions. What did the responsible Minister of whom we could ask questions have to say? He said: "I won't be really responsible until this Act is passed so I cannot really tell you until we finish the debate about this Act." Then we asked the question of the government: "Who is the responsible Minister?" And they said: "Well, really we don't know, but there is no one sitting in this House." And these words come—I am paraphrasing them a bit—but they come from the mouth of the hon. House leader. He said: "There is no one in this House who can answer you."

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Don't paraphrase.

Mr. Singer: In due course—oh, I wish the Minister would sit down until I am through. If he would start to read on page 2890 and read it through, he will find out what he said and he will refresh his memory.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Don't paraphrase.

Mr. Singer: This was the essence of it, Mr. Speaker. We had no responsible Minister in the House who was prepared to answer for the Niagara parks commission. Then the House leader said: "Well, all right, if you are going to be so insistent." There was a bunch of wrangling that went on, coupled with numerous interruptions by the hon. House leader. At the bottom of page 2901 this is what he said, and I quote exactly his words: "If it is of any assistance, and I have tried"—he is always trying, the House leader. "Of course, the Opposition wants to create confusion in these matters"—and this is his constant charge—"but as far as the government is concerned, there is no objection whatsoever to the board being called"—and that was the Niagara parks commission—"and if you would like to have a meeting next week, "May 2, or the week after," of this board and have them come before it, that is all right."

And then the debate continues on and he is going to make inquiries of the Whip, and he is going to direct the Whip and do all sorts of things and consult with the chairman. The system of responsible government breaks down, Mr. Speaker, because the government will not face up to the facts.

On May 2, there was not a Minister available in this House to answer for the parks commission; that commission was not called, nor was there any ability in the Opposition to be able to force it to be called before the committee on commissions, notwithstanding the undertaking given by the hon. Minister that it would be done.

This is where I say that the Premier has made a serious error in saying that our present procedures adequately cope with matters of concern to the people of the province of Ontario. There has to be a better system, otherwise it becomes patently obvious that the government, when it suits its purposes, can prevent us from examining matters of public concern, as they did on May 2 of last year.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I would urge upon the Premier to reconsider his position. The record is there and it is a particularly bad one in this regard. We still do not know what happened in the Niagara parks commission, and in election year it was particularly important, apparently, to the government that

we did not find out. Now, of course, the grand gesture will be made, and we are going to have a revolving rota of a thousand boards and commissions that we can examine once every four years.

There is a danger in that; I was not too surprised that the Premier accepted that suggestion from the leader of the NDP so quickly.

There is a very serious danger in that because conceivably, Mr. Speaker, we could examine the Niagara parks commission in 1968 in a few weeks, but something could arise in 1969 or 1970, and I can just hear the House leader now getting up and saying: "But in February of 1968 you examined it and you cannot do it again for another four years".

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Oh, no, no.

Mr. Singer: If the government is serious about a full and proper examination—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is confused by the fact.

Mr. Singer: If the government is sure that the people of the province of Ontario deserve full and complete information, then for goodness sake let us adopt the reasonable suggestion made by my leader. Let us not have on the record the obvious efforts of the government to keep from the public knowledge, the facts and matters concerning the people of the province of Ontario.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, my original intention was to speak solely to the proposed standing committee on orders in council and regulations, but this debate goes on and misrepresentation creeps into it so I am forced to clarify one or two points.

First, with regard to the committee on government commissions, the motion that was passed two years ago, Mr. Speaker, on the recommendation of my colleague from Riverdale was passed unanimously by the committee, including the Liberals, to the effect that there should be a staff. Now, one has to accept with a degree of gratification any slight promise of improvement in this area, and the Prime Minister has said that he is willing to have the committee recommend what staff it needs.

What distinction he is making between the staff that he is now willing to concede, and the staff that was proposed by my colleague —of an accountant and a counsel to do a thorough job—I do not know, I suppose we will just have to let experience be our guide. But the purpose is not an investigatory committee in the sense of what happened in Washington; it is simply to do an efficient analysis of the operation of that agency, or that board, or that commission. The other red herring that my friend from Downsview has brought in, of course, is nonsense, because the hon. member for Riverdale stated that you could bring in in any year whatever committees you wanted, and some of them are of less importance and you would hear them only once every four years, and others would be heard every year, every two years, every three years, or perhaps every four years.

Clearly, if a commission like that of the Niagara parks commission suddenly became worthy of further investigation this year, even though it had been investigated last year, it could be brought back again—so let us not have these red herrings brought into the picture.

I just personally look forward to discovering what may be the content in the Prime Minister's statement this afternoon—that he is willing that this committee have some staff. I hope when it comes, the staff will be an accountant and a counsel because I think a committee needs both of those to do the kind of digging into the various operations in these organizations so that the committee is responsible, not necessarily to the government, but to this Legislature. This Legislature in effect delegates to a commission a certain job to be done. Sometimes it is carrying out work that otherwise we would be doing here; sometimes it is a business operation, if it is like the Ontario Hydro, and I think we are responsible, as the board of directors so to speak, to hear what goes on. That, I submit, is the establishment of responsible government, in the sense of responsibility back to this Legislature.

Mr. Speaker, the second observation that I wanted to make was with regard to the question of a standing committee on orders in council. There is some dispute, quite frankly, in our ranks as to exactly what happened in the legal bills committee last year, and it will be interesting to go back and to examine its minutes to discover what happened. Certainly it is our firm recollection that no recommendation came back from the legal bills committee to do anything or not to do anything. Am I wrong? If I am wrong I—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: No, Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, and I am not a member of the committee, of course, but as I understand

it this was gone into—this report at that committee—and the committee made no recommendation one way or the other.

Mr. MacDonald: Well Mr. Speaker—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: That is my understanding.

Mr. MacDonald: Yes. Well, Mr. Speaker, with the Prime Minister I, too, was not a member of the committee so I cannot speak from personal knowledge. But the hon. member for Riverdale was a member of the committee, and intensely interested in the whole subject, and he has no recollection of any discussion taking place in the legal bills committee, and certainly I have no recollection of any recommendation coming back to the House.

What disturbs me, Mr. Speaker, is the Prime Minister's apparent retreat from his own very intense interest in this whole area, and his willingness to accept what I think is an unsatisfactory procedure—plainly the proposal that emanated some years ago from a select committee of this Legislature on government administration, for the annual bringing before the committee of the registrar, because this is not going to do the job that needs to be done. The problem you have, as we are all painfully aware, Mr. Speaker, is that orders in council and particularly regulations, represent the meat of many bills. We pass bills in this House which are mere skeletons, and the substance of those bills, insofar as they affect people across the whole of the province of Ontario, is not in the bill, it is in the regulations.

The Prime Minister, of course, is correct. They are published in the *Ontario Gazette* but very few people read the *Ontario Gazette* regularly. It is not a daily fare along with the daily newspaper, and what is desperately needed, Mr. Speaker, is not the registrar to come and report once to the committee, but a committee which is going to examine every regulation and every order in council to see whether in that regulation or order in council there is an abuse of power. If they find that there is such an abuse of power it can be reported back to this House, where they will have an opportunity for a full revelation to the public through the press and TV exactly what is taking place.

If the committee, on the other hand, from its examination of the order in council or the regulation, comes to the conclusion that this is all in order—there is nothing extraordinary about it—then the thing automatically passes. But my recollection is that in Manitoba, where this kind of committee has been established, what happens is that after a certain time lapse the order in council and the regulation become completely operative. Within that time lapse, a month shall we say, if the committee deems it necessary, it will refer it back to the House for a debate so that all the members of the House may be fully acquainted with the kind of power that is contained in the order in council or regulation.

The point I wanted to emphasize, Mr. Speaker, is that if the registrar is brought before the committee once during the year, what is he going to talk about? A few generalities? That is not meeting the point we want. What we want is a detailed examination of every order in council and regulation to find out exactly what it means, and that cannot be done by the registrar coming in unless he, in effect, is going to be the expediter of a consideration of them throughout the whole operation of the committee. So I would repeat, through you, Mr. Speaker, to the Prime Minister, I hope that he will reconsider his apparent dismissal of the proposal for a standing committee on orders in council and regulations because in my view the proposal of the registrar is a second best and very inadequate.

May I make one final comment on the amendment that was made by the leader of the Opposition. I agree with the leader of the Opposition that the objective of this resolution is a worthy one. I think it is well that we review our rules, precedents, customs and procedures in this House and get them in an up to date state, but I have to agree with the Prime Minister that I do not think the standing committee on standing orders is the proper body to do it.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): What do you suggest?

Mr. MacDonald: Well, at the moment I have no suggestion. I did make a suggestion last year that perhaps the previous Speaker, in conjunction with the Clerk and the present Speaker, might be an appropriate group. There was another proposal last year, the last time we discussed this, that maybe somebody within each party who is intensely interested in the rules of the House might be members of that kind of a committee.

I am willing to talk off the top of my head as to proposals. I am not completely unconversant with this problem. But that is not what is before us at the moment. What

is before us at the moment is the proposal that the committee on standing orders should do it. Now if they are going to do it surely we had better give very, very careful consideration (a) to the personnel; (b) that they are unlikely to be able to do it by the conclusion of this House, and at that stage the committee disappears, so that it is not an operative body. The leader of the Opposition made the proposal and I submit that it is not an appropriate one, though the objective is a very worthy one.

Mr. Sopha: Well, Mr. Speaker, what we are dealing with here is the viability and efficiency of Parliament as an institution. Therefore one might crave your indulgence and that of the House to add a comment.

By way of interpolation I can reveal what happened at the committee on legal bills last year for the information of those members who have addressed themselves to it and who have not spoken. The Minister of Transport (Mr. Haskett) arrived over the horizon on one occasion and he had some kind of a brief dealing with the matter of delegated legislation and his comments were very germane and very helpful and we discussed this thoroughly. The member for Riverdale was there at the time—and this is a matter very close to my heart—and I recall stating with very vitiated vigour, with which I usually speak, that what this province needs more than a five cent cigar is an administrative procedure code.

Professor Corry—President Corry I believe it is—Chancellor Corry perhaps, of Queen's said that it is time Canadian governments take steps to civilize the bureaucracy—that is his phrase—to civilize the bureaucracy—that is to say the adoption of a set of rules which govern the operation of all those people who exercise the power of delegated legislation. It is true that no decision was taken—no recommendation was made by the committee. I hope it will renew its researches this year into that very important area of public affairs.

The comments of the Prime Minister, and I always approach him with the greatest trepidation and respect, indicate that he is out of touch with what is going on in the committee life of this Legislature, and with my friend from Downsview I do not share his horror of the sinister aspects of the American congressional system. But I remind myself that Canada has exhibited its North American character in that it has borrowed in the development of its parliamentary institutions both from the British precedent and from the American, and I point merely to our Senate of Canada as being one of the illustrations of the moulding of these two.

In that regard this Legislature is well behind the Parliament of Canada and in recent years one has seen many illustrations of very effective endeavours of the committees of the House of Commons. Some of them, indeed, are joint committees of the Senate and House. I refer to the work done by the armed services committee, in giving everybody in the country that wanted an opportunity to oppose unification—they are all admirals—to have a forum in which to express their views.

The work done by the committee on the cost of drugs; the work done by the joint committee on divorce reforms—and no doubt there are many other illustrations that come to mind.

We have never done that here. Generally speaking, our committees have occupied themselves with the consideration of measures sent to them from this House and it has followed that the droll, tedious—both those words are very appropriate when we remind ourselves, the Attorney General and ourselves—the tedious hours that we had to spend in considering the securities bill and other statutes of a like nature, when there would often be only a corporal's guard of us who would survive the ordeal of several hours.

Now the other thing is that the lack of involvement of members, the lack of participation, the lack of the sense of stimulation that comes from being given important work has no doubt led Whips of the respective parties to a sense of frustration and might have created the retirement of the gentleman from London South and I suggest to the Prime Minister that that is the reason the committee system in general has failed to be as effective as it might have been.

The leader of the Opposition offers an alternative in this motion, which I heartily endorse.

Finally, I cannot resist the temptation to say that I look with gratification and enthusiasm on his resolution which encompasses the rules, procedures, customs, precedents and all the rest of the indicia of parliamentary government.

Let me say, Mr. Speaker, that I will not quarrel with my friend from York South about the form of the investigatory body. It is the principle with which we are concerned. We would adapt our motion to suit whatever

form might be mutually agreed upon, so he is not going to escape today by hanging his hat on the form of the body. He will be called upon to either support the principle, or repudiate it.

Let me get back to my final comment. The sooner we set up some such body as this, the quicker we will get rid of that Alice in Wonder make-believe of yesterday. As Duncan Macpherson said, "one thing about old Ontario, it is always up to date with yesterday." The sooner we will rid ourselves —I had hoped, sir, let me say, that when you stood in your place yesterday, that those prayers would have been updated, that we would have got rid of that Tudor nonsense that you chant every day.

Some hon. members: Shame, shame.

Mr. Sopha: Not at all. That we would make our appeal to the Deity contemporary and enlightened, and in line with the way people think in this province in 1968, instead of heralding a Tudor monarch.

So for that reason, if for none other, but for all the other reasons so ably expressed by my leader, I for one will heartily support this amendment.

Mr. L. M. Reilly (Eglinton): Mr. Speaker, before presenting the amendments, I should explain to the hon. members of this House that I had sent a written request to both Opposition leaders—the hon. leader of the Opposition and the hon. member for York South—asking them to meet in my office, if it was convenient.

I gave plenty of notice and telephoned a day in advance to make sure that they had received the correspondence, so that we could sit down and discuss all the matters concerning committee, and any improvement that could be made. I think I should explain to the hon. members of this House that this actually took place, and that two representatives of the Liberal Party and two representatives of the New Democratic Party, along with myself, sat down and discussed many of these things that we are talking about today.

At that time, there were three recommendations made, which I subsequently relayed to the Prime Minister, one was for the chairmanship of the public accounts committee, and the other two we have been discussing recently. There were no other amendments suggested.

All members were content with the formation of 13 committees, and I thought I should point out to the hon. members of this House that we had a very amicable meeting. The one exception of disagreement, and the only one, was one about the committee of estimates. There was no agreement about having an estimates committee.

I should point out that I, as a former chairman of the committee of the whole House, would like to do anything that I could do to speed up the work in the House of the estimates. I welcomed the suggestion that we give consideration to a separate estimates committee—but we could get no agreement on it.

I did not think, under the circumstances, that I should allow you to put the amendment until I had a chance to explain to the hon. members of the House that we had sat down and discussed this previously.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, speaking to the sub-amendment, and in reply to the chief government Whip, surely he is not suggesting that my suggestion put before you, sir, to set up a committee to deal with the reform of the rules of the House, should in any way be in the region in which he has jurisdiction. I understand from the Whip of the Liberal Party that he did have a very fine discussion with the hon. member, we all do when the occasion arises. But for you to suggest that in any way we were not acting in good faith following your meeting is surely inadmissible under these circumstances. My amendment, as you well know, Mr. Speaker, calls for a committee to deal with the rules of this House and I believe that it is one that should be supported by reasonable members on all sides.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Speaker: This being the opening of a new Parliament, and there being many new faces in the members' chairs, I would just draw to the members' attention the rules which are followed by this House with respect to voting procedures on an occasion such as this. For your information, I shall read the motion, the first amendment, the further amendment, and then the voting of course will be in the reverse order as far as may be necessary.

Mr. Reilly moves, seconded by Mr. Hodgson (Victoria-Haliburton) that standing committees of this House for the present session be appointed for the following purposes: 1. On agriculture and food; 2. On education and university affairs; 3. On government commissions; 4. On health; 5. On highways

and transport; 6. On legal bills and municipal affairs; 7. On labour; 8, On natural resources and tourism; 9. On private bills; 10. On privileges and elections; 11. On public accounts; 12. On standing orders and printing; 13. On welfare and reform, which said committees shall severally be empowered to examine and inquire into all sorts of matters and things as may be referred to them by the House and to report from time to time their observations and opinions thereon with power to send for persons, papers and records.

Mr. Nixon moves an amendment, seconded by Mr. Singer, that the motion be amended by adding thereto the following words:

> And that this House instruct the committee on standing orders to undertake forthwith a full study into the rules, precedents, customs and procedures of this House.

A further amendment by Mr. Renwick, seconded by Mr. Pitman, moves that the motion be amended by adding thereto:

> A standing committee on orders in council and regulations.

Is it the pleasure of the House that the second amendment to the motion carry?

As many as are in favour will say "aye".

As many as are against it will say "nay".

In my opinion the "nays" have it.

The House divided on the amendment by Mr. Nixon, which was negated by the following vote:

AYES	NAYS
Ben	Allan
Braithwaite	Apps
Breithaupt	Auld
Bukator	Bales
Deacon	Belanger
De Monte	Bernier
Edighoffer	Boyer
Farquhar	Brunelle
Gaunt	Burr
Good	Carruthers
Haggerty	Carton
Innes	Davis
Knight	Davison
MacKenzie	Deans
Newman (Windsor-Walkerville)	Demers
Nixon	Downer
Paterson	Evans
Reid (Rainy River)	Ferrier
Reid (Scarborough East)	Gilbertson
Ruston	Gomme
Sargent	Grossman
Singer	Guindon
Smith (Nipissing)	Hamilton
Sopha	Haskett
Spence	Henderson
Trotter	Hodgson (Victoria-Haliburton)
Worton—27.	Hodgson (York North)
	Jackson
	Jessiman
	Johnston (St. Catharines)
	Johnston (Carleton)
	Kennedy
	Kerr
	Lawlor
	Lawrence (Carleton East)
	Lawrence (St. George)
	Lewis
	MacDonald
	MacNaughton
	Makarchuk
	Martel
	Meen
	Morin
	Morningstar
	McNeil
	Newman (Ontario South)
	Olde
	Peacock
	Pilkey
	Pitman
	Potter
	Price
	Pritchard (Mrs.)
	Randall
	Reilly
	Renwick (Riverdale)
	Renwick (Mrs.) (Scarborough Centre)
	Reuter
	Robarts
	Rollins
	Root
	Rowe
	Rowntree
	Shulman
	Simonett
	Smith (Simcoe East)
	Smith (Hamilton Mountain)
	Snow
	Stokes

AYES	NAYS
	Villeneuve
	Welch
	Wells
	White
	Winkler
	Wishart
	Yakabuski
	Yaremko
	Young—78.

Clerk of the House: Mr. Speaker, the "ayes" are 27, the "nays" 78.

Mr. Speaker: I declare the amendment lost.

All those in favour of the main motion will please say "aye."

All those opposed, please "nay."

I declare the "ayes" have it.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Reilly moves, seconded by Mr. R. G. Hodgson that a select committee of 15 members be appointed to prepare and report with all convenient dispatch, lists of the members to compose the standing committees ordered by the House, such committee to be composed as follows: Mr. Morningstar, chairman; Mrs. Pritchard, Messrs. Dunlop, Evans, Farquhar, Henderson, Kerr, Olde, Rowe, Stokes, Villeneuve, White, Whitney, Worton and Young, the quorum of said committee to consist of four members.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I have a question before the orders of the day that I would like to put to the hon. Premier. Would the Premier report to the House the result of his investigation into the charges made by Mr. J. J. Pigott, president of Pigott Construction Company, that the Ontario Centennial museum of science and technology is "a provincial bloody disgrace"?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, I have not yet received that report. When I have received it, I will so inform the House.

Mr. Nixon: And, supplementary to that, may I ask the Premier if this was simply a request to the responsible Minister or a report, or was his own investigation broader than that?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: No, really I think more was perhaps put on the remark I made to the press. When they asked me, I said that I would check into it—I believe that was my term. This has since grown to be my own sort of personal investigation of the matter, but I actually said to the press that I would check into the matter, and that is what I am doing. When I have the report that I have asked for, I will so inform the House.

Mr. T. Reid (Scarborough East): Before the orders of the day, Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Premier.

Quelles sont les mesures deja prises et les mesures a prendre dans l'avenir, afin de garantir a la population francophone de l'Ontario, qu'elle peurra s'addresser au service civil de notre province en leur langue maternelle, celle que promis dans votre Discours du Trene?

Mr. Speaker: Before the Prime Minister, to whom the question was addressed, rises to deal with that question, I think it is only right that I should review for the members the situation in this House. I allowed this question to be asked before the orders of the day, so that the sense of this House in this rather important matter might be obtained.

The traditions and rules of this House have always provided that debate—and that includes questions and answers before the House—should be in English, but it was always the custom to allow a member to address this House in his mother tongue, and if it should have been French or Italian, or any other language, he or she was quite at liberty so to do, provided that a copy of the remarks in the language other than English be provided to Mr. Speaker for *Hansard*, both in the language used in the address and in translation into English.

I would point out to the members that the matter of dealing with the official affairs of this House in another language than English, at the present time is a most difficult one. I would just mention two or three of the practical difficulties which face the Speaker and his staff and the *Hansard* people.

First of all, there are very few employed in the public service of Ontario—presumably because the population of Ontario is rather largely English speaking—who are facile in the other official language of Canada. Then the setup for recording is such that we have found that it is a very difficult matter—and I believe that on other occasions in this city and elsewhere it was also found a very difficult problem—to arrange for the proper and competent translation and reporting of remarks, addresses and speeches in languages other than the English language,

which is mostly used in this city and this province.

The members will also understand, that a question directed by one of them to a Minister, in a language other than English, must go to the staff, eventually, not only of the Speaker's office, but of the ministry concerned, and at the moment, again, that staff is practically all English speaking. Therefore a question in a language other than English poses a very great administrative problem.

When I allowed this question to come before the House today, I requested, and the request was granted, that a proper English translation be furnished me, so that I could be sure that the recipient of the question would be receiving the same question as was in the mind of the member who made it in another language. I accepted this question and passed it along, with the English translation, and I was assured that the Prime Minister would be in a position at least to make remarks with respect to the question and perhaps to enlarge on the matters which I have drawn to the attention of the House.

Now, I am sure that the members will understand that there is no desire on the part of the Speaker's office, or Mr. Speaker, or any of the government offices to impede free debate and proper debate, but I would point out to you that the practical difficulties at the present time are very great, and that even should there be action taken in this House to have these matters made part of the rules, or the practices of this House, that could not really be effective for a very considerable time, due to the practical difficulties which have arisen.

In order to fortify myself with respect to the view of the government in that regard, I have perused very carefully, as I hope the member for Scarborough East has done, the remarks contained in His Honour's speech yesterday. But I think if they are perused and read in context, that they will say—they did say; His Honour did say—almost exactly what I have said at this moment, with respect to addresses in this House in the language of the—

Mr. Sopha: Not what the Prime Minister said at Ottawa.

Mr. Speaker: I am talking about this House now, not at Ottawa—in the language that the person wishes to address this House.

With those remarks, I would leave the floor open to the Prime Minister if he would care to reply to the question.

Mr. Sopha: Before his reply, on a point of order, I want to remind you, Mr. Speaker, that I delivered a question in French to the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Brunelle) this morning to your office and I acquainted the French-speaking bilingual secretary of the Minister of Lands and Forests, in French, of the question, and she assured me the Minister of Lands and Forests would be acquainted with its import. You returned it to me, sir, saying you refused it by reason of the fact that I had not provided you with the English translation.

The thought simply never occurred to me—having read the declaration of the Premier of Ontario, on behalf of the people of Ontario, at the Ottawa conference, to the effect that French was to become an official language in this Legislature—that that encompassed the provision of an English translation, and especially when addressing the question to a bilingual French-Canadian Minister. I had every assurance that he would understand the language of our birth, and would reply in that language.

It just seems to me that what you have said today is certainly not consistent with the declamations of the Premier of this province, to his fellow Premiers a week ago, in the city of Ottawa.

Mr. Speaker: I would like to point out to the member for Sudbury that the rules and orders and proceedings of this House are a matter for decision of this House. At the present time I have been chosen as the Speaker of this House and have a certain amount of authority vested in me by your election yesterday. The rules of the House cannot be changed by any unilateral declaration, or usages and customs of the House cannot be, no matter how important or who the person may be.

I say no more as to what may have been said elsewhere. I am merely pointing out that so far as the rules of this House are concerned, and the questions and procedures, they are in my opinion as I have expressed them and I think the members will agree. I would say with respect to the member's complaint about his question, he well knows that questions are directed to the ministry through the Speaker's office, and not direct to the Minister, no matter what language he speaks or how many he speaks, and that the practice which was adhered to by other members of his caucus is one which at the present time at least is in force and effect and one to which I will strictly adhere.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, I think perhaps the easiest way I can answer this question will be to say that placed on the desk of every member here tomorrow will be a copy of the remarks I made, which the hon. leader of the Opposition heard, of course, and the hon. member for Parkdale and the hon. member for York South, remarks which I made in Ottawa to which the hon. member for Sudbury has referred.

I set out in those remarks very clearly and in great detail what had already been done in this province and what we propose to do, and rather than read it, which I would have to do, I will see that a copy is put on everyone's desk. For the information of the hon. member for Sudbury, at the bottom of page 11 of this text I said first:

> At the opening next week of the new legislative session in Ontario we shall propose by resolution that any member of the Legislature of Ontario shall have the formally recognized right to address the Legislature in either English or French.

That is what the member read. That is what is in the Speech from the Throne. And, the member will see in this that I set out in this statement the practical difficulties that faced the government in implementing some of the ideas and the recommendations in the B and B commission – or the Laurendeau-Dunton commission, as I would prefer to call it. I will see that these are distributed and then the member will have a complete and full answer to his question.

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): Mr. Speaker, I have a question, in English on this occasion, for the Minister of Economics and Development and it is as follows and he already has a copy of the question:

How many lots leased directly by the Ontario housing corporation at Bramalea, Ontario, have been turned back by the lessees to the OHC?

Hon. S. J. Randall (Minister of Economics and Development): Mr. Speaker, I might say that members that were here in the last term know that I am the soul of co-operation but I only learned of this question and four or five others a few minutes before entering the House. I have not been near my office today. I will take notice of this one and those that follow and I will see that the information is gathered for the members.

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Attorney General, notice of which has been given:

With the altercations which occurred yesterday between the police and pickets at the Canada and Dominion Sugar Company, Chatham, has the hon. Attorney General requested the Ontario Provincial Police commission to investigate complaints of police brutality, and if so, what have the findings been to date?

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, the Ontario Provincial Police commission was requested yesterday after I had been in touch with the hon. member to look into this matter. I would not call it an investigation. However, I have a report from the commission. There was one person—and this one person is the only person so far as we have been able to ascertain—who was named as complaining and his complaint was made apparently to the hon. member after he had been arrested, as nearly as I can ascertain. He did not complain to the chief of police of Chatham or to the local police commission. He had been arrested for, I believe it was assault, or obstructing police; one or the other. The case is now before the court.

I understand the case will be heard Friday and I would hope—I am certain, in fact—that he will be given a full opportunity then to outline in evidence, the fullest opportunity, to set forth the facts of which he complained to the hon. member. I think it should be pointed out that while we certainly are interested in investigating any such allegations, complaints should be made really either to the chief of police or to the local board of police commissioners, or perhaps to the Crown attorney. That does not relieve me from the necessity of investigating, and this we have done. But as I say, this person apparently complained, not to anyone in authority, but to the hon. member, and apparently after he had been arrested. This case is now before the court and I would think that he will have a very full opportunity there to outline what took place.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Energy and Resources Management in three parts:

(1) Has the government worked out a programme for coping with the pollution problem in the Haviland Bay area north of Sault Ste. Marie?

(2) If so, what is that programme?

(3) If not, when will such a programme be available?

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Mr. Speaker, in a letter dated February 5, 1968, Mrs. McCauley, the owner of McCauley's Hotel, has been advised by the Ontario water resources commission that the pollution from the malfunctioning septic tank serving this establishment is to be corrected by May 15, 1968, or the commission will consider using powers under the OWRC Act. This hotel represents the main source of pollution in the area. The Ontario Department of Health will be investigating other private disposal systems serving cottages in the area to ensure they are functioning properly.

Mr. Paterson: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Labour, notice of which was given:

Are farm union members, whether growers of sugar beets or not, subject to the same rights and privileges as those employees of Canada and Dominion Sugar Company who are picketing the Chatham premises at this time? Could a court injunction restricting the number of pickets at the gates of this plant limit demonstrations by members of the farm union?

Hon. D. Bales (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, in reply to the question from the hon. member for Essex South I expect that the hon. Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. Stewart) will shortly make a statement in reference to the general situation at that plant. In reference to the second part of his question I would advise that only a court may determine that matter.

Mr. Paterson: May I ask a supplementary question?

Mr. Speaker: No. Not at this time. The member for Brantford has a question along the same line. Would he repeat it?

Mr. M. Makarchuk (Brantford): I have no questions right now, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Provincial Secretary. Is the government prepared to prosecute Mr. E. P. Taylor and the members of the board of directors of Canadian Breweries Ltd. for their refusal for thirteen years to hold annual meetings of the Pellar Brewery Company, a public company, as per section 306 of The Corporations Act?

Hon. R. Welch (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, I am anxious to be as helpful as I can. The question has not been asked exactly as it was sent to me. The question that I have before me is just—I want to be helpful and make sure I understand the question:

> Is the government prepared to prosecute Mr. E. P. Taylor and the members of the board of directors of Canadian Breweries Ltd. for their refusal to hold annual meetings—

No reference to the period of time.

> —of the Pellar Brewery Company, a public company, as per sections 306 and 308 of The Corporations Act.

That is the way I have the question.

Mr. Speaker: Yes, I have received notice and I would ask the member rephrase and reask his question in that form.

Mr. Shulman: I am reading the question as it was given to me here in the printed sheet but I would be quite prepared to have the Minister answer the question as he has it.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Having made sure of the question, there are one or two points about the question which I think would be helpful in making sure the member gets the answer that he wants. In studying this question, the reason it is so difficult to really understand it is that Mr. Taylor, according to the public records of my department, is not a director of Pellar Brewing Company, and also the question refers to a prosecution of the board of directors of Canadian Breweries Ltd. Now, if Pellar Brewing Co. is not holding its annual meeting as required by section 306 of The Corporations Act, I would assume that any prosecution respecting it would have to be against that particular company and its directors, and not against Canadian Breweries Ltd., or its directors. The other problem with the question, which explains my difficulty, is that the question refers to section 308 of the Act and this section deals with special meetings of shareholders as they are requisitioned, and not annual meetings. I just wanted to—

Mr. White: Other than that it is a good question.

Mr. Shulman: Would you allow a supplementary question?

Mr. Speaker: Would the member for High Park rephrase his question and submit it to me before the usual hour tomorrow morning?

I am sure the Minister will do his best to give him the information.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): In view of the fact that a London insurance man admitted on television that he received commissions from the OMSIP programme being placed with the London Life Insurance Company, will the Prime Minister advise the House the amount of monies and commissions, who received the commission from this deal, and how much money was involved in commissions, both the first year and the renewal premiums thereafter?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: OMSIP has not paid and never will pay any premiums to anybody so there cannot be an answer to the question.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, will the Prime Minister tell me that an integral part of the insurance structure—

Mr. Speaker: The member is out of order!

Mr. Sargent: A commission is part of the deal. Who gets the commission?

Mr. Speaker: Order, order! The member will ascertain if the Prime Minister will accept a supplementary question.

Mr. Sargent: Will he answer the question?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sargent: Will the Prime Minister agree that an integral part of the insurance rate structure is commission? Who gets the commission on the deal?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I can only repeat there is no commission now being paid, no commission ever has been paid, and no commission ever will be paid.

Mr. Sargent: So London Life Insurance are—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: There is no provision with the Ontario medical services insurance plan, there is just no provision in it any place, anywhere, for any payment of any commissions so that must be a complete, full answer to your question.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sargent: Will the Attorney General tell the House why it took so long, from 1964 to 1967, to catch up with Viola MacMillan?

Mr. Speaker: I would ask the members, in order that the answers might be properly given, to confine themselves to the words of the question which they have submitted. The question as I have it from the member for Grey-Bruce, is:

> Will the Attorney General tell the House why it took so long, from 1964 to 1967, for Mrs. Viola MacMillan to be sentenced by the courts?

And I would ask in the future—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, it did not take three years; it was not from 1964 to 1967. The information—the charge, that is—that was laid against Viola MacMillan was laid on October, 1965.

Mr. Sargent: Two years, then.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: In 1965 the information was laid; the trial was held on February 27 and 28, and March 1 and March 2 of 1967—and the member will note that was four days' trial—and at the trial Mrs. MacMillan was convicted. On March 10, the court, which had finished the trial on March 2, convicted Mrs. MacMillan; the court took a week to consider sentence; she was sentenced on March 17; Mrs. MacMillan appealed after sentence on March 17 of last year; the appeal was heard on October 23 and October 24 and her appeal was dismissed. So approximately two years passed.

I would point out to the hon. member that the nature of the case entailed a good deal of careful preparation of material, both for the Crown prosecution and for her defence counsel. No adjournment was ever requested by either Crown or defence in that case. There were dates arranged between counsel to suit the convenience of the court and to suit the convenience of counsel, and in order to give an opportunity to prepare the evidence fully and completely and to make sure that everything proper was done. Bearing in mind that the courts do not sit ordinarily in July and August, and that this was a very particular type of case, and a case in which it has not been easy to secure convictions, this was not an unduly long proceeding.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, I thank you. Would you accept a supplementary question? Believing that none of us can buy justice in this province—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Sargent: I would ask, could any citizen under legal aid get the same treatment?

Under legal aid could any citizen get the same treatment?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, the principle underlying the legal aid plan is that no person will be deprived of the right to be heard in court and have his case presented, or to prosecute a case, civil or criminal, by reason of the fact that he is unable financially to bear the cost of counsel for the proceedings.

Mr. Sargent: Thank you, sir. And further, will the Attorney General advise the House if he will consider the setting up of an unprejudiced commission composed of people outside the legal profession to investigate—and this is very important—to investigate the Canadian bar association's vast power over the courts in the province of Ontario and its control of appointments? Will you consider that?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, I am a member of the Canadian bar, a member of the legal profession; I am not aware of any influence that is exercised by the Canadian bar or by the legal profession.

Mr. Sargent: You are the only one that is not.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Well, I would point out to the hon. member that judges of our county and district courts, and of our superior court, the Supreme Court of Ontario, are all appointed by the federal government authorities—by the federal Minister of Justice.

I think it is probably fair to say that governments welcome some advice from the bar as to the ability and capability, character and so on, of members of the bar whom they are appointing. But I am quite certain, Mr. Speaker, that I can say this; that no individual, no government, exercises any influence over the courts of this province right down to the smallest court in any way; there is no influence exerted, we have an independent judiciray from top to bottom.

Mr. Speaker: Might I ask that the member for Grey-Bruce complete his series of questions while he is on his feet?

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, a question to the Prime Minister: What is the total cost to the taxpayers of Ontario for the Confederation of tomorrow conference held in Toronto last November?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, I will take this as notice. All the accounts are not in and I will ask the Clerk to put this on the order paper and I will answer in due course.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, will the hon. Minister of Economics and Development advise the cost of opening his Los Angeles office? How many people from Ontario went down to the opening? Who were they? Who paid their expenses? How much money was spent at the opening? And how many other U.S. offices do you have?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I will take notice of the question, Mr. Speaker, and get the information as I promised earlier.

Mr. W. G. Pitman (Peterborough): I would like to submit a question to the Minister of Education. Would the Minister indicate whether the Mackay commission on religious education in Ontario schools be submitting its report to this Legislature?

Hon. W. G. Davis (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, as I read the question, the member is asking whether the Mackay committee will be making its report to the Legislature or perhaps to the Minister. As I recall the terms of refence of the committee, and it is a committee not a commission, it was appointed by the Minister to report to him on certain aspects of religious instruction in the public school system of Ontario; and while I do not want at this point to prejudge what might happen with this report, it is my own personal view that this will be a report to the public and that means a report to the Legislature. It is perhaps the kind of report that the leader of the Opposition would dearly love to have go to the education committee for full and ample discussion by the members of that committee.

Mr. Nixon: When are you expecting—

Mr. Speaker: The member for Peterborough has a series; would he please complete them?

Mr. Pitman: I wonder if the Minister would mind a supplementary question on this. Would he assure the Legislature that there will be no change in the status of the separate schools before this report is received in this Legislature?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, Mr. Speaker, with great respect, I would be delighted to answer any supplementary questions, but to be frank, I do not understand really what the hon. member is suggesting when he asks me to assure the House there will be no change in status with respect to the separate schools.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps if the hon. member had a longer period of time to draft his question; he might ask it on Monday, I would be delightted to answer, but I do not think really it carries the import of what he is attempting to ask. What does he mean by status of the separate school system?

Mr. Pitman: Well it seems that there is dispute at the present moment as to what the possible relationship of the separate schools might be.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the member will accept the suggestion of the Minister.

Mr. Pitman: Indeed I will, sir. Thank you. I wonder if I could ask the Minister of Education another question? I do not mean to be beleaguering the Minister, but I think these arguments are important. Would he indicate when the Hall commission report will be submitted to the House?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, going back in memory, this was a committee which has since become a commission and I would anticipate once again, this report will certainly be made available, not only to members of the House, but I would hope would have very wide public distribution. And while I am not in a position today to report on its date of finalization, I understand, and I say this without checking with either of the co-chairmen today, that the report is in the process of finalization and I would hope that it will be available to members of the House and to the public to debate sometime this spring.

Mr. Pitman: A supplementary question. Could I ask whether it is likely that this report will be received before the legislation on the county school divisions?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I would doubt that the report will be available before introduction of legislation dealing with larger units of administration. I would doubt that the report will be ready before that time.

Mr. Speaker: Has the member for Peterborough completed his question?

Mr. Pitman: Mr. Speaker, I do have one more. I would like to ask the Minister when the proposed commission on higher learning, or committee on higher learning, which he, I think, proposed some time ago, will be appointed?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes, Mr. Speaker, the proposal for this commission on higher education was made last June. Since that time, I think there has been a general concensus with respect to the terms of reference.

The questions of structure, personnel, numbers, and types of representation, have taken some time to determine.

I would hope that I would be in a position to inform the House in the fairly near future the actual composition of the commission and there will be a sum provided in the budget of The Department of University Affairs for the next fiscal year to look after this very important work.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): A question for the hon. Minister of Highways.

Would the Minister inform the House of the exact location of the proposed Highway 53 freeway, within the limits of the city of Hamilton?

Hon. G. E. Gomme (Minister of Highways): Mr. Speaker, Highway 53 within the Hamilton city limits is the responsibility of the city of Hamilton.

Mr. H. Peacock (Windsor West): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Economics and Development.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Sudbury East has the floor.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): Mr. Speaker, I have a three part question for the Minister of Mines.

Would the Minister give the House the name of the person in charge of the study into the possible health effects of long term exposure to sulphur dioxide among workers in the Sudbury area, as announced by The Department of Mines on February 2, 1968?

Will the group doing the study hold public meetings, or hearings?

If so, will they visit Sudbury for that purpose?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence (Minister of Mines): Mr. Speaker, I received notice of this question just 20 minutes or so before I was on my way over to the House and I have not had the opportunity to delve into this important question in the manner in which I am sure the hon. member deserves before making an answer. Therefore if I may take this as notice, I will give an answer to the member later.

Mr. H. Worton (Wellington South): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Education.

What directives have been issued to local boards of education in their intermediate role,

pending reorganization, regarding the honouring of the existing contracts of 5,700 independent school bus operators in Ontario?

(2) Will the Minister give assurance that existing contracts will be frozen for a reasonable period of time until the new boards have made a fair evaluation of existing transport facilities in their respective areas?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I should point out that there have been certain policy guidelines sent out to the boards of education and to the school boards of the province and they do not require any alteration with respect to transportation or contracts for this current year. The reorganization does not take effect until introduction of the legislation and passage by this House with the intention that it will become implemented on January 1, 1969, so there is no problem with contracts as they exist. The legislation, when it is introduced, will provide for the usual clause that was in Bill 54 when the township school sections were consolidated for the determination of assets and liabilities and also the obligation of the new board of education to assume all existing contracts. The existing contracts, Mr. Speaker, would, of course, include transportation contracts so that any contracts that exist as of January 1, 1969, would of course be honoured by the new boards when they come into operation.

The question, Mr. Speaker, of endeavouring to freeze these for any period of time, say beyond the extent of the contract, is something that obviously would have to be looked at very carefully. It is doubtful that the operators themselves would want to freeze the contract if the contract, say, were for two years' duration because of increase in costs and what have you. I should also point out that while the figure appears to be substantially high, the reason is that a number of these contracts—which I do not anticipate will be disturbed in any way—actually involve parents of children who are transporting perhaps two or three youngsters from their own home or their neighbours' to the regular transportation lines of the school boards. But these are receiving payment now as the hon. member knows and probably these are included in the figure that he mentions.

Mr. R. S. Smith (Nipissing): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Energy and Resources Management.

(1) In view of the fact that certain American jurisdictions have begun to file requests for injunctions against individuals and corporations to discontinue pollution of the Great Lakes, would the Minister inform the House how many charges have been laid by the Ontario provincial authorities against individuals or corporations for dumping industrial wastes into Lake Ontario?

(2) How many convictions have been obtained resulting from these charges?

(3) Is it the intention of the government to enforce the regulations governing such industrial waste discharge?

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Mr. Speaker, no charges have been laid in 1967 for discharging industrial waste directly into Lake Ontario. However, six charges were laid during 1967 for discharging waste into water courses which discharged directly into Lake Ontario. Five convictions were obtained and the sixth charge was dismissed but is presently under appeal. The answer to the third part of the question is: Yes, it is the intention of the government to carry out the requirements of the OWRC Act.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): Mr. Speaker, I have a question directed to the Minister of Economics and Development.

Is the hon. Minister aware of the economic repercussions of the announcement of the closing of the Canada and Dominion Sugar Company in Chatham and has the hon. Minister's department initiated any studies to justify provincial intervention in order to keep Ontario's only sugar beet plant in operation?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Speaker, I have not had a chance to study that question but I might say that I think that will be referred to the Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. Stewart), who is now working on that, and when he is finished answering the question perhaps I could add something to it for you.

Mr. Makarchuk: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Highways.

Have arrangements been made to ensure that Department of Highways sanding trucks are available when requested by members of the OPP?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Speaker, it is department policy to act on all requests by members of the Ontario Provincial Police regarding the application of sand on our highways.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Brantford. Is this a supplementary question, or another question?

Mr. Makarchuk: Mr. Speaker, in view of the answer, sir, there was a coroner's inquest last week and one of the officers testifying in it stated that—

Mr. Speaker: I would remind the member that first he should inquire of the Minister if he would accept a supplementary question and then it must be a question and not a statement or a preamble.

Mr. Makarchuk: Would the Minister accept a supplementary question?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Yes.

Mr. Makarchuk: Last week there was a case at a coroner's inquest where the OPP was not able to get the sanding truck to sand a stretch of highway.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Speaker, I might say that I rather expected this question to follow. I read the report in the paper of this inquest and I immediately asked for an investigation from my own department which I have not received. But in the Toronto *Telegram* of February 15 there are a couple of paragraphs which, if the member had read them, he might see what happened. A Highways Department official testified that a sanding truck was en route to an icy section of the Queen Elizabeth Way at the time the two-car accident occurred killing three persons. At the inquest Mr. Mahoney said the department records indicate that no calls were made for a sander until 7.45, fifteen minutes before the accident. The trucks were loaded with sand and on the highways at 8 p.m.

Mr. Peacock: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Economics and Development and it relates to policies in the Ontario housing corporation. I hope he will not have to take notice to answer.

Has the Minister submitted to the federal Minister responsible for housing, the formula for the purchase by tenants of Ontario housing units built under the full recovery programmes of The National Housing Act? If he has made the proposal, could he tell the House what is the formula and when it is likely to come into effect, and if there is no such proposal would he consider submitting such a formula to the federal housing authority?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Speaker, I remind the hon. member it is easy to ask the questions; it is not always easy to find the answers. But I would say this to him in answer to the question he has posed and the series that followed: We have been petitioning the Minister of Housing in Ottawa for the last year to consider giving consideration to selling public housing to the tenants who have reached an economic status where they can afford to buy them. Just as recently as the housing conference in Ottawa this matter was discussed at the round table. It is my understanding that they will be passing an amendment to The National Housing Act to permit this to be done. We ourselves at the moment are having an estimator look at a number of sample units that could be sold to the tenants in view of the fact that their economic status have improved, and also with a view to separating the bricks and mortar from the land so it could be sold on the HOME programme to make it that much more easy for the tenant to afford to own the home and perhaps take the land out on a lease basis. As far as I am concerned I do not think that we can do too much until The National Housing Act has been approved in Ottawa and goes through the House and I am hoping it will be done very, very shortly.

Mr. Peacock: Mr. Speaker, would the Minister permit a supplementary question?

Would the Minister consider consultations by Ontario housing corporation with tenants of Ontario housing as well as with the federal government, about the formula under which the units might be sold?

Hon. Mr. Randall: If it is necessary, yes, but I do not think that is going to be necessary. We have an idea what the tenant's income is because of the rent scale, and I am quite sure that we can work out, without getting into meetings with the tenants, what they can afford. I think we can work out the details whereby they can afford to buy the homes that we set up on this programme once The National Housing Act has been approved. I do not think there is any difficulty as far as the tenants are concerned. It is a matter of how much for the package and can we separate it so they can afford to make whatever the minimum down payment is and carry out the payments within 27 per cent of their income. This is the formula, I presume, that will be worked out once they pass the Act.

Mr. S. Farquhar (Algoma-Manitoulin): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the hon. Minister of Mines, notice of which he has received and which is as follows:

Would the Minister consider, in the interest of complete fairness to individual prospectors in the Elliot Lake area, changing the time of staking to first light on February 19 rather than noon of that day?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the courtesy of the hon. member in not only giving me the usual notice, but ample warning of the question he was going to give me. In view of rather very recent developments around here, perhaps I can give amplification to the question, if I may, because I find the whole thing extremely intriguing and extremely interesting. Perhaps the members are not aware of the importance of the events which are going to take place north of Elliot Lake next Monday.

This is an area of over 90,000 acres, Mr. Speaker, that is being thrown open to what the department calls controlled staking, as of noon next Monday. This was an area which was removed from staking many years ago, I gather, or some time ago, in any event. The decision was made over three months ago by the department to open this area. It is the first time in Ontario, it is the first time in Canada, and I believe it is the first time in North America, that a decision has been made and procedures worked out along this line, to have a rush take place, a staking area thrown open like this, under the supervision of a governmental department.

Staking has never been at first light, I am informed. Originally the ground came open at midnight, but about 1935 this was changed to 7 a.m. standard time. This applies to ground that comes open automatically through forfeiture or cancellation. The reopening of withdrawn land can be at any time that is convenient or that is decided upon by the department, so that there is a complete difference here in this case than what has gone on in the past.

The decision to reopen the land at Elliot Lake at 12 noon was made only after very serious and very careful consideration. This is interesting ground and it was realized that there would be a staking rush involving a large number of people. Unlike ordinary rushes, where subsequent stakers are merely tying onto the discovery claim, every staker would have an opportunity to try for the prime ground. This meant that many stakers would likely be attempting to stake the same ground in competition with each other.

At 7 a.m., which at this time of year they tell me falls very shortly after daybreak, it was feared that some stakers would take unfair advantage of others by doing part of their staking under the cover of darkness and merely adding the finishing touches after 7 a.m. Twelve noon was selected because it permitted several hours of daylight for air patrol and ground investigation of any irregularities. This therefore put all of the stakers on an even basis.

Actually it is the feeling within the department that the time of staking makes very little difference to the individual stakers, regardless of their mode of travel. The feeling is, in any event, that they will be in the bush hours before the starting time, so seven o'clock or noon has very little bearing on who and how they will be doing it. Our hope of the 12 noon regulation is so that it can be policed in advance, and this is the story.

I was quite interested in the reported comment of Mr. A. C. Mosher, the president of the prospectors' and developers' association, when he indicated that their feeling was that noon was acceptable because department inspectors could "see what is going on." He added later, I gather:

> What is the difference? The little man can go in the night before. The big company stuff is a lot of eyewash.

It is very colourful language. But this is viewed by the Minister of Mines, in any event, to be such an important matter, that certainly the Minister himself is going to be on the ground—not staking—or above the ground at the time, just to make sure that everything is carried out. I will be up there at Elliot Lake, along with members of the staff, and if it is successfully carried out—

Mr. Nixon: Let us all go.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: —we will be looking at this with serious consideration so far as the future is concerned.

Mr. D. Jackson (Timiskaming): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Provincial Treasurer.

Have Ontario civil servants been denied the right to have credit union savings deducted from the payroll?

Hon. C. S. McNaughton (Provincial Treasurer): Mr. Speaker, may I say that this was a matter that was originally proposed to us about a year ago and since that time repeated representations have been made by credit unions throughout the province and we have replied by letter in each instance.

I believe that I cannot answer the hon. member in more appropriate terms than to place on the record the letter which has

followed each of the inquiries to which I have made reference. My letter reads as follows and I may say that they are going out every day, every week. The letter says:

> I can assure you that the numerous requests we have received for credit union payroll deduction privileges has been given sympathetic consideration in recognition of the services performed by these member-owned institutions. However, the practicalities of providing such a privilege must be given equal consideration by my department in terms of both cost and effect on our payroll operations. The provision of payroll deduction for individual savings would involve continuous administrative detail and adjustment, with 44 credit unions and many thousands of our more than 50,000 employees spread all across this province. The expense would be such that the service must be considered as part of the fringe benefits provided by the government to its employees.
>
> Consequently, I have suggested that the request be channelled through the civil service association for consideration at the next cyclical review which comes up in October. In the meantime, our payroll system is shifting to biweekly payment as of April, 1968. Because of the importance of ensuring that such a change is made with as little inconvenience as possible to our employees, it obviously would be impossible to consider an additional payroll adjustment at this time. However, if the civil service association of Ontario wishes to request deduction privileges for government employees during the negotiations in October, we should then be in a position to consider it from the standpoint of practical possibility.

And I repeat, Mr. Speaker, that letter has gone to many if not all of the credit unions throughout the province.

Mr. Jackson: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. member permit another question, a supplementary question? Is it not true that a brief was presented on January 25, 1962, asking for these rights?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Speaker, I can only speak with any degree of assurance about what I am familiar with myself. And the first approach was made to myself as Treasurer of the province by correspondence in April, 1967, by the credit union at Smiths Falls, Ontario. Subsequent to the receipt of the letter from the Smiths Falls credit union, they were interviewed by the comptroller of accounts and appropriate members of The Treasury Department staff and the same submission was made to that group in person, as I have made reference to in my letter.

Mr. MacDonald: I guess they are on the second or third round—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: It may very well be, but in any case, by your leave, Mr. Speaker, I say this is the only procedure that we think is workable.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Speaker, in light of the fact that the Minister of Economics and Development has said that he has not been in his office, and due to the fact that my question involves some research, if it could be deemed to be in the hands of the Speaker as of 9:30 tomorrow morning, I would ask it tomorrow morning.

Mr. G. Ben (Humber): I have a question for the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond) but as the Minister is not here I will leave it and I will put it in—

Hon. Mr. Randall: Is the member for Yorkview asking for the information tomorrow morning? I cannot get it for him that soon. I understand it is a very lengthy question and I do not know what all the details are.

Mr. Young: Mr. Speaker, supposing I put it on the order paper tomorrow morning and then the Minister can take it as notice.

Mr. Speaker: I would like to say to all the members that the procedure which the member for Humber has just acknowledged —that if a Minister is unavoidably absent from the House, the question will be withheld until the following day or the very next day that he is in the House—is one which will enable questions to be answered much more promptly and much more quickly and I thank the member for acceding to the procedure today.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to table the report of the Ontario securities commission investigation into the affairs of Northern Ontario Natural Gas Limited. I undertook to do this some time ago after the prosecutions were complete in this matter and I take this early opportunity in this House to table this report.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, before moving the adjournment of the House, I had hoped that we might commence the Throne Speech debate. Perhaps my experience should

have indicated to me that such would be impossible on this first full-day sitting. Tomorrow we will proceed with some routine matters and we will then on Monday launch the Throne Speech debate. I move the adjournment of the House.

Mr. Speaker: Before putting the Prime Minister's motion to the House, I would like to ask the members, in order that we may have the best service and co-operation from these young men who serve as pages, that when they have messages would they please indicate the number of the seat or desk of the recipient of the message that they are addressing. It will help the boys and I think it will help proceedings in this House to go more smoothly.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 6 o'clock p.m.



Legislature of Ontario Debates

No. 3

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

First Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Friday, February 16, 1968

Speaker: Honourable Frederick M. Cass
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1968

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Friday, February 16, 1968

Motion to appoint Mr. A. E. Reuter as chairman of the committee of the whole House, Mr. Robarts, agreed to 45

Statement re assumption of the cost of administration by the Ontario government, Mr. MacNaughton 46

Questions to Mr. Stewart re the sugar beet industry in southern Ontario, Mr. Nixon, Mr. MacDonald, Mr. Spence 48

Questions to Mr. Stewart re the Continental Casualty Insurance Company, Mr. Gaunt 52

Question to Mr. Randall re the Ontario housing corporation, Mr. Young 52

Questions to Mr. Dymond re sale of cigarettes, Mr. Ben 52

Question to Mr. Stewart re vertical integration, Mr. Sargent 53

Question to Mr. Stewart re Dutch elm disease, Mr. Sargent 53

Questions to Mr. Davis re teachers from Australia and New Zealand, Mr. Sargent 54

Questions to Mr. Grossman re plastic surgery, Mr. Sargent 54

Question to Mr. Dymond re suicide prevention centres, Mr. Sargent 55

Question to Mr. Haskett re automobile licence plates, Mr. Sargent 55

Questions to Mr. Davis re the standing committee on education, Mr. Pitman 55

Question to Mr. McKeough re The Municipal Act, 1963, Mr. Stokes 55

Question to Mr. Simonett re the Great Lakes Power Corporation, Mr. Stokes 56

Questions to Mr. Wishart re the Downsview air crash, Mr. Shulman 56

Question to Mr. Welch re the Peller Brewing Company, Mr. Shulman 57

Question to Mr. Yaremko re the Big Brothers movement, Mr. Lewis 58

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to 60

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 16, 1968

The House met at 10.45 o'clock a.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are pleased to have as visitors to the Legislature today students from the following schools: In the east gallery, Thistletown public school, Rexdale; in the west gallery, Westgate collegiate institute, Fort William, whose band is here to participate in the Kiwanis musical festival; the Lord Lansdowne senior public school here in Toronto; and Deer Park junior high school. This last school is hosting Joseph Rajah of the Woodbrook secondary school, Port au Prince, Trinidad. I am sure that we are pleased to have Joseph see the proceedings of our assembly this morning.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Motions.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves, seconded by Mr. Nixon, that Mr. A. E. Reuter, member for the electoral district of Waterloo South, be appointed chairman of the committee of the whole House for the present session.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, just before this motion is carried I would like to make a brief comment.

Our discussions yesterday indicated the importance of this office, particularly in the sessions that lie ahead when we will be dealing with the estimates, which is the primary function of the House in the form of a committee of the whole. Thus the office, the duties and responsibilities the member for Waterloo South (Mr. Reuter) will discharge, are very important indeed in the functioning of this House.

I would assure him, and the other members of the House, that he will have the complete support and co-operation of the government side in order that we may, if it is possible, expedite the passage of the estimates through the House. I would hope that he will exercise a firm hand to ensure that while everything that needs to be said is said, perhaps it need not be said more than once. In this way we may be able to achieve the objective we—

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Is the Premier giving him instructions?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: No, I am giving the member instructions.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, I will return to my remarks and simply say that the chairman of the whole House can anticipate the fullest co-operation in his rulings and in his conduct of the affairs from the government side of the House.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I was very honoured to be associated, as seconder, with the motion that in all likelihood will result in the selection of the member for Waterloo South as the chairman of our committee of the whole and Deputy Speaker. I know that the Premier has been much troubled in recent sessions by the fact that in his view the Opposition tends to probe too deeply into some of the matters that come before the committee, and although yesterday I put forward what I thought was at least a part of a reasonable alternative, he was not prepared to lead his supporters into the acceptance of even that. Nevertheless, I can tell the House that Mr. Reuter will have our honest support in his efforts to keep the discussions in the committee on the track, and particularly pertaining to the subject at hand.

As members no doubt are aware, the selection of the man for this particular post is a bit restricted in this democratic assembly to one from among 69 rather than one from among 117; but with that restriction in mind, and with that group in mind, he is certainly my first choice.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, in the rather lighthearted but sharp partisan exchanges this morning I would just like to add one bit, that the Prime Minister should never forget that if the record is examined closely he will discover there is as much time wasted by idle repetition from his own Cabinet Ministers in pronouncements to

this House, and by abuse of the time before the orders of the day, as there is on the part of the Opposition.

I accept his advice that we should be self-disciplined, but I invite him to turn around and gaze into the faces of his colleagues while he is giving it.

However, with regard to the motion that is before us at the moment Mr. Speaker, I wholeheartedly express my support of it. I can think of nobody—literally nobody—as I look around those serried ranks, already too large—still too large—on the other side of the House, who can be as fair and competent in handling a meeting. Therefore I am delighted to support this motion, even though the rules do not permit a "thirder".

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves that the Speaker do now leave the chair and that the House resolve itself into committee of the whole House.

Motion agreed to.

House in committee of the whole; Mr. A. E. Reuter in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Hon. members, I would like first of all to express my thanks to the Prime Minister and to the leader of the Opposition for presenting the motion which has resulted in my being in this position. I also wish to express my thanks to all members who supported that motion. The fact that this support was unanimous is very gratifying to me. I do appreciate that fact.

I realize quite fully the responsibility that goes with being the chairman of the committee of the whole House. I know that there is a lot that goes by, perhaps, in committee. The rules are sometimes a little more flexible, there is perhaps a little more latitude in dealing with matters in committee, but I would ask that all members on both sides of the House try to bear in mind the rules of this House and try to stick to those rules as much as is possible. In turn, I assure all members that I will continue to permit perhaps the same degree of latitude and flexibility that has existed in the past.

I would hope of course that there will be an absence of repetition and all members will attempt to keep in order while we are dealing with the various bills that come before the committee, as we go through them clause by clause, and the various votes in the estimates. Of course in turn for the co-operation of all members, I will see to it that every member on both sides of the House does receive the full privilege to which he is entitled to speak to any matter. I am particularly delighted to accept this responsibility to serve with Mr. Speaker, who is a man for whom I have always had the greatest admiration and respect. I am very, very pleased, too, that we have with us our esteemed Clerk, Mr. Lewis, whom I am sure will be of great assistance to me. Once again I wish to express my very sincere thank you for electing me to this enviable position.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves that the committee of the whole House rise and report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of the whole House begs to report progress and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Introduction of bills.

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Provincial Treasurer): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day I would like to make a statement to the House with respect to the matter of the assumption of the cost of the administration of justice by the government of Ontario.

The government of Ontario has adopted a formula for the apportionment of revenue from magistrates' court fines, under our programme to assume the costs of administration of justice, which will benefit all municipalities in this province. The formula gives our municipalities the full amount of all local bylaw fines, plus a 50-cents-per-capita grant to represent a share of the revenue from fines levied under non-municipal legislation.

This apportionment, coupled with assumption of costs by the province and other minor changes, will yield an estimated net gain for our municipalities of $18.5 million during the current year. This constitutes an increase of 23 per cent over the $15 million benefit advocated by the Ontario committee on taxation, on whose recommendation the government agreed to take over the costs of administration of justice.

As the government has promised, each and every municipality will benefit from the apportionment and assumption of costs. In turn, this benefit can be passed on to every taxpayer.

The total gain of $18.5 million must be expressed as a net figure since the formula

involves withdrawal of provisions under The Liquor Control Act and The Highway Traffic Act by which fines from infractions of these laws have been shared with the municipalities, as well as other provisions for sharing of fines levied under non-municipal Acts. It eliminates minor municipal grants under The Police and Fire Departments Acts and provides for adjustments in the schedule of per capita payments under The Municipal Unconditional Grants Act.

The formula for apportionment represents a thorough evaluation of the recommendation made by the Ontario committee and incorporates the important consideration of administrative efficiency and simplicity. The principal consideration in taking over the costs of administration of justice, as emphasized by the taxation committee, is that this function is of general benefit and has little direct association with property itself. It therefore is appropriate that such costs should be financed out of provincial revenues rather than property tax.

To calculate an average figure for property tax relief is impossible, because of the mix of industrial, commercial, residential and farm assessments in the tax base and because of differing implications for individual municipalities and counties. However, the fact that the total net gain to the municipalities will be 23 per cent more than the committee advocated, indicates that the government has given very sympathetic consideration to the mounting burden on the property taxpayer.

By apportioning a share of fine revenues through a per capita grant, the government's formula will provide greater tax reduction for residential and farm property owners than if a proportion of the non-municipal fines was granted to municipalities. The 50-cents-per-capita grant will be applied directly to reduce the mill rate that would otherwise be levied on residential and farm properties. The per capital payment recognizes the growing cost of law enforcement to our municipalities and provides for financial assistance on an equitable basis.

In addition, the municipalities in our northern districts will receive an increase of $1 in their per capita grant to bring it in line with the level of assistance provided municipalities of comparable size in southern Ontario. They have received $1 less in the past because they have not been responsible for meeting costs of administration of justice. Another adjustment will be the withdrawal of the additional $1 per capita payment to counties in which an Indian reserve is located. This provision was designed expressly to assist such counties in the administration of justice, the costs of which they will no longer assume.

Grants to municipalities under The Fire Departments Act and The Police Act are being eliminated at this time for administrative reasons. They are the vestige of a programme to encourage provision of pensions and workmen's compensation coverage for police and firemen, which has long since been accomplished. The grants paid for 1967 will approximate a total of $865,000 for the entire province. The Ontario committee on taxation has recommended that they be abolished and this is an appropriate time to do so.

It will be evident that the formula involves the revision of a number of provincial statutes to accommodate the changes. These amendments will be brought forth in due course.

In summary, the government proposes the following arrangements, all effective January 1, 1968:

1. Payment to municipalities of all revenues from local bylaw fines;

2. Payment to municipalities of a 50-cents-per-capita grant to represent an apportionment of revenue from fines levied under non-municipal legislation—plus $1 per capita to municipalities in our northern districts;

3. Relieving the municipalities of all expenditures relating to administration of justice, including the costs of all courts, registry and land titles offices and jails, and such items as fees and expenses payable to jurors, Crown witnesses, coroners, court constables and court officials and other related matters;

4. Withdrawal of other revenues from administration of justice sources including fees from registry and land titles offices, fines under non-municipal legislation, share of revenue from liquor fines and highway traffic fines, grants under The Fire Departments and Police Acts and the special per capita grant relating to Indian reserve population.

This is the second of three stages in the process of removing the burden of administration of justice costs from the municipal taxpayer. The first was the inclusion into the Ontario public service of municipal staffs engaged in the administration of justice and operation of local jails. Municipalities were relieved of the costs of salaries and benefits for these employees on January 1.

The third and final phase, that of arrangements for assuming costs of accommodation for administration of justice functions, will require considerable more time to resolve, although we have provided for funds to meet anticipated expenditures which up to this year have been the responsibility of the municipalities and counties. The considerations are

complex, involving debt retirement charges, leases, rentals, operational and maintenance costs relating to accommodation for administration of justice. Conditions vary so widely from jurisdiction to jurisdiction that a major survey, now under way, must be finished before arrangements can be completed with the municipalities.

Nevertheless, in preparing their 1968 budgets, municipalities can anticipate reimbursement by the province of all costs outlined above, as from January 1 and on a quarterly basis. Details for this procedure will be provided in an appendix to this statement which will be distributed to municipalities immediately.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I want to pay tribute to the special joint committee of the association of Ontario mayors and reeves and the Ontario municipal association whose responsible assistance was offered, accepted and appreciated by my colleagues and myself. The government has enjoyed the benefit of the committee's written submission, as well as the informal discussions from a series of meetings which have assisted the government in undertaking a difficult task. It has been a most valuable contribution and my colleagues and I appreciate the spirit of cooperation which has prevailed. The government, for its part, looks forward to continuing this dialogue with municipal leaders in undertaking other reform measures.

Mr. Speaker: Does the member wish to ask a question?

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): If the Provincial Treasurer would not mind just clarifying one point. He said there would be a net saving of $18 million to the municipalities. Does this mean that the overall extra cost to the province would be that much?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I think that is probably a fair assumption, Mr. Speaker. First of all, the government is relieving them of the cost, and by the formula that I described, the per capita grants, which in effect represent a sharing of non-municipal fines, will provide added assistance to the municipalities.

It will be recalled it was mentioned in the statement that Mr. Smith estimated that the cost would be roughly $15 million. It turns out that it is going to cost $18.5 million, which is relieving costs on the one hand, and providing additional revenues on the other.

Mr. Speaker: Before I recognize the leader of the Opposition with his question this morning, I would like to draw to the attention of the members and particularly those new members, the rules and procedures of this House which govern the asking of questions of a Minister before the orders of the day. The practice of this House has not been based on the strict rule of the House. Questions have been allowed on notice, and after they have been approved by the Speaker, have been allowed to be delivered in the morning of the day on which an answer was required and to be asked verbally.

It is not my intention to restrict this practice in any way, except to ensure that those questions which are asked orally and for which an answer is required are matters of importance and urgency, and that those which require either a great deal of research, which are not of an urgent nature or which require a voluminous answer in the way of statistics and figures will be delivered by me to the Clerk of the House and duly placed on the notice paper by way of a notice for return.

Therefore I would ask the members as they frame their questions to bear that in mind. Questions of urgency, questions of immediate importance, will be received as usual and will be dealt with in the normal manner. Those which are not so, if they come to my office, will be sent by me to the Clerk of the House.

Up until and including today I have accepted the questions which have come in. Many of them, as the members will realize, have not been matters of urgency; and many of them have required and will require answers at length. But in any event, yesterday and today we are dealing with them on the wide open basis that if they were acceptable, and properly phrased, they could be asked.

I would now recognize the leader of the Opposition, whom I believe has a question.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, this question has some urgency. I direct it to the Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. Stewart).

Would the Minister inform the House what position he is going to adopt in respect to the negotiations with the federal government and the Canada and Dominion Sugar Company Limited in respect to keeping the plant open and saving the sugar beet industry in Ontario?

The question reads "Canada", and I would like it if he could save it all across the country, but I would be most interested in his views as they affect the province of Ontario.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, I have a comparable question. Per-

haps I can put it on the record and I imagine the Minister's reply will deal with both.

1. Has the government any programme to save the sugar beet industry in southwestern Ontario?

2. What immediate action does it involve?

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent): Mr. Speaker, I have a question similar to that. Would it be all right to ask it at this time?

Can the hon. Minister of Agriculture and Food report on what action has been or will be taken by his government to retain in production Ontario's only sugar beet plant at Chatham, Ontario?

The second part: Does the hon. Minister not feel that if this plant is not re-opened the economic welfare of some 900 sugar beet farmers in southwestern Ontario will be seriously affected?

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): Mr. Speaker, with the number of questions that are placed before me here I am sure you will permit me, sir, to deal with this matter at some length, if I may, so that I may set out the situation as we see it.

First of all, I would agree, if I may answer the hon. member for Kent first and say that certainly we would agree that the economic situation of the farmers who are producing sugar beets throughout Ontario would be quite drastically affected if the plant were not re-opened.

I think it is important in dealing with these questions that we review briefly, if we might, the sugar beet industry in Ontario prior to 1967.

The industry goes back with a very long history of hills and valleys, if I might say, in production and income statistics, but I do not think it is particularly relevant this morning.

However, the fact remains that there was only one sugar beet factory open in Ontario, and that was the Chatham plant, for some few years prior to 1967. At that time it was felt it might very easily happen that the plant would close entirely because there was not sufficient income for the sugar beet producers to encourage increased production. Acreage slipped to about 10,000 to 11,000 acres, and I believe that Canada and Dominion Sugar Company, who owned and operated the plant, expressed justifiable concern when they advised the sugar beet producers marketing board that unless this acreage could be very substantially increased the plant would close. It just was not economic to process such few beets.

The sugar beet producers approached our government and we in turn approached the federal government on their behalf, in supporting them. I want to pay tribute to the federal government for the establishment of a policy last year, about a year ago now, which provided on a five-year basis a reasonably substantial subsidy for sugar beet producers in Canada, particularly those in Ontario. I think we have to recognize that the sugar beet producers of Manitoba and the sugar beet producers of Alberta enjoy, because of geography, a very preferential treatment as regards freight rates; and so their industry is protected to a greater degree than is the industry in Ontario.

However, the subsidy that was announced by the federal government last spring was applicable across Canada, based on a sliding scale regarding price of sugar in the various regions of Canada. This was quite an attractive subsidy and I believe results in the federal government paying something under $1 million this year, or it will pay that much for the 1967 production.

The proposition was attractive enough to the beet growers that they assured Canada and Dominion Sugar Company that they would contract a minimum of 20,000 acres of beets for the growing season of 1967.

The Canada and Dominion Sugar Company advised the board that if this could be assured then they would offer to keep the plant open for a minimum of five years. The federal government, while indicating the subsidy, would be based on a year to year basis, gave the undertaking to the sugar beet growers and to Canada and Dominion Sugar Company that they would renew the policy each year.

This, we felt, assured the continuance of the sugar beet industry for at least five years. The sugar beet board, armed with this information, and I think the confidence that had been expressed by both the government and the company in the industry, went out and contracted 21,000 acres last spring for the growing season of 1967.

Unfortunately, we recall, there was a wet cold spring in 1967 and there were not that many acres of beets planted. It was something like, I believe, 18,000 or 19,000 acres.

It is interesting to note that because of the type of the season we had last year there was an extremely good yield. The average yield was 20.3 tons per acre on the beets harvested;

and a total of 287,000 tons of beets were harvested, representing 96 per cent of the planted acreage. Unfortunately, the beets that were left in the ground seemed to be left in that great part of the province known as Middlesex North where we had prolonged wet weather. We lost a considerable number of beets there because they just could not get them out of the ground.

But I think generally the beet growers of the province were enthusiastic about this new agreement. There was no doubt whatever in my mind, and certainly in the mind of the beet board, that 20,000 acres would be contracted for 1968. In fact I would think it would be much beyond that, because the sugar beet crop is perhaps one of our best cash crops in Ontario.

Now hon. members can understand I think, with this background, what a shock it was to the sugar beet board to be called in on a Monday a few weeks ago and advised that February 29 would see the closing of the Canada and Dominion Sugar plant at Chatham. We were advised at noon of that day by the chairman of the beet producers board this had happened.

I must confess that my reaction was one of stunned disbelief that this could have happened.

However, it happened, and the following day, on Tuesday, representatives of Canada and Dominion Sugar Company called at my office to see me and expressed their regrets that the decision had to be taken to close the plant. I asked them what was the reason; were they dissatisfied with the number of beets grown, with acreage, with the volume; what was the problem? They readily admitted that they had made a modest profit on the operation at Chatham, but they frankly confessed that more profit could be made by bringing in raw cane sugar and processing it in this province, or in Canada.

I think this leads us to one conclusion, and that is simply this, that this great country of Canada is one of the few countries in the western world which has no sugar policy. I suppose that we could say that the present method of obtaining supplies of sugar in this country is one that may lend itself to obtaining sugar at prices that are very, very cheap on the world market.

What happens is this, Mr. Speaker: Many countries negotiate prices for raw cane sugar at fixed prices. They buy the sugar off the world market from the sugar producing countries at these pre-determined prices. But over and above these pre-determined quotas, or figures that are set to fulfill the contracts pre-negotiated, there is always a surplus, and I believe, if memory serves me correctly, that this surplus amounts to about 18 per cent of the amount of cane sugar produced in the world today. Eighty-two per cent of it is contracted for by the various countries involved.

Canada has been obtaining its sugar requirements out of that surplus of 18 per cent sold at distress prices—whatever it will bring on the world market, the free market. Dump it on the market, buy it for what you can. This is what has been happening, and I think you can readily understand that no beet industry can survive in that kind of climate. There just simply has to be some type of subsidy provided to maintain the beet industry in Canada.

The federal government recognizes this, and it recognized it last year in implementing this type of subsidy programme. The federal government frankly told us that it felt it was necessary, until a world sugar policy could be determined, that the sugar beet industry be maintained in Canada, so that our consumers would have the benefit of an assured supply of sugar during this time of uncertainty in the sugar market.

I refer to the policy that is in existence in the United Kingdom, where it is stipulated that a minimum of 22 per cent of the domestic requirements of the United Kingdom be produced in the United Kingdom. I refer to the sugar policy of United States, where it is stipulated that approximately 53 per cent of the sugar used on the domestic market of United States be produced in the United States. In the United States they can grow either beets or cane, in certain areas, but I would say that 22 per cent or thereabouts of the domestically produced sugar of the United States is produced from sugar beets.

The sugar beet board came to us a week ago. I say "to us" because they met through the good auspices of the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. McKeough) in whose riding the plant is located and who has many constituents vitally interested in this whole matter. I met with the group, and with other representatives of the various government departments, the Provincial Treasurer, and others.

We were most impressed with the responsible attitude that was taken by the sugar beet producers marketing board in suggesting various ways and means that this unfortunate problem of the closing of the plant might be corrected, and in effect the closing out of the sugar beet growing industry of Ontario. We were in wholehearted accord with their sug-

gestions that Canada should embark upon a national sugar policy similar to that of the United States and of the United Kingdom, in requiring through statute or regulation, implemented at federal level, that there be a minimum requirement of sugar produced in Canada, based on our domestic requirements. At present, we produce about 15 per cent of the domestic requirements of Canada, in Canada. We depend upon off-shore sources for the balance.

We supported the board wholeheartedly in this, as I say, but we felt, as did the board, that this figure might well be increased to perhaps 20 or 25 per cent. Our reason for supporting them I think is quite obvious to anyone who really considers the position of Canada. If our beet industry disappears, there could come an international crisis of sufficient importance that our off-shore supplies might be cut off. I am sure that I voice the sentiments of every hon. member of this House when I say that we all would hope that no such crisis would ever develop, but it is not beyond the realm of possibility and certainly this is why other countries of the world have adopted this particular policy, along with the importance of the industry to the economy of the country in which beets are grown, wherever they may be grown, or where the cane is produced.

Based on these negotiations that were held with the sugar beet producers marketing board, I arranged to have a meeting for the board with members of the federal Cabinet. This meeting was held yesterday in Ottawa, with the Minister of Trade and Commerce, the Minister of Agriculture, the Secretary of State for External Affairs—who has a personal interest in the area, just as does my friend the Minister of Municipal Affairs in the Ontario government—and representatives of The Department of Finance and other departments of the federal government.

I would say, Mr. Speaker, that this was a most useful meeting in that we were able to set out clearly the position of the sugar beet grower in Ontario and set out why we believe that the federal government—with the wholehearted support of this government, and I have assurance of the governments of Alberta and of Manitoba, the other two provinces in Canada where beets are grown, and I am sure with the support of the province of Quebec, although I was not able to contact their Minister because he was not available—should support this industry by the adoption of minimum requirements for domestic use of sugar in Canada produced in Canada.

I believe that if this key point were adopted, I think we can assure that the sugar beet industry will continue in Canada, but I believe that along with that has to go a recognition in the development of a policy that those sugar processing companies who process beets will be given some type of consideration —I should say favourable consideration—in comparison with companies who process imported cane sugar alone. I think it would be most unfair to say to any company, "You must continue to process beets," and at the same time to say to another company, "You can continue to bring in cheap cane imports in competition with beet processed sugar."

So this sets out the situation. We felt that we had a useful meeting. We are optimistic that a satisfactory solution can be found to this very great misunderstanding that has developed and we hope that a satisfactory resolution can be found through further negotiations which will continue next week.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question if the Minister will permit. I would like a bit more information. It is a very full statement and an interesting one as far as I am concerned, but I understand that the Canada and Dominion Sugar Company refuses even to consider selling its refining facilities to any other group because the new group would then be in competition with Canada and Dominion in its world-wide responsibilities. With that in view, would the government consider the possibility of not accepting its refusal to sell, and simply expropriate that property for fair compensation, and then sell it to an organized group of farmers operating as a cooperative so that they could take advantage of the federal subsidies which make it a viable part of Ontario agriculture?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, there are many alternative suggestions; this might be one consideration. The company certainly indicated to me, and I believe to the federal government as well as to the growers, that the plant was not for sale for the processing of sugar beets.

Mr. Nixon: They will not stand competition.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Because I think as a corporate entity it was simply a business decision that they could make more money out of the imported raw product, so why use this domestic product? I think this is just a business decision that they made. Now we do not agree with this and I so advised them quite frankly in my office the first day I met them. However, we are looking at all these alternative possibilities. The company is meeting with the board and with the federal officials and ourselves again next week.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Agriculture and Food, notice of which has been given.

(1) Does the Minister consider the arrangement between the milk marketing board and the Continental Casualty Insurance Company to provide insurance to farmers a normal one?

(2) Is the Minister aware of any complaints from farmers who feel that they have been unjustly treated by the company?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, I find difficulty in understanding my hon. friend's first question. Perhaps he can enlighten me a little.

Mr. Gaunt: Mr. Speaker, I presume that the Minister is wondering about the phrase "a normal one". What I mean by that is, has it been done before? Is this a normal arrangement?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, to my knowledge the offer of insurance by the milk marketing board to producers of milk in Ontario is a continuation of the policy—or I should say the programme—of offering such policies that had been in existence before the milk marketing board took over and co-ordinated the activities of the various producer groups, and they simply carried that on as I understand it. I have no knowledge of any farmer who has been unjustly treated by the Continental Casualty Company. This may be the case.

I did have one of my own constituents relate to me what seemed to me to be a breakdown in communications that was corrected after we brought it to the attention of the milk marketing board and the matter was straightened out. This is the only instance that I can think of and I have no other further knowledge. However, I would, Mr. Speaker, be very happy to advise the milk marketing board of the hon. member's reservations and concern regarding the offering of this insurance to the milk producers of Ontario.

Mr. Gaunt: Mr. Speaker, may I ask my friend a supplementary question?

Could he tell me the type of contractual arrangement under which this agreement was made—in other words what I am saying is how was this company picked over and above some other company? What type of arrangement was it?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, as I advised the hon. member, these arrangements were made long before the milk marketing board ever took over. The milk marketing board simply continued the former programme. I cannot tell him why this company was picked over any other one. I have no idea. Does my hon. friend have some reservations about this company? Are they not doing the job? Is there something wrong? If so I think he might state this, because all we can interpret is that there is a problem here and I do not know what it is, quite frankly.

Mr. Gaunt: Mr. Speaker, if I may, the only judgment that I can make, sir, is based on the number of complaints which I get and perhaps we could discuss this matter further at some time.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the member would furnish that information to the Minister at another time in writing at his office and he might be able to assist him.

Mr. Gaunt: I will do so.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Economics and Development—an eight-part question:

(1) What price was paid for the land acquired by Ontario housing corporation for the Chapel Glen Village project announced by the Minister on October 13, 1967? (2) How many acres are included in the purchase? (3) At what date was the agreement to purchase signed by OHC? (4) At what date was the purchase completed? (5) To what extent was the land serviced with sewer and water facilities, utilities, or other amenities at the date of the purchase? (6) Has any additional servicing been commenced for this land since purchase? (7) Have any proposals by builders for building houses on this land been approved? (8) Was the borough of North York consulted before October 13, 1967, regarding the servicing of the land for this project?

Hon. S. J. Randall (Minister of Economics and Development): Mr. Speaker, I will take notice of the question and see that the information is supplied to the hon. member.

Mr. G. Ben (Humber): I have a question for the hon. Minister of Health, notice of which has been given.

Does the Minister's department intend taking action to have the packages containing cigarettes retailed in Ontario labelled to inform the purchasers that the contents of such packages are, or could be harmful to the health of the user?

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, when The Department of Na-

tional Health and Welfare became involved in this matter of the relationship of disease to cigarette smoking the provinces were invited to discussions on the subject. It was then agreed that programmes would be carried on on a national basis rather than each of the provinces launching out on their own local programme. Ontario agreed to participate in the national programme and still follows this plan. Advertising, packaging and labelling have all been, and are still, part of the studies being conducted.

There is also some question about the jurisdiction or responsibility in respect of labelling and this is being researched at our own governmental level. It is not yet agreed, however, that such a proposal as made by the hon. member for Humber would achieve much in helping attain the desired objective. This is not to say that the idea has been abandoned. It will continue to be kept under consideration in the total programme.

Mr. Ben: Would the Minister accept a supplementary question? Would the Minister inform this House how soon the House could expect some word from the bodies, federal and provincial, which are studying this problem of late?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: No, Mr. Speaker, I would not be in a position to give the hon. member any definitive information about this.

Mr. Ben: Before the orders of the day the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Wishart) placed on our desks a speech he had made with reference to this Canadian bill of rights. Are we to interpret the first paragraph as being an endorsement of Trudeau for leader?

Mr. Speaker: The member for Grey-Bruce has a series of questions and I would ask that he deal with them now.

An hon. member: He has not considered running for leader yet.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): If you would answer some of the questions it would not be very happy for you guys.

Question to the Minister of Agriculture and Food. In view of the statement in the *Globe and Mail* this morning, and I quote:

> Harold F. Braymire, of the agricultural economics department of the University of Missouri, told a convention that the biggest change now taking place in the beef cattle industry in the United States is the growth of vertical integration.

And he further quotes, the hon. Minister has a copy there:

> Packers now are either feeding cattle themselves or having them fed under contract.

Dr. Braymire predicted that within 10 years almost all cattle on feed in the United States would be packer fed, or under contract from a packer, and that the private cattle feeder who takes high risks will disappear.

We have talked of the need for vertical integration. Would the Minister advise the House if he plans legislation in this House against vertical integration in this industry?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend has advised us that there are problems, according to this speaker, in the United States. While I recognize that the problems that were brought to the attention of the beef improvement annual meeting are simply the expression of one man's opinion, the question that has been directed to me deals with our planning legislation in this session against vertical integration in this industry.

I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, we have no notion of introducing legislation in the Parliament of Ontario having to do with the industry of the United States. I must confess as well that we have no evidence whatever of any large scale cattle feeding in Ontario on a vertically integrated basis. But I would say this: That the whole matter of vertical integration is under active examination by the economists employed in the study being carried out by the farm income committee of the province.

Mr. Sargent: Would the Minister accept a supplementary question?

Scientists now inform us that tiny imported European wasps are credited with saving the bulk of elm trees in Europe against the Dutch elm disease. Would the Minister advise what research he is doing in this regard in Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I might suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this question should be more properly directed to the Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Brunelle) because this is a matter that is under consideration.

The control of Dutch elm disease is a matter which is under active research by The Department of Lands and Forests. I have not heard of this, but I can assure the member, and I am not sure whether the Minister is here or not this morning, but I can assure him that if there is any means of controlling Dutch elm disease that is effective,

our government would be more than interested in it. It is a very great problem.

Mr. Sargent: To the Minister of Education: In view of the press release this morning in the *Globe and Mail* that $100,000 will be spent by Ontario board of education to bring 102 teachers from Australia and New Zealand, will the Minister advise if this is going to be continuing or has he plans to offset this importation?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I do not know if one should really refer to this as an importation; and I think to be very accurate about it, the Ontario board of education is not involved, Mr. Speaker. I do not believe such a body exists. It is the Toronto board of education that has recruited teachers in Australia. This is a matter that is exclusively within its jurisdiction and upon which The Department of Education for the province of Ontario pays no grants.

Mr. Sargent: Indirectly this is the Minister's baby anyway. What is he doing about it? Has he any plans to feed more teachers here?

Mr. Speaker: If the member wishes to ask a supplementary question of the Minister he will inquire of the Minister if he will accept such a question. Otherwise he will proceed with his next question.

Mr. Sargent: You are running a pretty tight ship here! Will the Minister answer a question?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I am always prepared to answer questions, but I just wonder whether the hon. member might like a day or so to consider the phrasing of his question so I can give him a proper reply to it.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Grey-Bruce still has the floor.

Mr. Sargent: A question for the Minister of Reform Institutions, Mr. Speaker, on a press release this morning in the *Globe and Mail*—it is a good Tory paper, hon. members should read it sometimes—438 inmates of the New York state prison, chained down there, have been given plastic surgery to help them in rehabilitation. Would the Minister be that modern in his thinking here?

Mr. Speaker: Would the member please ask the Minister in the terms submitted to the Minister?

Mr. Sargent: I do not have it?

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): Not the way I have it, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Sargent: Sorry, Mr. Speaker.

A press release this morning in the *Globe and Mail* states that 438 inmates of the New York state prisons have been given plastic surgery to rehabilitate them. Has the Minister any plans for a similar programme in Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, The Department of Reform Institutions has had such a programme since 1965.

Mr. Sargent: How many have been put through?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I assume we can presume the hon. member has asked for a supplementary question, and it is only because he is going to get it in the record anyway that I make a virtue of necessity and say, "yes," I will accept a supplementary question. Now the supplementary question is—

Mr. Sargent: That is very neighbourly of the Minister.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: How many? The member has already asked me.

Mr. Speaker, I received notice of this question just a few moments ago. It will take some time to get these figures together.

I might add also that we are presently doing some research to find out what effect this has on rehabilitation. We will be pleased to give the hon. members of this House the results of that report when it does come.

Mr. Sargent: Thanks.

A news report this morning—this is a question for the Minister of Health—72 British doctors were interviewed by a recruiting team from the British government and 50 are returning to the British Isles to practice. Would the Minister advise what recruiting plans he has in The Department of Health in Ontario to recruit doctors for the province of Ontario, especially the northern sections?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member's questions came to me just as I left my office. I was not able to get the answer to this one. I did manage to get an answer for his next question. I will take it as notice and provide the answer, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Sargent: Does the Minister intend to answer the first question Monday?

To the same Minister: In view of the fact that suicide is the tenth leading cause of death in our nation and the fact that over 40 states in the United States have set up suicide prevention centres, does the Minister plan any steps along this line in the province of Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker. in the development of our mental health programme the need for emergency services is recognized as an essential element. Under the regulations of the new Mental Health Act emergency services is one of the five essential services which a psychiatric facility will be required to provide to the community.

It is the department's view that a total service be provided rather than it be broken down into segregated parts. In our view every community psychiatric facility is prepared to provide the service referred to in the member's question. It might be of interest to him too to know that some of the so-called suicide centres in the United States are being discontinued.

Mr. Sargent: Because they have no money, that is why. They are not financed properly.

My next question, sir, is to the Minister of Transport: Will the Minister advise us of any plans to extend the cut-off date for the 1968 licences; and if he plans to keep these offices open in the evening?

Hon. I. Haskett (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, it is not intended to extend the time for using the expired 1967 licence plates beyond midnight of February 29.

As regards the hours of sale, for some years it has been practice for the 280 local issuers across the province to maintain office hours that are compatible with local or community practices and this has been generally satisfactory.

They have had licence plates for 1968 on sale since December 1, that is for almost three months now. But this year, because it is leap year, the motoring public is afforded one extra day on which to get their 1968 plates.

Mr. W. G. Pitman (Peterborough): Mr. Speaker, I would like to place a question to the Minister of Education. I think it is a matter of some urgency and it is predicated upon the comment of the Prime Minister on the committee system of this House expressed yesterday.

Would the Minister indicate whether he would be prepared to have the standing committee on education hear representations from counties and other municipalities in relation to the organization of larger units of educational administration?

Hon. Mr. Davis: It has always been my practice, since becoming Minister, to refer any legislation dealing with educational problems to the committee on education.

I should point out that we have already had several meetings with various representative organizations, as the member well knows, and also with many boards and municipalities. I anticipate these discussions will go on and I would suggest that perhaps upon the introduction of the bill, or second reading, I could indicate a suggested procedure that the committee on education might follow for very detailed consideration of this very important piece of legislation.

I think, Mr. Speaker, it must be borne in mind that the way this is conducted is of course up to the committee on education, but from my standpoint at least, I would indicate to the House that we would welcome, in fact we are encouraging, detailed discussion of the guidelines at the moment, and of course when the legislation becomes available after introduction here in the Legislature.

Mr. Pitman: A supplementary question on that, which was referred to by the Minister. Would he perhaps consider the bringing of the representative teacher organizations and the interested organizations to this committee for the better understanding of the members of the Legislature?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I would be really rather surprised if the various organizations do not request to come to the standing committee on education and I would be delighted to have them there.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Municipal Affairs, which he has notice of.

Is it the government's intention to implement the recommendations of the select committee on The Municipal Act of 1963 at page 14, to wit—that the words "Canadian citizen" be substituted for the words "British subject" wherever they occur?

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the member for notice and I am sorry that I was not here yesterday to answer his question. I know it gives him concern, and it gives my department and the government concern. It is a little bit more complex, however, than perhaps the question indicates.

My department has been for some time considering the implications of the change and I would just mention a couple of the observations which we would make.

To substitute the words "Canadian citizen" for "British subject" in The Municipal Act would in effect disenfranchise many thousands of British subjects who by the federal Act are not necessarily Canadian citizens. The suggested amendment in itself might deprive municipalities of the services of many valuable members of council. I am told that we estimate within the department that this simple amendment which the member suggests, and which on the surface appears most reasonable, would disenfranchise immediately about 184,000 British subjects who are not Canadian citizens. It is of concern to me.

Interestingly enough, I had a letter several weeks ago from a member of a women's institute, I think inquiring on behalf of the women's institute, with particular reference to The Assessment Act where the asssessor asks or puts down, "Are you a British subject?" She had written to me about this. I have answered her along the lines that I have just answered the member, but I have asked the department to take a continuing look at the implications.

Yesterday I signed a letter before the question came in, to my colleague the Provincial Secretary (Mr. Welch), asking him to take a look at the whole problem from the point of view of citizenship.

I directed a copy of the letter to the Minister of Labour (Mr. Bales), who was chairman of the select committee on The Election Act. It may well be that if that committee is reappointed, they might take a look at the implications of the question which the member has raised.

Mr. Stokes: Thank you for that answer. Mr. Speaker, I have another question for the Minister of Energy and Resources Management and it is in three parts.

1. Would the Minister advise the House what was the cause of Tuesday's power failure in the Great Lakes Power Corporation system between Bruce Mines and Wawa?

2. What steps are being taken to prevent reoccurrence of the failure?

3. What agency of his department specifically oversees the operations of the Great Lakes Power Corporation?

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Mr. Speaker, perhaps I might answer the third part of the question first. I might say that the Great Lakes Power Corporation is a private company and no agency of my department oversees the operation of the system. As to the first and second parts of the question, we would be pleased to try and get from that company the answers, if the member so desires.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): Mr. Speaker, this morning I submitted a question for the Attorney General to your department, inquiring as to why a certain inquest has not been ordered. Your department, or somebody in your department, has changed the wording of that question to whether the inquest has been ordered. Sir, I would just like to point out to you that it is unique in this Legislature to have questions submitted in writing and it is quite intolerable to have the intent of the questions changed and I would put my question to the Attorney General.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. I would point out to the member that questions asked in this House are only those which are submitted to and approved by the Speaker. Questions beginning with the word "why" will not be accepted. The corrected question as sent back to the member reads as follows: "Has an inquest been ordered?" If the member would read his question in that wording it will be accepted by me and directed to the Minister.

Mr. Shulman: I will then read your question, not mine.

Has an inquest been ordered into the air force crash deaths in Downsview as per the instructions re such deaths issued by The Attorney General's Department on July 5, 1963, page 2, section 4, and did the coroner or any other representative of the Attorney General attend the RCAF board of inquiry and ask all necessary questions as per section 6 of the instructions?

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I am very glad to answer the question and I am quite happy to state "why" actually. The answer is that no inquest was ordered into the Downsview crash, and the reason why is that this was a military aircraft of naval defence. The Department of National Defence exercises a very firm jurisdiction which supersedes the provincial authority, and insists upon holding its own inquiry. No personnel of the defence department may be required by a coroner to give evidence.

There was a crash of a defence plane at Trenton on June 28, 1967, in which we were proceeding with the coroner's inquest and the

federal department went so far as to apply for a writ of prohibition to prevent the coroner from calling witnesses. One can understand that their attitude is that in a defence situation, where certain of the evidence may be, in their opinion at least, of a secret nature, they exercise a jurisdiction which transcends a provincial jurisdiction and we are not at liberty to do more than certain things.

On the second part of the question: A coroner did attend the site of the crash and took certain evidence of that situation, but no inquest has been ordered for the reason I have given.

In the instructions which the hon. member refers to, I read also from page 2 just to indicate the authority of the federal Department of Defence. Section 8 says:

> When in the opinion of the president of the board, evidence is pending, the disclosure of which would prejudice service interests, he shall request the coroner or other designated person to withdraw while such evidence is given.

The hon. member can observe the very definite authority of the federal court of inquiry so that they may even order the coroner out of the inquiry. I have not had time, since I received the question this morning, to ascertain whether these regulations are fully in effect. I understand there have been some changes but I think the tenor is generally the same. We are seeking—we have been since the Trenton inquiry—to get some clarification further in this matter.

I think I would say this as a general opinion, that if it were a civil aircraft which crashed—Air Canada for instance—although under The Department of Transport, I think we would be able to assert a very definite right, certainly a very definite position, that we should have the right to make a full inquiry. But the member can, I think, understand that in a matter where The Department of Defence says this was a military plane and military personnel were engaged and it crashes, the court of inquiry which is laid on very fully in defence regulations, supersedes our jurisdiction and we just cannot get to it with a coroner's inquest. We can get some information; we are furnished with a report without the final conclusions which may involve military knowledge which is classified as secret, but that is about as far as we can go.

Mr. Shulman: Will the Minister allow a supplementary question?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Yes.

Mr. Shulman: Would the Minister agree that air force administrative order 240104 in reference to RCAF fatalities lays out a procedure whereby an inquest may be held without interfering with secrecy?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I am not sure since the hon. member refers to a specific—

Mr. Shulman: This was mailed out by the Minister's department on July 5, 1963.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: That was 1963, yes.

As I say, we are seeking to get a clarification on the present state of their regulations and directions. I cannot answer that at the moment. I will be glad to look into it and get the hon. member an answer as soon as possible.

Mr. Shulman: I have a question for the Provincial Secretary.

Is the government prepared to prosecute Messrs. E. P. Taylor, J. G. Campbell, C. O. Dalton, W. E. Drury, J. D. Fraser, J. L. Percy, C. M. Richardson, H. Robinson, F. R. Dobbin, I. R. Dowie, H. A. Cornwall and R. A. Davis, who are listed in the 1967 return of information particulars from The Provincial Secretary's Department as members of the board of directors—1966 or 1967 of the Peller Brewing Company for their refusal to hold annual meetings as per section 306 of The Corporations Act?

Hon. R. S. Welch (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for notice of this question this morning.

As he will perhaps know offences under The Corporations Act are prosecuted by summary conviction proceedings. Further, by virtue of this, The Summary Convictions Act of Ontario and the criminal code of Canada govern this particular situation.

I would underline that having said that, any prosecution for a violation under section 306 would have to commence within six months after the offences actually took place.

I would also point out that for reasons best known to the hon. member he continues to name people here who, according to public information, have ceased to be directors of the said named company. Four of those named are no longer directors, that is are no longer directors according to the public information which is available to him and to anyone in searching in my office, and I refer particularly to the four being Messrs. Taylor, Dowie, Cornwall and Davies. According to the public records all four ceased to be directors of this company on September 9, 1966.

Having said that then clarifying the legal position, I should also point out that under the proceedings referred to any person who has knowledge of facts that an offence under the Act is being committed has the right to commence such proceedings by laying an information before a justice of the peace.

The status of The Department of the Provincial Secretary in any of these proceedings is really no different than that of any other person. Where facts are brought to the attention of my department which, if established, would constitute a violation of the Act which I administer, it is not the policy of the department to commence prosecution proceedings in respect of such violation unless the department is further satisfied that some public interest is being adversely affected by such alleged violation. Now in the present instance, on the assumption that it can be established that Peller Brewing Company Limited is in fact violating the Act, and I underline the fact that that is raised as an assumption, by in fact not holding an annual meeting as required by section 306, my department is not aware of any circumstances from which it could be determined that any public interest is being prejudically affected by the failure to hold such meeting or meetings.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): This is a simple and friendly question for the Minister of Social and Family Services. Will the Minister accede to the request of the Big Brothers association for direct government subsidy?

Hon. J. Yaremko (Minister of Social and Family Services): Mr. Speaker, I think that perhaps I can best answer the hon. member's question by quoting a letter which I wrote to the then ordinary member of the Legislature, now the Minister of Mines (Mr. A. F. Lawrence) on January 29, and I have his permission to read this letter. I wrote him this letter.

Re: Big Brothers of Metropolitan Toronto.

> Dear Allan: I acknowledge receipt of your letter of January 25. The matter of assistance to the Big Brothers movement has been before me almost from the time I assumed this portfolio. The organization has been known to me all of my life and I have completely accepted the merits relevant.

I interject by saying that I grew up in an environment and community where many of my friends did have Big Brothers so I was a witness to their work. My letter goes on to say:

> I enclose herewith a copy of the most recent letter by me to the president.

That had been some days earlier.

> When I state on page two: "It is difficult for me to tell you that funds are unavailable from this department at this time", it is indeed a matter of deep regret to me.
>
> I only wish I were in a position to give a favourable answer at this time to the whole of the movement. For indeed it would have to be dealt with as such and not on a local basis, for I know that other branches are experiencing difficulties and would like similar assistance, as would other additional meritorious and voluntary agencies.
>
> I assure you of my continued interest in the specific situation and shall keep you advised.

Further, I sent copies of that letter to the member for York-Forest Hill (Mr. Dunlop) who had also been in touch with me some time ago; and in the mail to the government Whip there is a letter in which the closing paragraph states:

> As I have stated, I am sympathetic to the cause of the Big Brother movement and have been long aware of the merits of their activity, but find myself, presently, not in a position to be of direct assistance.

Mr. R. H. Knight (Port Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I request permission to rise on a point of order.

The last two days the hon. members of this House have had a reference paper before them which I have found to be very useful. But at the same time it is partly erroneous in print and is what I consider a slight on the good name of the riding I represent.

I would like to refer to the seating plan which you have in front of you and which was handed out to hundreds of people on Wednesday on the occasion of the official opening of this House. If you will note on the upper right hand corner, at seat 99, you will see clearly written there the name Porth Arthur—Porth Arthur.

I am insulted to think that such an error could come into this House unnoticed and remain uncorrected and I certainly hope that this obvious disregard for the name of the riding of Port Arthur is not an indication of indeed disregard for the feelings and the pride of the people of Port Arthur.

Now this strikes me as very ironical, because members of the government should know that the people of Port Arthur—and I can say this honestly, having been an observer

of their actions for the past eight years—at this point do believe on many occasions because of omissions in government publications, that there is a certain amount of disregard, a sort of looking down on, the people of our area—because of similar omissions.

I might say that the people of Port Arthur and Fort William would like to have the honour and the benefit of good publicity that is carried in these publications that go out in The Department of Tourism and Information, The Department of Mines, industrial promotion—

Mr. Speaker: Order please!

The member will confine himself to the subject in question please.

Mr. Knight: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, the point is quite simple. We see here in this simple example of disregard for a name, an indication that perhaps there is too much ignorance and neglect in departments of government for the people in our area.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The member will resume his seat.

Mr. Knight: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I would point out to the member that the publication of the seating plan is the responsibility of the office of the Speaker. It is taken from the list supplied by the various party offices. I have not had occasion to see whether the typographical error was one made by a typewriter or by the printer. I would call to the attention of the member that by that misprint I believe the great city of Port Arthur, which has wonderful fresh air and very lovely people, has probably received much more publicity than otherwise it would have received.

I would, also for the member's information, advise him that the revised and full session seating plan I trust will be available on Monday—with the proper colouring, proper numbering and I hope the proper spelling of Port Arthur—and at that time I am sure the member's feelings will be suitably assuaged, his people will feel rewarded for his efforts and the Speaker may rest assured that things in his office are now in good order. The government has no responsibility with respect to the seating plan, other than to furnish its members, as do the other party offices.

Hon. J. A. C. Auld (Minister of Tourism and Information): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, emanating from the previous remarks, I would just remind the hon. member that the omission to which he refers was in federal government publications.

Mr. Lewis: On a point of order, I would like to revert, sir, for a moment to the observations you made preceding the question period in this House and the indication that such a period fell within the purview of your office. I wonder whether the Speaker might not consider abandoning what some regard as the absurdity of tendering written questions in advance to the Minister, and turning to a more appropriate and desirable form of a free and spontaneous question period over a given period of time prior to the orders of the day; as they do in the other jurisdiction.

Mr. Speaker: I can assure the member that that matter has been under consideration and is. As one of the Ministers has earlier said—the Minister of Municipal Affairs—some of these questions which look so simple when placed either on a question paper or spoken from the mouth of a member, in actual practice are not really as simple. But I assure the member that that matter is certainly under consideration.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It will never get beyond the questioning of the hon. member for Grey-Bruce!

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, could you enlighten the House as to wherein lies the difficulty? Where is it complex rather than simple?

Mr. Speaker: There are many difficulties. One of them is that there are certain practices and traditions in this House which we prefer to follow because they give us certain orderly conduct of business—

Mr. Sargent: They keep the lid on.

Mr. Speaker: —a certain orderly conduct of business, which I am sure the members would not wish to have disturbed unless something better were available—both for obtaining information for the members and for the operation of this House. So far as I am concerned, that is presently the difficulty, and any member who has sat in this House for two days now, can understand what part of the difficulty might well be. If the members would discipline themselves and their questions, it might be a far easier matter, although I am not so sure.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might raise another point of order in reverting to a comment or an explanation of yours

when my colleague, the hon. member for High Park, put his question?

I am genuinely puzzled as to exactly why a question cannot begin with "why". For example, many times in this House questions have been asked, "Has the government done such and such a thing; if not, why not?" I suppose the straightforward way of putting the question is, "Why did the government not do such and such a thing?" So that we can avoid future argument on this, why cannot you begin a question with why?

Mr. Speaker: The member for York South has put enough whys in at the moment to take care of a good many questions. But perhaps it is because that has been the practice of the Speaker's office; perhaps it is because the present Speaker is legal in his training and feels it is better to commence a question in another way. That might be the answer.

I will take the matter under advisement, but I would ask that until there has been a different ruling, the very slight changes which are necessary should be made by the member, and when he puts down "why", he should just think a minute and then he can put down something different. I think there is merit in the member's suggestion, indeed, but at the moment I would leave my views and ruling in that regard. However, I will not forget it over the week end.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, may I request that if the Speaker's office make any changes in the questions they take great care not to change the intent of the question?

Mr. MacDonald: The intent was changed this time.

Mr. Young: The Attorney General said it was all right.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, on Monday we will proceed with the moving and seconding of the motion in reply to the Speech from the Throne.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 12:15 o'clock p.m.

No. 4

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

First Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Monday, February 19, 1968

Speaker: Honourable Frederick M. Cass
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1968

5

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Monday, February 19, 1968

Expressions of sorrow on the death of former Prime Minister E. C. Drury, Mr. Robarts, Mr. Nixon, Mr. MacDonald, Mr. G. E. Smith 63

Reading and receiving petitions 65

Report of select committee re standing committees, Mr. Morningstar 65

County Judges Act, bill to amend, Mr. Wishart, first reading 66

Extrajudicial Services Act, bill to amend, Mr. Wishart, first reading 67

Wages Act, bill to amend, Mr. Wishart, first reading 67

Religious Institutions Act, bill to amend, Mr. Wishart, first reading 67

Division Courts Act, bill to amend, Mr. Wishart, first reading 67

Private Investigators and Security Guards Act, 1965, bill to amend, Mr. Wishart, first reading 67

Prearranged Funeral Services Act, 1961-1962, bill to amend, Mr. Wishart, first reading 67

Minors' Protection Act, bill to amend, Mr. Wishart, first reading 68

Commissioner to investigate administrative decisions and Acts of officials of the government of Ontario and its agencies, and to define the commissioner's powers and duties, bill to provide for, Mr. Singer, first reading 68

Statement re the central purchasing authority for the Ontario government, Mr. Connell 68

Question to Mr. Yaremko re adoption of children, Mrs. M. Renwick 69

Questions to Mr. Robarts re tax relief for horse racing, Mr. Sargent 69

Questions to Mr. Wishart re the Melchers case, Mr. Sargent 70

Question to Mr. Robarts re community development and welfare benefits to Indians, Mr. Sargent 70

Question to Mr. Davis re the Hall-Dennis committee, Mr. Sargent 71

Question to Mr. Davis re salary negotiations of teachers, Mr. Pitman 71

Question to Mr. Dymond re the availability of drugs for hospitals and institutions, Mr. Pitman 71

Questions to Mr. Dymond re the Ontario Hospital at Porcupine, Mr. Ferrier 71

Question to Mr. Brunelle re compulsory fishing licences, Mr. Ferrier 72

Questions to Mr. Rowntree re Ontario securities commission questionnaire, Mr. Deacon 72

Question to Mr. Dymond re radiation from colour television sets, Mr. Haggerty 72

Questions to Mr. Stewart re imports of glazed cherries, Mr. Deans 73

Questions to Mr. Connell re sale of Mimico reformatory lands, Mr. Lawlor 74

Question to Mr. Dymond re the air pollution control service, Mr. Lawlor 75

Question to Mr. Wishart re death of Mr. Peter Donnelly, Mr. Shulman 75

Questions to Mr. Wishart re Mr. Elias Rabbiah, Mr. Shulman 75

Question to Mr. Dymond re recruiting doctors for Ontario, Mr. Sargent 75

Questions to Mr. Davis re district school boards, Mr. Jackson 76

Motion of thanks for the Speech from the Throne, Mr. J. R. Smith, Mr. Meen 76

Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Nixon, agreed to 88

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to 88

Appendix 89

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 19, 1968

The House met at 2.30 o'clock p.m.

Prayers.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves, seconded by Mr. Nixon, that the members of the legislative assembly of the province of Ontario in Parliament assembled pay their tribute of respect to, and place on the record their expression of sorrow on the death of, Ernest Charles Drury, the eighth Prime Minister of Ontario, who occupied that high office from November 14, 1919, to July 16, 1923; and also extend their sympathy and that of the people of Ontario, to his bereaved family in their great loss.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, it was with a great sense of loss, which I have no doubt was felt by all members of this Legislature and by the people of Ontario, that we learned of the death of Mr. Drury in Barrie on Saturday.

He was, as this resolution states, the eighth leader of the government in this province since Confederation, and his contribution to the life of the province generally was quite exceptional. He was a farm leader and he came to be known in his term of office as the "Farmer Premier". His 90th birthday was celebrated just a little over a month ago on January 22. Many festivities and honours for him were being planned by the people in his particular area, which would have involved this government, in celebration of this anniversary. It is a matter of regret that he did not live to experience these honours which would have been paid to him and which he so richly deserved.

He was a descendant of a pioneering family that settled in 1819 in Simcoe county along what was known then as the Penetanguishene Road, and which is now Highway 93.

He was born on the family homestead near Crown Hill in Oro township, and until shortly before his final illness, when he was taken to hospital, he continued to live on that family farm during his entire life.

Farming and agriculture dominated his life. His father, Mr. Charles Drury, was Ontario's first Minister of Agriculture.

The late Ernest Drury himself was a graduate of the Ontario agricultural college. He was secretary of the Canadian council of agriculture in 1909, and five years later he became the first president of an organization called the United Farmers of Ontario which was developed to relieve the depressed state of agriculture.

In 1919 this organization became a powerful political factor in the life of the province. In the general election in the fall of that year the United Farmers of Ontario elected the largest number of members in this Legislature. Mr. Drury was selected to lead the UFO members and following his election in a by-election he headed up a coalition with labour members at that time to form a government. That government set in motion many pieces of legislation the benefits of which are today enjoyed by the people of Ontario. For instance, he instituted mothers' allowance; he further developed the growing Department of Highways established under the Hearst ministry. In addition to that the mines branch came out of The Department of Lands and Forests to become The Department of Mines.

He also established the Ridgetown agricultural school modelled along the lines of the Kemptville agricultural school established in 1917. He did much to further the programme of bringing cheap hydro to the rural areas of the province. He was very active in forestry development and furthered the municipal-provincial reforestation programme which is quite well developed in the county which he called his own.

After his political career came to an end he continued to serve his people in Simcoe county as sheriff, county court clerk, and registrar of the Supreme Court for that county.

He published a book just recently called *Farmer Politician* in which can be found the story of the great farmer that he was. In an expression of appreciation when a Simcoe county forest was named in his honour he said: "I would rather have this for my monument than a statue in Queen's Park or on University Avenue."

Here was a man, Mr. Speaker, who enjoyed a full life, both personally and in the service of his people. His monuments are not of brick or of stone, but are to be discovered in the benefits that he left, still enjoyed today by the people of his province. I join with all

members of this Legislature in expressing sorrow at his passing and in extending to his family my deepest sympathy.

The funeral will be tomorrow afternoon at two o'clock, and in view of the fact that there are many members from all sides of the House who desire to attend that funeral and pay their last respects to this great Ontarian, I will move at the appropriate time that when the House adjourns today it will stand adjourned until 2:30 o'clock on Wednesday afternoon.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): It seems almost miraculous that a Premier of Ontario, in this case Mr. Drury, could have entered into that responsibility in 1919 and that we today are mourning his passing. When you think of the expanse of time and experience that must have come under this man's view, it means that he has seen some of the greatest changes in his world and our world that could be imagined. Mr. Drury was well known in all parts of the province, but surely in rural areas much more closely and with more affection, perhaps, than anywhere else.

My father, the former member for Brant, was a member of that Cabinet in 1919 and certainly many instances of Mr. Drury's broad opinions, flexibility of approach, and ability to try new ideas were recounted in my hearing.

I was glad that the Premier mentioned particularly that Premier Drury was responsible for the strengthening of the reforestation programme of this province, because there are many areas, three of them that I can think of offhand, which are now covered with fully mature trees which were planted in badly eroded areas almost under his direct leadership. The Premier quoted Mr. Drury's view that this he felt would be a more substantial monument than anything else. I can vouch that this was most sincerely held by him, and respected by others.

His career was a most interesting one, politically; the high regard that he commanded in all parts of the province has been attested to by many people. We certainly regret the passing of such a fine man. Of course, this is tempered to some extent by the understanding that he had a full life of 90 years, during which time he had offices of very high responsibility. I am told by his friends he maintained his clarity of mind and mental faculties to the very end.

Really, his life and career is something that we can be very grateful for as citizens of Ontario, and certainly I join in this resolution that conveys our sorrow to the Drury family.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, just a little over a year ago, I had the pleasure of sharing with some 100 or 125 friends and personages of the province of Ontario at a luncheon in Orillia, the occasion of the official release of Mr. Drury's biography.

The occasion will always be a memorable one because while he was physically much more frail, to the point that he had to be wheeled in in a chair, when he was introduced, he started by saying that the time had passed for him giving speeches. One hour and ten minutes later he completed a speech which, I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, was something to behold.

There was a lucidity of mind, and a grasp of the issues, many of which we may have read before, just as clearly then as back at the time when he was active in politics, or when he had been writing his book. The months have passed since then and as a result of physical deterioration, as the Prime Minister indicated, we were all cheated of an opportunity of sharing in a tribute to Mr. Drury on the occasion of his 90th birthday—a rather elaborate set of celebrations had been arranged in the area in which he was born and raised and to which he was so dearly attached.

As the Prime Minister has indicated, there are few men in Ontario political life who have left their mark as clearly in terms of new starts, new ground being broken; particularly in the field of agriculture, and the handling of our resources, conservation, reforestation—that truly is a monument to Mr. Drury.

I take great pleasure in joining the leader of the Opposition and the Prime Minister in paying tribute to a man who has so substantially contributed to the life of this province and in extending our condolences to his family on the occasion of their bereavement.

Mr. G. E. Smith (Simcoe East): The hon. members from Simcoe Centre (Mr. Evans) and from Dufferin-Simcoe (Mr. Downer) join with me in a tribute to this highly respected citizen of Simcoe county, a distinguished Canadian, and a former Prime Minister of this province.

Ernest Drury was a member of one of Simcoe county's pioneer families in which political service was traditional. His father served as Minister of Agriculture in Sir Oliver Mowat's Liberal government. Like his father, Ernest was a farmer. His background, his political attributes have already been mentioned. His talents were many and great. He was a sincere progressive, a forthright and honest public servant, a believer in free trade, and an author.

Already mentioned have been many of the items of Legislature that were established under his term of office as Premier from 1919 to 1923. In addition I would like to pay tribute to his support of Doctors Banting and Best, who went on to discover insulin and bring great reforms and modern discoveries to the world of health.

On retiring from politics, as has been mentioned, Mr. Drury continued to serve the people of Simcoe county as sheriff, as county clerk and registrar of the Supreme Court until at 82 he resigned the last of his public offices.

In addition to the book already mentioned, Mr. Drury was a student of history and at the age of 81 published his second book entitled, *All for a Beaver Hat,* which was a chronicle of the Huron Indians in the Lake Simcoe area during the 17th century.

Mr. Speaker, I know that all members will join with me in mourning the loss of this outstanding humanitarian, statesman, agriculturalist and author, and in extending deepest sympathy to members of his family.

Mr. Speaker: Once again we have guests in the gallery from various schools and we welcome them. In the east gallery, from Downsview collegiate institute, in Downsview; and from the University of Windsor, in Windsor; and in the west gallery, from Bessborough Drive public school, in Leaside; from the West preparatory school in Forest Hill Village; and the John G. Althouse public school in Islington.

Presenting petitions.

Clerk of the House: The following petitions have been received:

Of the corporation of the city of Kitchener praying that an Act may pass authorizing it to issue and sell debentures to acquire certain lands; and for other reasons.

Of the corporation of the village of Point Edward praying that an Act may pass removing the application of section 44 and paragraph 8 of section 4 of The Assessment Act as they apply to the Blue Water bridge.

Mr. Speaker: Presenting reports.

Mr. E. P. Morningstar (Welland): I beg leave to present the report of the select committee appointed to prepare the lists of members to compose the standing committees of the House and move its adoption. (Also see Appendix, page 89.)

Your committee recommends that the lists of standing committees ordered by the House be composed of the following members:

AGRICULTURE AND FOOD: Messrs. Belanger, Burr, Carruthers, Downer, Edighoffer, Evans, Farquhar, Gaunt, Gilbertson, Good, Hamilton, Henderson, Hodgson (York North), Innes, Johnston (Carleton), MacDonald, Makarchuk, Morningstar, McNeil, Newman (Ontario South), Olde, Peacock, Pitman, Renwick, Mrs. (Scarborough Centre), Rollins, Rowe, Ruston, Sargent, Smith (Simcoe East), Snow, Spence, Villeneuve, Whitney, Yakabuski—34.

The quorum of the said committee to consist of seven members.

EDUCATION AND UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS: Messrs. Bullbrook, Carruthers, Deacon, Dunlop, Good, Johnston (St. Catharines), Lawlor, Lawrence (Carleton East), Lewis, Martel, Morrow, Newman (Windsor - Walkerville), Newman (Ontario South), Pitman, Potter, Pritchard, Mrs., Reid (Scarborough East), Rowe, Smith (Hamilton Mountain), Snow, White—21.

The quorum of the said committee to consist of five members.

GOVERNMENT COMMISSIONS: Messrs. Apps, Ben, Bernier, Boyer, Bukator, Deans, Demers, Downer, Evans, Ferrier, Gaunt, Gilbertson, Good, Hodgson (York North), Jackson, Jessiman, Johnston (St. Catharines), Johnston (Carleton), Kennedy, Morningstar, Morrow, Olde, Paterson, Price, Renwick (Riverdale), Rollins, Shulman, Singer, Smith (Simcoe East), Smith (Hamilton Mountain), Smith (Nipissing), Snow, Sopha, Stokes—34.

The quorum of the said committee to consist of seven members.

HEALTH: Messrs. Apps, Belanger, Ben, Braithwaite, Brown, Carton, Demers, Dunlop, Johnston (Carleton), Meen, Morin, Potter, Pritchard, Mrs., Reid (Rainy River), Reid (Scarborough East), Renwick, Mrs. (Scarborough Centre), Rowe, Shulman, Smith (Hamilton Mountain), Trotter, Winkler—21.

The quorum of the said committee to consist of five members.

HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORT: Messrs. Belanger, Bernier, Bukator, Burr, Davison, Deacon, Deans, Evans, Gilbertson, Haggerty, Hamilton, Hodgson (York North), Innes, Jackson, Jessiman, Johnston (Carleton), Johnston (St. Catharines), Kennedy, Kerr, Knight, Lawrence (Carleton East), MacKenzie, Martel, Morin, McNeil, Newman (Windsor-Walkerville), Olde, Root, Smith (Simcoe East), Smith (Nipissing), Snow, Whitney, Yakabuski, Young—34.

The quorum of the said committee to consist of seven members.

LABOUR: Messrs, Apps, Bernier, Boyer, Braithwaite, Demers, De Monte, Gisborn,

Haggerty, Jessiman, Johnston (St. Catharines), Knight, Lawrence (Carleton East), Makarchuk, Morningstar, Newman (Ontario South), Pilkey, Root, Rowe, Smith (Hamilton Mountain), Sopha, Yakabuski—21.

The quorum of the said committee to consist of five members.

LEGAL BILLS AND MUNICIPAL AFFAIRS: Messrs. Ben, Dunlop, Edighoffer, Hodgson (York North), Jessiman, Johnston (St. Catharines), Kennedy, Kerr, Lawlor, Lawrence (Carleton East), Meen, Morin, Newman (Ontario South) Potter, Renwick (Riverdale), Sargent, Singer, Smith (Hamilton Mountain), Sopha, Winkler, Young—21.

The quorum of the said committee to consist of five members.

NATURAL RESOURCES AND TOURISM: Messrs. Allan, Apps, Bernier, Boyer, Bullbrook, Davison, Demers, Evans, Farquhar, Gilbertson, Henderson, Hodgson (Victoria), Jackson, Jessiman, Johnston (Parry Sound), Knight, MacDonald, Makarchuk, Martel, Morin, McNeil, Newman (Ontario South), Paterson, Reuter, Reid (Rainy River), Rollins, Sargent, Smith (Simcoe East), Smith (Nipissing), Snow, Spence, Stokes, Villeneuve, Yakabuski—34.

The quorum of the said committee to consist of seven members.

PRIVATE BILLS: Messrs. Belanger, Bernier, Bukator, Bullbrook, Carton, Deacon, Deans, Demers, De Monte, Ferrier, Gilbertson, Good, Haggerty, Hamilton, Henderson, Hodgson (York North), Innes, Jackson, Jessiman, Johnston (Parry Sound), Johnston (St. Catharines), Kennedy, Lawlor, Lawrence (Carleton East), MacDonald, MacKenzie, Meen, Morin, Morningstar, McNeil, Newman (Windsor-Walkerville), Olde, Peacock, Pilkey, Pitman, Potter, Price, Pritchard, Mrs., Reid (Scarborough East), Reuter, Rollins, Root, Singer, Smith (Simcoe East), Smith (Hamilton Mountain), Sopha, Villeneuve, Whitney, White, Yakabuski—50.

The quorum of the said committee to consist of seven members.

PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS: Messrs. Belanger, Bernier, Braithwaite, Breithaupt, De Monte, Downer, Dunlop, Henderson, Kerr, Lawlor, MacKenzie, Meen, Potter, Price, Renwick (Riverdale), Rollins, Root, Shulman, Singer, White, Winkler—21.

The quorum of the said committee to consist of five members.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS: Messrs. Allan, Breithaupt, Carton, Gaunt, Kerr, Meen, Newman (Ontario South), Peacock, Renwick (Riverdale), Trotter, White, Winkler—12.

The quorum of the said committee to consist of five members.

STANDING ORDERS AND PRINTING: Messrs. Boyer, Breithaupt, Davison, Downer, Farquhar, Hamilton, Hodgson (Victoria-Haliburton), Hodgson (York North), Innes, Johnston (Carleton), Martel, Olde, Price, Pritchard, Mrs., Reid (Rainy River), Ruston, Smith (Simcoe East), Snow, White, Yakabuski, Young—21.

The quorum of the said committee to consist of five members.

WELFARE AND REFORM: Messrs. Belanger, Ben, Brown, Burr, Carruthers, Dunlop, Edighoffer, Farquhar, Gilbertson, Hodgson (Victoria-Haliburton), Hodgson (York North), Kennedy, Morningstar, Potter, Pritchard, Mrs., Renwick, Mrs. (Scarborough Centre), Rowe, Ruston, Trotter, Villeneuve, Whitney—21.

The quorum of the said committee to consist of seven members.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry?

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, this might be a place where, by way of amendment, I can make a change in the name. In the highway and transport committee, I move that Mr. Innes (Oxford) replace Mr. Sargent (Grey-Bruce).

Mr. Speaker: Are there any other amendments? Is it the pleasure of the House that the amendment moved by the leader of the Opposition that Mr. Innes of Oxford replace Mr. Sargent of Grey-Bruce be carried?

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves that when the House adjourns today it stands adjourned until 2.30 o'clock, p.m., on Wednesday next.

Motion agreed to.

Introduction of bills.

THE COUNTY JUDGES ACT

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The County Judges Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I might inform the House, Mr. Speaker, that the purpose of the bill is to add a junior judge in each of the counties of Essex, Middlesex and Lincoln and there are certain consolidating sections which conform to that arrangement.

THE EXTRAJUDICIAL SERVICES ACT

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Extrajudicial Services Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: The purpose of this bill, Mr. Speaker, would be to increase the compensation which is paid by the province to judges of the Supreme Court from $4,000 to $6,000 per year for the services they render to the province.

THE WAGES ACT

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Wages Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: The purpose of this bill, Mr. Speaker, is to outlaw wage assignments except in the case of assignments to credit unions.

THE RELIGIOUS INSTITUTIONS ACT

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Religious Institutions Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, this bill, as I understand it, affects only The Anglican Church in Canada and the amendment is to provide that by the consent of the bishop as now required in a conveyance, lease or mortgage, there may be added—in his stead if necessary—the signature of the coadjutor bishop or the suffragan bishop.

THE DIVISION COURTS ACT

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Division Courts Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: A very minor amendment, Mr. Speaker, that this bill brings about, in that the notice to be given now to the Provincial Secretary where a barrister substitutes for the division court judge, shall now be given to the inspector of legal offices.

THE PRIVATE INVESTIGATORS AND SECURITY GUARDS ACT, 1965

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Private Investigators and Security Guards Act, 1965.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, there are two amending sections: one to extend the scope of the Act to persons whose primary business is transporting valuables and using security guards for this purpose.

The other section is simply to change the method of appointment of the registrar under the Act by appointment by the Lieutenant-Governor in council. And provision is also made for a deputy registrar.

THE PREARRANGED FUNERAL SERVICES ACT, 1961-1962

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Prearranged Funeral Services Act, 1961-1962.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Attorney General a question?

Mr. Speaker: If the member for Grey-Bruce will wait until the motion has been put.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, may I say to the Attorney General that these bills, as I understand, are not law until they are proclaimed. Right? We have outstanding about 30 bills from last session that have not been proclaimed, so this could drift—

Mr. Speaker: The member for Grey-Bruce is out of order.

Mr. Sargent: Did you answer my question?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: If he wishes to speak to this bill, the member may do so.

Mr. Sargent: All right, if I may, sir. This bill, as I understand, will not be law until it is proclaimed. Is that correct?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: The bill will not be law, Mr. Speaker, until it has been passed and given second reading and third reading by this House, then proclaimed. If it receives the consent of the Lieutenant-Governor and is then proclaimed, then it will be law.

Mr. Sargent: We still have about 30 bills from last year that have not been proclaimed.

Mr. Speaker: I would point out to the member that when he receives a copy of this bill he will find that section 5 says, "this Act comes into force on the day it receives Royal assent."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, at present this Act provides that embalmers, funeral directors and licensed insurers may sell funeral services for future performance. The amendment deletes the word "embalmers" from the Act because embalmers are not in the business of providing prearranged funeral services.

THE MINORS' PROTECTION ACT

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves first reading of bill initituled, An Act to amend The Minors' Protection Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, this bill implements a recommendation of the committee on youth which reported at the last session. The amendment permits the admission of children under 18 years of age to a poolroom as recommended by that all-party committee.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): And bagatelle too!

COMMISSIONER TO INVESTIGATE ADMINISTRATIVE DECISIONS AND ACTS

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to provide for the appointment of a commissioner to investigate administrative decisions and Acts of officials of the government of Ontario and its agencies, and to define the commissioner's powers and duties.

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Minister of Municipal Affairs): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, how can the member for Windsor-Walkerville (Mr. Newman) second the motion when he is not in his seat?

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, he was in his seat when I prepared the notice of motion. We will replace his name if it is your will with the member for Grey-Bruce.

Mr. Sargent: The member has it!

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, may I say very briefly that the bill would provide for an ombudsman for the province of Ontario.

Hon. T. R. Connell (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I should like to make an announcement concerning a recent appointment to The Department of Public Works.

On September 27, 1967, the hon. Treasurer of Ontario (Mr. MacNaughton) announced the adoption of the Ontario government's new purchasing plan. Subsequently the government authorized the creation of a division of The Department of Public Works to act as a central purchasing authority for all departments.

In addition, a committee of Deputy Ministers was formed to provide the authority with assistance in formulating administrative policy. The members of the committee are the Deputy Minister of Highways, Deputy Minister of Health, the Deputy Minister of Economics and Development, and the Deputy Minister of Public Works as chairman.

The central purchasing authority is designed to provide functional guidance to the individual departments and all technical aspects of purchasing strategy as well as supervising the government's overall purchasing policy. The authority will purchase selected items for multi-departmental use wherever significant mass purchasing economies can be realized. The design of this programme effectively combines the new techniques and central purchasing concepts of modern business management with the social responsibilities inherent in conscientious public administration.

After an extensive, Canada-wide competition involving some 71 applicants, Mr. Robert W. Clarke was appointed executive director of supply in charge of the government's central purchasing authority.

Mr. Clarke, who is presently purchasing agent for the Canadian Kodak Company Limited, will join The Department of Public Works on March 11, 1968. This appointment is the first one that has been made to the new division.

Mr. Clarke, who has been with the Canadian Kodak for 23 years, has during the 1960's centralized and reorganized, where practical, the company's entire purchasing function, formerly a widely decentralized operation similar to the Ontario government's purchasing organization.

The success of his efforts has been recorded on a front-cover feature article in *Modern Purchasing* magazine in 1966. It is evident that Mr. Clarke, as a professional engineer, vice-president of the Canadian association of purchasing agents, a holder of a certificate in industrial management and a professional purchaser diploma, is exceptionally well-

qualified to undertake these very important responsibilities.

It is my expectation that the central purchasing authority under the leadership of Mr. Clarke will make a substantial contribution to the efficient operation of the Ontario government and to the economic development of our province as well.

Mr. Sargent: The last province in Canada to do it!

Mr. Speaker: Before we proceed with the other items before the orders of the day, I would like at this time to wind up the dialogue which the member for York South and Mr. Speaker engaged in last week.

I have been unable to find any better way of asking a question than saying "Why"; and provided that it does not end up in a double negative, which has so often been the result of a question asked that way, I would certainly receive with pleasure any time questions which start with that interrogatory word.

Mr. MacDonald: Tradition is maintained—"Why" has been around for a long while.

Mrs. M. Renwick (Scarborough Centre): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Social and Family Services. Has an item been added to the adoption policy guide sent out March, 1966, by the child welfare branch to the children's aid societies of Ontario, outlining specific policy guidelines on the separation of siblings for the purpose of adoption?

Hon. J. Yaremko (Minister of Social and Family Services): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has misconstrued this particular adoption policy guide.

This guide has to do with applications from persons; that is, it has regard to those applying for adoption, it is not related to children to be adopted.

I take this opportunity, however Mr. Speaker, of bringing to the attention of the hon. member and members of this House, that on February 8, 1968, an order in council was approved by the Lieutenant-Governor upon my recommendation as follows:

> That a Minister's advisory committee on adoption and foster care be established consisting of five members; that Mr. Stanley G. Mullins be appointed one of the members of the said committee, and chairman thereof.
>
> The said committee shall:
>
> (1) study and review the policies and practices of the children's aid societies in respect to the adoption of children and to all matters relating to adoption, particularly those circumstances that impede or promote the placement of children for adoption;
>
> (2) study and review the policies and practices of the children's aid societies and relevant organizations in respect to the placement for adoption of children resident in Ontario in other provinces and in other countries;
>
> (3) study and review the policies and practices of the children's aid societies and related organizations in Ontario in respect to the placement and maintenance of children in foster care, and particularly the relation between foster care and subsequent adoption.

I may say, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Mullins, the chairman, is presently the president of Laurentian University of Sudbury. I may sum up his career to date as follows: That he is a scholar, a writer, an educator; and in this latter respect his activities have been mostly centred in Trinity College at the University of Toronto, Laval University, and of course presently, Mr. Speaker, at Laurentian University at Sudbury.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, a question to the Hon. Prime Minister. In view of the statement by Mr. E. P. Taylor that he would have to padlock the Ontario racetracks to force tax relief on the Ontario government, would the Premier advise: (1) Does Mr. Taylor have this power? (2) Does the government plan any tax relief for racing?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, I have no desire to be technical in replying to any question in this House—I am indeed, quite prepared to answer any question that is asked of me—but the words now used by the hon. member are really not in the form of the question that came to me. There is quite a difference in the sense.

I do not raise this through any lack of desire to answer the question, but the question I have is:

"In view of the statement that Mr. E. P. Taylor would have to padlock." There is nothing in my question to indicate that Mr. Taylor made this statement.

Now, I do not know how the hon. member wants his question worded, but the question that I have and the one he has asked are really quite different in what they say. I am prepared to answer the question that I have received—

Mr. Sargent: Go ahead!

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the member for Grey-Bruce would allow me to read the copy of the question which was submitted and which was passed to the Prime Minister's office. He read it, but with considerable hesitation and it was difficult to understand, and the question is:

In view of the statement that Mr E. P. Taylor would have to padlock the Ontario racetracks to force tax relief on the Ontario government would the Premier advise: (1) Does Mr. Taylor have this power? (2) Does the government plan any tax relief for racing?

Is it the member's pleasure that that question should be answered by the Prime Minister as asked?

Mr. Sargent: Whatever he feels like doing. I mean, he knows the intent.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, the question as you have read it is as I have received it. In the first place, I have not seen the statement that Mr. E. P. Taylor would have to padlock the Ontario racetracks.

In answer to the first part—does Mr. Taylor have this power—I believe that he is an official of the Ontario jockey club. I am not aware of what powers he has as far as padlocking the tracks controlled by the Ontario jockey club, which is a duly incorporated company carrying on business in the province. I am afraid I cannot advise what power he has to close the tracks that are operated by that organization of which I believe he is an officer. Certainly, I would point out to the hon. member that there are racetracks operated in this province by organizations other than the jockey club. I would assume Mr. Taylor would have no possibility of any control over their operations.

In answer to the second part of the question—does the government plan any tax relief for racing—I would simply say that there have been representations made on behalf of the horsemen whose horses run at our tracks; and there have been representations made to the government by the tracks themselves. I will, of course, not given any indication of what the tax policy might be—that is a question for the Provincial Treasurer which he will answer in his Budget. These representations have been made and this aspect of the racing and the horse breeding industry is receiving consideration.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, would the Prime Minister accept a supplementary question on this?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Yes.

Mr. Sargent: Do you feel it is good for one group to have such a monopoly control of racetracks?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I can only say, Mr. Speaker, I do not consider that there is a monopoly control over racing in this province.

Mr. Sargent: That is the weakest statement the hon. Prime Minister ever made—he does not believe there is monopoly control. A question to the hon. Attorney General, Mr. Speaker. Would the Minister please advise the House when the Melchers case is coming to trial?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, this is a matter with which the Attorney General has nothing to do. It is a civil action. I understand it has to do with a case brought by an employee who was dismissed from his employment. It is a matter for the parties to arrange when they get on with the trial and I cannot inform the hon. member when they may bring their case to trial.

Mr. Sargent: Would the Minister accept a supplementary question?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Yes.

Mr. Sargent: Is it unusual to have a case drag this long in the courts and is $10,000 still the fee to be on the board—in the liquor board?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: In answer to the first question, some unusual cases take a long time to get to trial, but generally cases get down to trial within a matter of months. The other matter I do not know anything about.

Mr. Sargent: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question for the hon. Prime Minister. What is Ontario's position to date with regard to the agreement made in November, 1966, between the federal department of Indian affairs and the province of Ontario, in which the federal government agreed to pay 90 per cent of the cost of community development and welfare benefits with regard to Indians and the province paid 10 per cent of such costs? It is kind of an ambiguous question but it is regarding Indian affairs. That is it. Do you have it?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, there was an agreement made as stated in the question between the federal department of Indian affairs and the province of Ontario. There are a great many details under the broad agreement which have not yet been settled between the federal government and various departments of this government. These matters are presently under consideration between the government of Canada and this government.

That is the position of this matter at the present time.

Mr. Sargent: There is no formal agreement yet?

Mr. Speaker: The member for Grey-Bruce has a further question. Does he wish to place it?

Mr. Sargent: Yes, sir. A question for the hon. Minister of Education. Would the Minister advise when the Hall-Dennis committee report on the aims and objectives of education in Ontario, appointed in 1965, will be brought before the House and how much has this committee cost to date?

Hon. W. G. Davis (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, as I recall, the member for Peterborough asked a comparable question last Thursday and as I recall I informed him that I was not in a position to say specifically when the report would be available for the members of the House and the public as a whole, although I did understand, as I stated on that occasion, that it was in the process of finalization and I was hopeful that it would be available for debate in this House before this present session ceases.

With respect to cost—I believe in 1966, Mr. Speaker, the cost was in the neighbourhood of $50,000. In the following year 1966-67—$150,000 and this year I believe it will be around $170,000 to $175,000.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Peterborough.

Mr. W. G. Pitman (Peterborough): Mr. Speaker, could I direct a question to the Minister of Education?

In view of the difficulties experienced by teachers in Ontario in negotiating salaries with dying school boards—which I suggest, Mr. Speaker, does introduce a note of irresponsibility in some cases—would the Minister see fit to prepare guidelines in negotiations with teachers' and trustees' organizations throughout the province?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I am not sure that I really concur with the term dying school boards used by the member for Peterborough. I have not had brought to my attention the question of teachers having difficulty in negotiating salary contracts above and beyond the traditional complexities of this time of the year.

There have been one or two instances where the boards have suggested that they were having difficulties because of the proposed transition and we have had some discussion. At this point, Mr. Speaker, we have this matter under consideration.

Mr. Pitman: Might I ask a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker? Would the Minister assure the House that no Ontario equivalent of the legislation which Mr. Johnson found necessary to introduce, when negotiations broke down in Montreal, will be brought before this Legislature?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I would think that the question asked by the hon. member for Peterborough presupposes a condition that existed in the province of Quebec that fortunately does not exist here, and is completely unrelated to any change that is being proposed with respect to school administration.

Mr. Speaker: If the member for Peterborough will please complete his question.

Mr. Pitman: I am sorry Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Health. In view of a statement of Dr. W. W. Wigle, president of the pharmaceutical association, that it was "double talk" for the province to talk about buying drugs through "bulk price" with something added, what steps does the Minister intend to take to ensure the availability of such lower priced drugs to hospitals and such institutions as suggested in the Speech from the Throne?

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): If Dr. Wigle actually said what he is reported to have said, then I would suggest that he spoke with two tongues. He did not speak to me in this vein. He was quite of the opinion that we could come to an agreement and he was prepared to accept the principles we outlined. These principles, put before the manufacturers, the medical association, the hospital association, Ontario hospital services commission and the retail pharmacists, were agreed to in principle. We are now busily engaged in working out the details.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Cochrane South had the floor.

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Health. It is a three-point question: When will the Ontario Hospital in the Porcupine be open? Secondly, how many patients will be treated in the beginning, and how long will it be before the hospital is at full capacity? Thirdly, how many employees will be employed in the beginning, and what eventually will be the full work force?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Arrangements are being made to open the hospital, sir, as soon as

possible. It is not quite completed yet and the date of opening has not been set.

Services will be provided for mentally ill and retarded persons and will be expanded as quickly as staff can be moved into their positions and programmes developed in keeping with a good service organization.

It is not possible to give a specific date when the hospital will be operating at capacity. We will, however, make full use of this facility as quickly as possible.

Provision has been made for a staff of 175 in opening the hospital. When fully developed, it is estimated that between 250 and 300 will be employed there.

Mr. Ferrier: I have a question for the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests, Mr. Speaker. Is it correct that the Minister intends to introduce legislation during this session providing for compulsory fishing licences for all or some Ontario residents who wish to fish in Ontario waters, and if so, why?

Hon. R. Brunelle (Minister of Lands and Forests): In reply to the hon. member's question, this matter is under consideration by my department. If it is brought about, the reason is that we need additional sources of income to provide for the ever increasing demands of the fish and wildlife management programmes.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs. Would the Minister advise the Legislature if the questionnaire concerning trading and shares of Wee Gee Uranium Mines Ltd., sent to all security dealers on December 22, 1967, by the Ontario securities commission disclosed that a major percentage of the shares of the company were owned by relatively few shareholders?

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the answer to the question is yes. The matter is involved presently in a public hearing being convened by the commission pursuant to section 593 of The Securities Act on February 27 next.

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Speaker, would the Minister answer a supplementary question? Was there any evidence of wash trading disclosed by that questionnaire?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: I have no knowledge of the answer to that question.

Mr. Deacon: May I ask another supplementary question? Would the Minister determine and advise the House if there was evidence at that time of wash trading in that questionnaire?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: I do not know that I can give that undertaking. The matter is presently under investigation by the commission, and I think that it should wait until after the public hearing on the twenty-seventh.

Mr. D. M. De Monte (Dovercourt): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Bales). What is the basis of calculation of permanent disability pension under The Workmen's Compensation Act and its regulations?

Mr. Speaker: I might advise the member that this is one of the type of questions that I said the other day were not of immediate importance, and which took considerable research and would be placed on the order paper. I am sorry the member was not advised, but I think that his office was, so that is the procedure on that question.

Mr. De Monte: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): I have a question for the hon. Minister of Health. Would the Minister inform the House what steps, if any, have been taken by your department to guard the citizens of Ontario from such hazardous radiation which, as no less than the President of the United States has indicated, emanates from television sets?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, some months ago, the staff of our department investigated the radiation from colour television sets. Minimal exposure was found for radiation; some colour television sets did appear on the market with defective tubes and these have been recalled and corrected.

The radiation protection division of The Department of National Health and Welfare had also conducted similar investigations on sets sold in Canada. The results have not indicated excessive exposure. The intensity of radiation emitted from colour sets decreases rapidly as it passes through the air, and in our experience would be undetectable several feet away from sets, even those which exceeded the recommended level at the set.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Mr. Speaker, before I ask my question, might I ask a question of Mr. Speaker? Would it be possible to inform the House whether you intend to take the questioners in the order that you have them before you, rather than in order of them standing up?

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps it might be well to adhere to the practice of taking questions from the leader of the Opposition and the leader of the third party first, and that has been my practice. Heretofore it has been in the order of standing up. And as the hon. member may have noticed, I have done my best, in order to keep matters reasonably progressive, to take them more or less in the order in which I have them, which is not necessarily the order in which they are received in the office, or the order in which the questioner stands.

I am open to suggestions from the member, or any member of this House. I think what we wish to do is to have questions asked and the information provided in the most expeditious, best, and fullest possible way.

Mr. Deans: In order to avoid the exercise of jumping up and down to be noticed, I wonder if it might be possible just to have Mr. Speaker inform who the next questioner will be.

I have a question of the hon. Minister of Agriculture and Food. In view of the threat to the fruit growing industry of southern Ontario by the importing of government-subsidized glazed cherries from France, has the government undertaken any programme to protect this industry, and has the government approached the federal government regarding this matter.

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): Mr. Speaker, in reply to the hon. member's question, first of all the product involved is not in the hands of the producers; it is in the hands of the processors. The problem has not developed until the offer for sale by the processors of the 1967 crop.

The glazed cherries he refers to are really the maraschino cherries that have come to be an accepted trade name in Canada. This particular variety of cherries is grown by about half of the 1,000 cherry producers in the province. I would say about 20 growers produce this variety in abundance; the others do produce in limited quantities. The imports from France have proven to be a threat since the crop was processed last fall, and is now in the hands of the processors.

The member for Wentworth has called these cherries government-subsidized and indeed he may be right. But at the moment we have no evidence that this is the case. I would say, however, that this is purely and entirely a federal matter. We have nothing to say about the importation of food products into Canada and I believe it simply points up the problem that affects not only this particular commodity but a great many others.

Perhaps the concern of eastern Canadian agriculturists can be summed up by recognizing that, whereas 46 cents out of every farm cash return dollar for all of Canada comes from exports, only 13 cents of the Ontario-Quebec dollar comes from exports, and in western Canada it is 80 cents. And this, I think, emphasizes the disparity between eastern and western Canada and our concern in eastern Canada with increasing imports of food products and the concern in western Canada for increasing exports of food products.

The matter was discussed on February 9 by a delegation consisting of representatives of the food processors, and others in the Niagara peninsula, with the horticultural council at Ottawa, and with the president of the Canadian food processors' association. They met with federal government representatives, Departments of Trade and Commerce, National Revenue, Industry, Agriculture, and Finance. The problem has been discussed and I believe it is safe to say that it is under very active consideration.

However, it is a matter that is greatly involved in the old policy of import and export problems relative to trade agreements under GATT, the General Agreement on Tariff and Trade, and it also is a matter which has been taken into consideration, in its principle, by the Kennedy round of negotiations which have have been concluded and which are now in the process of implementation.

I would say, Mr. Speaker, that the case has been very well put by the people involved. The federal government, I have been given to understand, is very sympathetic to the problem but there is just no easy solution to it at the moment. We can only hope; and certainly express our support for the position of the processors involved, because if it continues to be a problem it will definitely affect producers next year. We trust that the federal government will arrive at a satisfactory solution on a very complex matter.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question?

Am I then to assume that—

Mr. Speaker: The member will ask the Minister if he would accept a supplementary question.

Mr. Deans: Would the Minister accept a supplementary question?

Mr. Speaker: The member asked if the Minister would accept a supplementary question.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Oh, yes!

Mr. Deans: Thank you.

Can I then assume from the Minister's rather lengthy answer that this government has not approached the federal government at this time?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: If the hon. member, Mr. Speaker, would do me the favour of having read my speeches in the *Hansard* of previous sessions of this House he would see aptly demonstrated there that we are greatly concerned and have approached the federal government on the matters of imports of cheap food products from other countries. We are greatly concerned with it and our position has not changed.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, would the Minister accept a supplementary, supplementary question? Again I ask the question.

Mr. Speaker: There must really be an end to this. If the member would so phrase his first supplementary question, he might well receive the answer for which he is looking.

Mr. Deans: This will be the end, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Will the Minister accept a second supplementary question?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Oh, certainly!

Mr. Deans: On the problem of the importation of glazed cherries from France, has the provincial government of Ontario approached the federal government to make its viewpoint known?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: On this specific question, to my knowledge, we have not approached the federal government, nor has anyone from my administrative office, but I would say this—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Our staff are very vitally involved in this matter; as they are in all matters of imports into this country.

Mr. MacDonald: We got to the bottom of it finally.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Public Works in three parts.

Did the Minister advise and consult with the Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Randall) and/or the Ontario housing corporation regarding the department's plans to put up for sale 135 acres of land formerly used by The Department of Reform Institutions and known as the Mimico reformatory grounds?

The second question is: At what stage in negotiations has the hon. Minister arrived in his relations with the municipal corporation of Etobicoke in the sale of these lands, and what are the terms?

Third, would the hon. Minister consider the possibility of placing, as one of the conditions on such a sale, that the said municipality institute a feasibility study as to the best use to which these lands might be put?

Hon. Mr. Connell: Mr. Speaker, the answer to the first question is "yes".

The second question: We re-offered 67 acres for sale to the borough of Etobicoke at the appraised value of $25,000 per acre. This morning the department received a proposal from the borough respecting a method of financing this purchase. This proposal, of course, has not been studied sufficiently to allow me to announce its acceptance at this time.

For the information of the hon. member the department has offered the borough an option on an additional 68 acres of the Mimico reformatory property at the same price per acre. This offer is open for acceptance for one year. The borough has also made, this morning, a proposal concerning the option.

In view of the fact negotiations are presently proceeding, it would in my opinion be unwise to disclose additional information on the terms of the sale and the option at this time.

And on the third question, the answer is "no". The borough has been expressing an interest in the property for the past three to four years. It has always been Etobicoke's intention to develop the property for industrial uses in order to provide more industrial assessment in the municipality.

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. Minister: Would he accept a supplementary question?

Hon. Mr. Connell: Yes.

Mr. Lawlor: Are these lands being sold, at least the first parcel thereof, being sold as industrial property only?

Hon. Mr. Connell: That is my understanding; that the borough of Etobicoke is using them for industrial purposes.

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Speaker, I have another question. The question, Mr. Speaker, is directed to the Minister of Health.

What actual steps have thus far been taken by the air pollution control service respecting the operation of the Ontario Building Materials Limited plant located on the easterly side of Grand Avenue in the borough of Etobicoke as requested by a letter of January 24, 1968, from this member to Mr. B. Drowley, and replied to by the hon. Minister on January 29, 1968?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member was advised the survey of the Ontario Building Materials plant by our air pollution service was underway at the time his letter was received in January; our recommendations have been brought forward and are currently being formulated for the plant and for others in the immediate vicinity, since the Ontario Building Materials Limited is not the sole contributor to pollution in the area. These recommendations will be issued shortly in accordance with section eight of The Air Pollution Control Act.

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Speaker, may I ask if the hon. Minister would accept a supplementary question?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Yes.

Mr. Lawlor: The question then is: The Minister speaks of recommendations; has an inspector from the department actually been on the premises and reviewed the situation?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I cannot give a definite answer to that, sir, but I presume before we came to the point where we were making recommendations to cure the problem an inspector would have visited, but I would have to find out definitely whether this indeed happened.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Attorney General.

In the light of the unusual circumstances surrounding the death of Mr. Peter Donnelly, will the Attorney General overrule the Toronto coroner and order an autopsy and inquest?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, I would not consider, at the moment certainly, overruling the decision of Dr. Baxter. Unless some further circumstances that were unusual should come to our attention, I have no thought at present of overruling his decision.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, I have a second question of the Attorney General.

Does the government know the present whereabouts of Elias Rabbiah?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, no, the government does not know the whereabouts of Elias Rabbiah. We have notified practically all police forces. They are aware of our desire to find him and bring him back to this jurisdiction. Interpol, the international police force, is looking for him and is aware of our very fervent desire to get him—find him. Nobody knows his whereabouts at the moment.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, will the Attorney General accept a supplementary question?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Yes.

Mr. Shulman: Was the government aware of the whereabouts of Elias Rabbiah three and a half weeks ago?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Not so far as I know, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, the hon. member for Grey-Bruce asked a question on Friday, the answer to which I was not prepared to give. His question was:

> A news report states that 72 British doctors were interviewed by a recruiting team from the British government and 50 are returning to the British Isles to practice.
>
> Would the Minister advise what recruiting steps the Ontario Department of Health has to recruit doctors for the province of Ontario?

The Department of Health seeks to recruit professional staff outside of Ontario more or less on an ongoing basis. They do this mainly by using advertising through the daily press and professional journals. On occasion we have sent recruiting teams to the United Kingdom and to certain European countries.

In 1967, through advertising in newspapers in seven of the ten provinces, and professional publications in Canada, the United Kingdom and America, we succeeded in recruiting 29 physicians for the department and related staff.

Generally, 1967 saw more doctors coming to Ontario than in any year for the past 10: 132 doctors, mainly from the United Kingdom, Australia, New Zealand and South Africa were admitted to full registration in Ontario; 295 were placed on the special register. These are generally appointed to

teaching staffs, to special salaried positions, to government and related staff.

I am advised, by the universities particularly, that they find a marked increase in interest among Canadian trained doctors seeking to return to Ontario.

Mr. D. Jackson (Timiskaming): Mr. Speaker, I have two questions, the first one for the Minister of Highways.

Has the Minister's department consulted with The Department of Municipal Affairs regarding the probable economic advantages to the township of Teck if the proposed bypass around Chaput Hughes townsite is changed from the north side to the south side of Highway 66 and extended to connect with the south of Main Street in the townsite of Kirkland Lake?

Hon. G. E. Gomme (Minister of Highways): Mr. Speaker, I will have to take this question as notice.

Mr. Jackson: My second question, Mr. Speaker, is to the Minister of Education.

Did the Minister consult with the school boards of the territorial districts of Ontario, in particular the district of Timiskaming, prior to the submission of the Minister's guide for the reorganization of school boards to the district school boards?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, as the member is well aware there are some 1,400 to 1,500 school boards in operation in the province of Ontario. While I recognize it would be worthwhile if one could discuss all these matters with individual boards when reorganization is taking place, I think the hon. member will appreciate that this really is an almost impossible task.

As I understand it, in Timiskaming—the hon. member can correct me if I am wrong—there have been three consultative committees at work for some months, one of them, I think, for a two year period of time. There have been discussions of these matters with the area and regional superintendents and when we get into discussions of the proposed legislation itself, Mr. Speaker, I can outline to the hon. member the criteria that was used in the proposals for northern Ontario, and I would be delighted to have his observations at that particular time.

I should also point out if the hon. member wishes to arrange an appointment with me for a representative group from the Timiskaming district that would truly indicate the interest of the total boards involved in that community, I would be more than prepared to see them.

Mr. Jackson: Will the Minister permit a supplementary question?

Did the department consult with anyone other than government officials before they made their submission?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member had been here some four years ago, in 1964, when the legislation was introduced with respect to consolidation of township school areas—it was called Bill 54—I think it was very clearly established then the general principles that were guiding the reorganization of school administration in the province of Ontario.

The hon. member, if he were to check *Hansard* and read the legislation—and I am sure his colleagues who participated in the debate will recall that the township school area was established as the minimum unit for elementary purposes—but the legislation, on a permissive basis, also established the probability of county boards of education, combining elementary and secondary. These matters have been under study now in most counties of Ontario for the past two years and I would think, Mr. Speaker, that there has been very clear indication that this was the direction that was being taken.

There have been studies made by the federation and by other interested educational organizations, and as some of the members opposite are fully aware, in three or four counties county boards have already been established.

Mr. MacDonald: If this was clear, why was it not announced during the election?

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: Consideration of the speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor at the opening of the session.

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

Mr. J. R. Smith (Hamilton Mountain): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to move, seconded by the member for York East (Mr. Meen) that a humble address be presented to the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor as follows: To the Honourable W. Earl Rowe, P.C., LL.D., D.Sc.Soc., Lieutenant-Governor of the province of Ontario:

May it please Your Honour:

We, Her Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects of the legislative assembly of the

province of Ontario now assembled, beg leave to thank Your Honour for the gracious speech which Your Honour has addressed to us.

Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure and I deem it a great honour to have the privilege to address this House on this, the 25th year of consecutive Progressive Conservative government in the province of Ontario; a quarter of a century of unparalleled leadership and progress in Canada's banner province. I feel somewhat humble giving this my maiden speech as one of the youngest members on the government benches, and as a member for one of the new seats created by redistribution.

I have the privilege of being the member for Hamilton Mountain, which we Mountain people refer to as a riding that looks down on the rest of the city of Hamilton. My riding is unique in that it contains a virtual cross-section of the voters found in urban Ontario. A densely populated compact residential community. I am very cognizant of support that we received not only from labour, which is the predominant group in my riding, but the fact that I received 80 per cent of the votes in our well known Macassa Lodge, our home for the aged, and at Idlewyld, and that I received a substantial plurality in the new subdivisions of my community, where the voters are mainly young marrieds, and the support from the many residents of high-rise apartments.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that our victory on Hamilton Mountain was a combination of many factors—a superb organization, diligent dedicated workers, some platform and confidence in the Robarts administration of this province.

However, I believe the true significance of this victory and of the victory in Ontario is that it indicates that our Progressive Conservative party does not represent any one segment of society over the others, but represents all of the people in our province in every walk of life and ethnic origin. Once again, it shows that this government, under the leadership of Prime Minister John Robarts, is a government of all the people all of the time.

It is interesting to know that our campaign slogan was "October 17, your date with progress," and on that basis the government of this province with its past heritage and record looks to the future. Coming as I do from the great industrial city of Hamilton, it seems only natural that I should make mention of an industry that has made an immense contribution to the prosperity of both that city and of Ontario. Indeed, it is one of the principal full works of our country's economy. I am, of course, referring to that most precious of all metals—steel. More than 80 per cent of Canada's steel is produced right here in Ontario, mainly in the country's three major steel producers, The Steel Co. of Canada Ltd., Dominion Foundries and Steel in Hamilton, and Algoma Steel Corp. in the city of Sault Ste. Marie.

The Canadian steel industry is one that in terms of sheer enterprise, technological achievement and willingness to spend immense sums of money in obtaining the best equipment available, is second to none and which, through harnessing to the fullest possible extent these unique human traits of individual initiative, thrift and ingenuity, has become a world leader.

The nation's leading steel producer, for instance, The Steel Co. of Canada in Hamilton has, since 1950, spent $830 million in modernizing and expanding its productive facilities, and in the same period has nearly doubled its work force from 11,585 to 20,556. At its Hilton works basic steel plant in Hamilton 11,000 highly skilled steel-makers—including many who have come to our city from all parts of the world to grasp at these very opportunities and challenges offered by dynamic free economy—produce coke in North America's largest coke ovens; iron in North America's largest open hearth furnace; plate in Canada's widest steel plate mill; and steel rod in the world's fastest rod rolling mill.

In the town of Burlington, or perhaps I should say the city of Burlington, is Canada's first steel research centre. There is a team of Stelco metallurgists, chemists and technicians are continually searching for improved and more efficient ways of both making and using steel. In addition, both Stelco and Dofasco now have major mining developments in initial production here in the province of Ontario—Stelco's Griffith mining and pelletizing complex at Red Lake and, in the case of Dofasco, the Sherman Mine at Timagami.

I would also like to make mention here of the high degree of corporate citizenship which Canadian steel-makers have displayed in the discharge of their responsibilities to the communities in which they are located. I think this is only fitting because very often we are so prone to criticize industry.

Stelco for example, is recognized as a leader in the field of air and water quality control and over the past nine years has spent more than $16 million on the continuing programme that, among other things, has eliminated most of the dust discharge from steel-making furnaces through the installation of electrostatic precipitators. Working closely with the Ontario water resources commission, that company

has taken measures to improve the quality of its waste discharge into Hamilton Bay by acquiring Canada's first hydrochloric acid steel pickling line and through installing a water recirculation system on its coke oven batteries.

I feel, Mr. Speaker, that Canada's steel industry has demonstrated in a very real way the innate superiority of the private enterprise system as a creator and distributor of wealth; as a provider of jobs and security; as an efficient and economical supplier of goods and services; and perhaps most important of all, as a medium of providing opportunity for the creativity of individual Canadians.

Neither do I think there can be any doubt that the high living standards and level of economic security we enjoy in Ontario today are the results of wise and far-seeing practices that have been initiated, particularly, in the economic field by this Progressive Conservative government of Ontario.

I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that the government will give the most urgent priority over the next few years to fostering the highest possible levels of economic growth and expansion so that we can obtain adequate revenues to finance needed government programmes without resorting to the imposition of crippling rates of taxation on both individuals, industry and commerce. I also trust that the government will continue to set strict priorities on its spending and, therefore, be able, through the wise use of tax incentives, to speed up the generation of our own sources of development capital here in the province of Ontario and to encourage more and more residents of this province to participate directly in the development of their resources.

Unlike our socialist friends, Mr. Speaker, who always have plenty to say about the distribution of wealth, but are not notably tongue-tied when it comes to putting forward meaningful and realistic suggestions with respect to its creation, I believe that the measures I have outlined are a vital necessity if we as a government are to play our full part in improving the quality of life here in this province, while at the same time keeping taxation within reasonable limits.

With reference to the question of priorities in spending, I think this government of Ontario is to be commended for its steadfast refusal to allow the province to be blackmailed into entering the federal government's medicare scheme in the face of more urgent priorities such as housing, economic development and education. I find it incredible that after pleading with the provinces to restrain their spending in order to fight inflation, the Dominion government would do a complete about-face and try to force Ontario and its sister provinces into massive additional expenditures they simply cannot afford.

I find it even more incredible, Mr. Speaker, that the federal government would attempt to force its own brand of medicare onto Ontario, when the overwhelming majority of our citizens in this province are already covered by group or private plans or through OMSIP, particularly when the latter provides subsidized, and, in many cases, free, medical care for people with low income and indigents. Yet this is precisely what it has attempted to do, and despite the wide splits that have occurred along the way in the federal Cabinet, the fragile façade of Cabinet solidarity finally prevailed, however shakily. Once more, Mr. Speaker, political expediency, I believe, has triumphed over economic reality.

To those in this House who are so free with their criticism of this government for not entering the federal medicare plan I say this: I think one of the greatest injustices any society can perpetrate on the indigent, the aged, the chronically sick, the infirm within its borders, is to squander its financial resources on compulsory, all embracing welfare programmes, irrespective of need, and to embark on such programmes without regard to the ability of the economy to sustain them, and to attempt to meet the bill by imposing a crushing burden of taxation upon its citizens. When this happens, you create an inflation-torn, demoralized society that lacks the financial means, the economic strength and the moral will to support its weakest and most helpless members who through an accident of birth or a cruel quirk of subsequent fate cannot properly support either themselves or their dependents.

I must say that it seems rather strange to be in this House, coming straight from the classroom with nine years of rewarding teaching at Franklin Road public school and Hillfield College in Hamilton. Being a recent graduate of one of our provincial teachers' colleges, I wish to say to the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Davis) that I intend to put forth to you, sir, my own personal views on some of the inadequate aspects of teacher training in this province. While The Department of Education has placed increased emphasis on the upgrading of all areas of education yet I personally feel that our teacher college programme leaves much to be desired.

I was urged by many fellow teachers to seek election to this House and I intend to work for reforms in the area of teacher train-

ing. If it were not for the ingenuity of the many gifted and dedicated teachers we have in this great province we would have even more serious problems in the field of elementary education.

I feel also that the integration of teachers' colleges and universities in Ontario is long overdue. There is no higher responsibility or privilege than being a classroom teacher, yet we as a province have perhaps been neglectful of this fact.

I would stress to the Minister we are seeking improved training and professional recognition.

I think it is most encouraging to note the importance that the government of Ontario, under the leadership of the Prime Minister, places on the individual resources of Ontario. Thus, as one of the members of this Legislature—one of the younger members—it is my personal hope that many of the recommendations made by the Legislature's select committee on youth will become implemented.

I wish to commend the chairman, the hon. member for Kingston and the Islands (Mr. Apps), and the members of his committee, for their report. By 1971 over 50 per cent of Ontario's population will be under the age of 25.

Across this province young people are excelling themselves in the fields of art and science and in the field of athletic achievement. I trust that the committee's recommendation that the voting age in Ontario be reduced to 19 years of age will soon become law.

The white paper of the hon. Minister of Education concerning the reorganization of school jurisdictions in this province is, I believe, another positive, far-reaching step in the long evolution of education administration in this province. As a school teacher I can appreciate how this reorganization will provide more equal educational opportunities for the students of this province, availing them of total programmes of more specialized training in teaching, guidance staffs and psychological and adjustment services.

The reduction of almost 1,400 operating school boards to a little over 100 will undoubtedly provide a challenge of adjustment to trustees, teachers, administrators and students alike. However, I am confident, Mr. Speaker, that our province is progressive and will meet the challenges of streamlining our school areas and thereby ensure the future of educational progress in Ontario.

The proposed direct tax billing, and the forthcoming school trustee elections will stimulate and increase public awareness of the place and importance of education in our society and economy.

I think one of the greatest problems in the field of community recreation is our community's use of school facilities. I think that joint planning between school boards and municipal parks and recreation departments is essential if maximum extracurricular use is to be made of these facilities—both the present ones and the future planned facilities.

Likewise, the location of elementary and secondary school libraries, I think, should be so located that they can be open to students and parents during after school hours for research and study periods.

I think, Mr. Speaker, it is most encouraging that in several of our metropolitan areas school boards have instituted, in addition to their regular summer schools, summer school enrichment programmes on a voluntary basis for elementary school children paying a nominal registration fee.

I would like at this time to make mention of the Hamilton board of education's 1967 enrichment summer school programme for early teens. Students were offered three elective options in arts, crafts, physical education or remedial reading fields. Here, I believe, is an imaginative use of facilities, resources and skilled personnel to the benefit of our adolescents who often face summer employment difficulties.

The dramatic development of our regional community colleges of applied arts and technology is providing an important medium in post secondary education. In my own riding the Mohawk college of applied arts and Technology is rapidly taking shape while the college operates in temporary quarters. The record of this Progressive Conservative government in Ontario is one of showing concern for the training of youth and the training of adults to meet the technological and sociological challenges of this century.

Mr. Speaker, I know that parents of children with special problems welcome the positive steps being taken by The Department of Health in providing regional centres for diagnostic and treatment services for emotionally disturbed and other children with mental or physical handicaps, and the retarded.

The proposed programme of the newly formed Chedoke children's centre on the grounds of the Hamilton sanatorium on Mount Hamilton will eventually be developed into a comprehensive facility to aid

children in the entire Niagara peninsula region. Just as this government has been a leader providing services for the retarded child, likewise we are on the way to expanding the services to other children with special emotional problems and physical handicaps.

In one field after another this government is to be commended for the creation of regional facilities to cope with specialized problems. Likewise the proposed Ontario assessment and reception centre at Oakville for juvenile offenders shows that this government has a social conscience. I only hope, Mr. Speaker, that juveniles during the period of remand will be allowed the use of the assessment resources of this centre so that the judge or magistrate will be able to make a more rational appraisal of the child's problem.

Children's aid societies and parents across this province also welcomed the Minister of Health's (Mr. Dymond's) white paper on emotionally disturbed children.

While on the subject of children, I might say that many children in our urban industrial society are what we might say, "caught in the crunch". Recently the Canadian welfare council emphasized this problem in an article on the need for more child day-care centres.

Today more and more families are on the move, relatives and neighbours are no longer available for baby sitting. Industry is continually encouraging women to work. For financial and personal reasons, more and more young married women are returning to work, while many residents of high-rise apartments find them so designed that they create service problems for supervising young children.

I believe that our Department of Social and Family Services is admirably assisting the financing, the licensing, and the supervision of nurseries and child day-care centres all across Ontario. Many churches and religious organizations are to be commended for their venture into this field. However, Mr. Speaker, I sincerely trust that both labour and management will also co-operate to a greater extent to organize child day-care centres and nurseries. The startling statistics that enrolment in Ontario's 15 universities has jumped by 10,000 this year over last year for full-time enrolment of 94,800 undergraduates, I believe, is a living testimonial of the progressive policies of this Progressive Conservative government. I trust that this House will encourage The Department of Education's project school-to-school, which is designed to develop in Ontario students an awareness of the day-to-day life of young people in the Caribbean commonwealth schools and likewise to present to these students a picture of life in Canada.

Similarly, the successful programmes of student-exchange and travel during this past summer, I feel, should be retained, and special emphasis placed on Ontario community exchange of students. It seems that so many of our southern students need to become familiar with the north, the northwest, and the eastern areas of our province. The educational and sociological values of such exchange programmes to places of historic, natural and other interests cannot be overemphasized.

Visitors to the outstanding Ontario pavilion at Expo 67 in Montreal were greeted at the main entrance by a dramatic display of a clump of uprooted birches, falling waters and rocks, a display that will long linger in my mind. Nearby a very small sign read:

> His Majesty, The Tree; My Precious Sister, Water; The Lowly Rocks Bearing Secrets; Riches Await Everything Here, Awaits Man.

I think this verse could well become the motto of The Department of Energy and Resources Management as reflected in its policy of preserving and assembling and managing our provincial physical resources. The goal of conservation authorities in Ontario is a subject of world-wide interest and enthusiasm. As a member whose riding runs along that portion of the mountain brow technically referred to as the Niagara escarpment—a scenic wonder of phenomenal natural beauty, historical interest and possible recreational facilities—I will await with anticipation the report of the committee studying the proposed Niagara escarpment scenic drive. Likewise, I trust that more recreational and wilderness areas will be obtained in closer proximity to our urban centres.

Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a high honour for me to sincerely congratulate you on your appointment as Speaker of this House. We are indeed fortunate in having a Speaker possessing such an outstanding scholastic background and war record, and a fine record of public service to the people of Ontario.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. J. R. Smith: Since your election to the Ontario Legislature in 1955, and your subsequent appointments as Minister of Highways, Minister of Municipal Affairs, and Attorney General, you have earned the reputation of

an outstanding member, administrator and legislator. I know that the people of your historic riding of Grenville-Dundas join with me in wishing you the very best in your capacity as Speaker of this historic legislative assembly.

As a new member of this House, I am deeply conscious of the heritage and traditions of this body. Ontario has undoubtedly been richly blessed by the fine calibre of men and women that have offered themselves for public service. At this time I would like to extend to the family of the late Mr. Lloyd Letherby, the former hon. member for Simcoe East, our sincere sympathy. The sudden passing of this dedicated member is indeed a loss to this Legislature, of which he was a member since 1954, and to the people of his riding of Simcoe East.

I would like also to extend very best wishes to the hon. member from Chatham-Kent (Mr. McKeough), on his appointment to the important position of Minister of Municipal Affairs. I know that his background as a municipal councillor in Chatham, and as a member of this House, combined with his vigour and his dedication, will serve him well in the challenging office of Minister of Municipal Affairs.

I know, Mr. Speaker, that this House joins with me in expressing our deep sorrow to the people of your region who have suffered in recent mid-winter floods.

I know that all the members of this House applaud the appointment of the hon. Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Guindon). The constituents of Stormont and the province are fortunate in having a man of his calibre in such a position. I know that he will be a worthy asset to the Cabinet.

Likewise, I would like to extend to the new Minister of Mines (Mr. A. F. Lawrence), the member for St. George, the very best in his new capacity. Mr. Lawrence has proven himself as a capable chairman of one of the most difficult committees in the last session, and I know he will have the drive and the ability to establish himself in a like manner as Minister of Mines.

With these additions to the Cabinet, I feel confident that Ontario will have a government of great ability, distinction and enterprise.

Honourable members, now let us get on with the job!

I would say to the hon. Prime Minister, the historians of our nation will make due note of his Confederation of tomorrow conference. Once again the sound administrative policies of this government of Ontario were reflected in the convening of this historic meeting which is well equipped with the aid of the Ontario advisory committee on Confederation. The harmony and open discussion at this gathering was a testimonial to his leadership.

The hon. Prime Minister's endorsement of the guiding principles of the spirit of the first volume of the report of the Royal commission of Bilingualism and Biculturalism, is that both official languages be recognized wherever the minority is numerous enough, reflects his enlightened attitude concerning the Canada of the future. Once again this Progressive Conservative government has demonstrated that it is doing something positive to save Confederation. You have repeatedly demonstrated that Ontario's first aim is the survival of Canada.

In this year of centennial plus one, we in the province of Ontario have the duty to keep our traditions for the maintenance of a strong united Canada where the ranks of our founding people are recognized so that we may march forward hand in hand united as Canadians. For union makes the strength. Undoubtedly, Mr. Speaker, the dialogue begun in Toronto did much to create the co-operative attitude that was evident at the constitutional conference recently convened in Ottawa.

We in Ontario are indeed proud of the Prime Minister.

Mr. A. K. Meen (York East): Mr. Speaker, I am deeply grateful for the honour conferred upon me and upon the historic constituency which I have the privilege to represent in this Legislature as seconder of the motion for the adoption of the address of His Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor of Ontario. It is my further privilege, sir, as a newcomer in this Legislature, to participate in the first Parliament of this our second century of Confederation.

One hundred years ago it took but a few weeks to dispose of all the business to come before this Legislature, but a few weeks to look after all the problems that arose concerning this province. Due to the foresight and the wisdom of our forefathers we now have a third of all the people of Canada in this province of ours and about half the total income, and the business of this province has become far more complex. It certainly is going to take us a good deal longer than it took our ancestors of 100 years ago to dispose of business of this Legislature in this session.

I am proud to be a part of this aspect of democracy, sir, and I am sure that we all look forward to a most productive session. We

can frequently assess the future, Mr. Speaker, by looking at the past. In so doing I think it is fair to say that we have inherited, in our present system, a government and Parliament, the stability of which is second to none and from which flows democracy in its broadest and finest sense. Freedom is our heritage and we, sir, are the stewards of that treasure.

I echo the sentiments of my fluently bilingual colleague from the riding of Hamilton Mountain, Mr. Speaker, in offering congratulations to you on your election as Speaker of this assembly. With your wealth of experience as a lawyer and as a legislator, I know that you will do this post justice. You are the first lawyer to occupy this post for some years and as a member of the legal profession I feel justly proud, and I am sure all the members of the legal profession feel justly proud, in knowing that one of our members occupies this important position in our Legislature. I know that you will serve with distinction.

I would also like to offer congratulations to Roderick Lewis, Q.C., the Clerk of our House, on his recovery. We are all delighted to see him back to serve us in the post of Clerk.

Perhaps a word about the recent campaign would be in order from me also, Mr. Speaker, I was delighted to be a member of the Conservative party in this campaign with a smoothly running team from one end to the other, ably led by our Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts). It was easy to conduct a platform on the planks provided by him and by his colleagues in the Cabinet.

We made no false promises. We offered no pie in the sky bill of fare. We said to the people, look at our record, judge us by our past and they did so at the polls on October 17 by returning a very substantial majority on the Conservative side of the House, Mr. Speaker.

I echo, too, the sentiments of my colleague in reference to our two members who have been appointed to Cabinet portfolio rank. The hon. member for Chatham-Kent (Mr. McKeough) to the rank of Minister of Municipal Affairs—delighted to see that—and the member for St. George (Mr. A. F. Lawrence), who is presently enjoying the hospitality of Elliot Lake, I understand, to the portfolio of Minister of Mines. I, too, express congratulations and best wishes to both on behalf of all of us.

I have the honour to succeed the hon. Hollis E. Beckett, Q.C., who, since the year 1951 represented his and now my riding of York East in this Legislature. He served the riding and he served this Legislature very well indeed. He served on many committees, on some as chairman, notably as the chairman of the select committee on The Municipal Act and related Acts. Now, after 16 years, he has hung up his provincial political gloves, so to speak, and I know that Ontario and my riding of York East in particular owe a great deal to him. I am sure it is a debt that we will all long remember. Mr. Beckett and his lovely wife Irene are both enjoying the best of health and I am sure that this House wishes them all the very best in the years that lie ahead.

I would like to dwell for a minute, Mr. Speaker, on the matter of housing. It is an issue raised in all quarters. It is an issue raised frequently and it is not one capable of any simple or pat solution but it is one that somehow must be resolved. The home ownership made easy programme, to use the colloquial, and if you will pardon the mixture of metaphors, is getting off the ground. But it is heading, I suggest, primarily in the areas of single family detached dwellings costing, generally speaking, of the order of $15,000.

It seems to me that we need, if I may use the expression, "more economical" housing accommodation, probably in the multiple family dwelling areas. This is what I am beginning to believe, at any rate. I did a little bit of research concerning my general area and Metropolitan Toronto area and I came up with some figures that I must confess surprise me. I discovered that 90 per cent of the household earning heads, generally the man in the household, was earning less than $7,000 a year and 80 per cent less than $6,000 a year and these are the very people whom we are trying to help.

Normally, the National Housing Act formula to determine the approximate amount which a householder could afford to take from his gross annual earnings and apply into the housing area, his own housing accommodation, has been taken over the years at 27 per cent.

I have used a figure of 30 per cent for ease of calculation, because it is quite apparent that on a $6,000 gross income you have a net disposable amount which could be used properly for housing accommodation of $1,800. Disregarding principle retirement of a mortgage, let us say, but talking only in terms of interest at current rates, taxes, insurance, heating and so on, the $1,800 just covers it, just covers it and that is all. So the $15,000 house just carries for $1,800. Thus, the householder with $6,000 a year income breaks even and you are not even

talking about retiring a mortgage but just talking about carrying the thing, and this theory is the same, I suggest, whether we buy a house, or buy the land, or whether it is rented under the HOME programme.

Now in pre-war Toronto it seemed to be good business to build a house for the purpose of renting it—that is, the single-family detached dwelling—but it does not appear to be so today. In fact, it appears to me to be utterly uneconomical to build a house for the purpose of renting it. It may even be uneconomical to build a house for the purpose of buying it. I am beginning to think that here in Metro.

The cost of services, both as to capital and subsequent maintenance, seems to have put the single-family detached dwelling in an area like Metropolitan Toronto simply out of reach of most of us and we have run out of land, to boot. There is no simple answer. We could try extending farther out into the suburbs but then we get into problems with the servicing of those areas.

In pre-war Toronto they had zoning restrictions that permitted a house on 2,000 sq. ft. of land—16 by, say, 120 ft., something of that sort—but in later years zoning restrictions have required minimum land or lot area for single family dwellings of the order of 5,000 to 6,000 sq. ft. Municipalities, in an effort to increase their revenues to carry their costs over the years, have increased these minimum requirements; they have increased their building restrictions, thus increasing the cost of the house that has to be built on the land even though it is quite clear that in many cases cheaper and perfectly satisfactory houses could be built.

This is fine so far as raising taxes is concerned, but it does not solve the housing problem. We have to do something a little bit different. I have come to the irresistible conclusion that we cannot continue to spread out in the future as we have done in the past and that, in areas like Metropolitan Toronto, we simply have to alter our philosophy. We have to change our way of thinking. Where, up to now, we have talked and thought in terms of single-family detached dwellings, we are going to have to start thinking in terms of multiple-family dwellings, town housing, condominiums, and the like.

New York, London, Tokyo—they have all long since done this and their philosophy is quite clear. There is little low-density housing within miles of the core of cities of that sort. The needs of our people are not being met with the present restrictions that are imposed in many cases by the municipalities.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the HOME programme—although it is fine in the direction you are going—should also be extended into other areas of multiple-family dwellings. These seem to be the economic units for families with children.

Two Toronto developers, who have been active in the area of construction of homes both single-family and multiple-family types, were asked if they built a house at $25,000 with a density of five of these units per acre, what would it cost, or what could you sell that same house for, if you were to build it in row housing, town housing type construction, with about 20 of those same dwelling units on that acre of land that would give the same accommodation, the same quality of construction. Both of them came back with the same figure, namely, $15,000. That happens to work out at a nice three-fifths of the cost of a single-family detached dwelling.

I was curious then to know what a house selling at $15,000 might cost if its quality were incorporated into, for example, a town housing project. It is not a linear function, unfortunately. If it were you would come up with $9,000, but it is not quite that easy because of the basic raw cost of land and basic services, but it still works out at the order of $11,000. So the HOME programme is fine in providing single-family detached dwellings. It is an excellent project and I think the hon. member for Don Mills, the Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Randall) is to be congratulated for the progress made in this line to date.

I suggest now that the HOME programme can be extended. It does not, right now, seem to help those 80 per cent making in the order of $6,000 a year. The short range might well be, Mr. Speaker, to reinstitute the limited dividend development for low rental housing units. I am not really sold on that kind of project, mind you—

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): The member does not have to be a Conservative to say that—

Mr. Meen: Simply get it into operation, Mr. Speaker. There is some land in Metro, I am given to understand, presently available which could be used for that service. In the long range, though, and this is really what I am trying to work toward—we have to alter our philosophy here in areas like Metropolitan Toronto. I suggest that we can no longer afford single-family detached dwellings and

that multiples, town housing, condominiums, have to become the norm rather than the exception.

These, of course, should be in conjunction with properly planned and supervised community facilities, such as swimming pools, schools, shopping centres, places of worship, gymnasia—all this sort of thing. If we did this, we could set our course for the years ahead, I think, in the proper direction.

The Condominium Act passed last year was certainly a step in the right direction. The gentlemen of this House, Mr. Speaker, who served in the last Legislature are probably far more conversant with that Act than I am but a review of its terms indicates to me that it applies basically to ownership and might well need an amendment or a readjustment of some of its terms in order to accommodate the HOME programme. If this is the case then I think we should do that and get organized so that the HOME programme and the facilities available to the HOME programme can be extended into condominium type construction. I am not suggesting that the province get into the housing business by way of having a housing department. I think that is better done by private enterprise. I am simply saying we have our HOME programme, we have The Condominum Act which perhaps needs readjustment, but I believe that this operation can be extended to provide for the people who need it most.

Mr. Speaker, as mentioned in the Speech from the Throne, this is to be Human Rights Year—the 20th anniversary of the United Nations declaration of human rights. Human rights and human freedoms in a democracy like ours are often taken for granted. We forget how well off we are in our freedoms of choice—where we work, or if; and how long and when; where we live and how we travel between our homes and our places of employment; how we take our vacations and where —either within this country, or outside it. Sometimes we forget how these were won for us and the people and the work that went before. Perhaps we are inclined to be a little smug with our human rights and privileges as we think they exist here. I suggest that there may still be more to be done. We are certainly going to have to be careful of the human rights and of the privileges of our minorities. There will be more restrictions that have to be imposed and that is sort of the essence of civilization, isn't it? In the interests of the people as a whole, restrictions are placed on what you and I might consider to be our normal freedoms.

We have to guard the rights of minorities and we have to guard them zealously for they are the ones too often isolated from the rest of the community by barriers of language difference. They are the ones that need the protection the most and, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that by doing so we render our democracy all the stronger.

The Ontario human rights commission set up under The Department of Labour, under the most able leadership of the hon. Dalton Bales, from York Mills, has been doing an admirable job in this regard. Even in the short time since my election in October I have had occasion, a number of times, to deal with this department, and I offer them high commendation for the way in which they tackle problems and the way in which they resolve them.

There is a further area of civil rights, Mr. Speaker—equality before the law. For centuries, and despite Magna Charta for that matter, it has been a fact of life that, although fine in theory, equality before the law did not seem to work out that way in practice. The wealthy litigant could afford to hire the most expensive and competent counsel in town; he could afford to conduct the most extensive, and consequently expensive, investigations; he could afford to institute delaying tactics, all designed perhaps to wear down the opposition. And then if and when he did get to trial, and perhaps he lost, he still had the wherewithal to take the case to the court of appeal and perhaps wear down his opponent before he got to that state and win out in the long run.

So really there has not been over the years the real equality before the law which so many of us treasured as part of our heritage. This has not been unique to Ontario, nor to Canada, and I think perhaps it is a characteristic of the entire free world. But we here in Ontario last year, Mr. Speaker, took a most courageous step in the institution of the Ontario legal aid plan, an imaginative and far-reaching plan as you will ever find. It is second to none, and the eyes of the free world are upon us to see just how well it works. It is still barely 11 months old but it seems to be working reasonably well, subject to some modifications which I expect will be made in the next little while.

But it took a courageous government to institute this imaginative scheme and a cooperative bar association to implement it. And, Mr. Speaker, I think it is only right that I can offer to both the government and to the bar association sincere congratulations. With this legal aid system, no one needs to be denied a basic human right, the right to justice.

It is not inappropriate now to refer to the matter of the Royal commission report on bilingualism and bi-culturalism and the measures proposed by the government to implement it.

It is most gratifying indeed to hear in the Speech from the Throne, recognition, and I quote: "of two linguistic communities and many cultures within Canada, and appreciates that this diversity is the source of much of our strength and the enrichment of our life."

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, since February 18, 1952, until the end of December, 1957, we had in the person of our Lieutenant-Governor, the Honourable Louis Orville Breithaupt, a most distinguished Canadian of neither French nor English origin. Today, a relative of his is here in the Legislature, the hon. member for Kitchener (Mr. J. R. Breithaupt). It is unfortunate that he is on the wrong side of the House.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Meen: I was about to say, Mr. Speaker, that that is a matter of opinion.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): He is in the wrong party, but on the right side of the House.

Mr. Meen: But nevertheless I am sure that will not prevent the hon. member from making a real contribution to the deliberations of this House. And he is only one of many members of this Legislature whose ancestors are neither French nor English. So I am pleased to note the government's assurance of equal rights for all residents, regardless of national or linguistic origin. Acceptance of the B and B proposition by English Canadians would constitute, as our Prime Minister said in Ottawa, a denial of our history of the last 100 years and might very well, I suggest, result in the same kind of stalemate as we had in the period 1841 to 1867. Furthermore, the commission did not recognize the change in the complexion of our Ontario society over the last 100 years, and I can quote a few statistics on this. At Confederation, there were only 13,000 Canadians here in Ontario who were neither French nor English, nor American. By 1961, we have 1,887,000-odd.

The bilingualism and biculturalism commission has used, to determine ethnic composition, the matter of mother-tongue spoken in the home, and this is where, to my mind, they seem to have "gone off the track", to use a colloquial. This does not make much difference in the province of Quebec, but it makes a very great difference here in Ontario. For example, according to the B and B report there are 183,000 Germans of German origin, but in point of fact, there are over 400,000, so they were wrong by more than two to one. And we likewise, and we are proud of it, have large Italian, Greek, Macedonian, Dutch, Polish, all ethnic groups here in Ontario; in addition, of course, to the largest group of all, the French group.

And I would observe, Mr. Speaker, that all people of ethnic origin, save for the French and English, outnumber the French by three to one, and equal two-thirds of those of us with English background. It is thus clear to me that the B and B report places far too much emphasis on language itself and fails to recognize the true ethnic cultures. There are thousands of people who adopted the English language, sir, but retained their ethnic cultures. I therefore heartily endorse our government's commitment to ensure a full and equal citizenship for all residents of Canada regardless of their national or linguistic origin.

I would like also, Mr. Speaker, to deal for a few minutes with our Progressive Conservative Party of Ontario. I am proud to be a member of this party; we can look at the historic statues dating back to Sir John A. Macdonald, right through to the bill of rights by John G. Diefenbaker. The Progressive Conservative Party throughout this entire period, has served Canada and Canadians and served them well. Continuing dedication to national development, political independence, commonwealth co-operation, and personal freedoms—these are the ideals, these are the credo that find expression in the policies and programmes of our Progressive Conservative Party. And nowhere, either in Canada or in the free world, have these ideals been practiced and used to greater effect than here in Ontario since 1943.

The opening of this, the 28th Legislature marks the 25th year, as my friend from Hamilton Mountain observed, of Ontario's progress forward; the 25th year of progress for Ontario under a Progressive Conservative government.

Twenty-five years ago, Mr. Speaker, the hon. George Drew put forward his imaginative, and I suppose at that time it looked slightly socialist, 22-point programme. On it has been founded the progress we have achieved to date.

The Progressive Conservative philosophy stresses freedom of the individual human being above mass considerations of collectivist society. This emphasis gives a much larger sphere of activity, of individuality, to the individual person in our great province than could ever result under a socialist programme.

Socialists would have us believe that their theories of social welfare are the only ones that are truly concerned with the ideals of humanity.

Mr. Speaker, we are just as conscious of the needs of our people. I suggest even more so. We do not deny our social responsibility to take care of those who are not able to take care of themselves. We will not abandon this principle in favour of indiscriminate taxes on all of us to provide a benefit to all of us regardless of our need.

The government's position on medicare is a good example of this Conservative philosophy. We will not buy universality in social welfare. The federal government on this score will bring our taxes to the point, I suggest, of scandal.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): They are now.

Mr. Meen: Yes, I agree they very well are. In fact, one might even call it confiscation of income. And what are they doing this for, Mr. Speaker? I suggest they are doing it to support more government bureaucracy set up to replace private systems that presently are doing a first class job.

We decry monopoly. We decry it in government, just as much as in private enterprise. The federal anti-combines legislation is aimed at this very sort of thing. And what does the federal government do but set about to create its own little monopoly, and it is not so little in the area of medicare.

In the words of our Prime Minister:

> We must always recognize the need for the state to do those things for individuals which cannot be done by those individuals. But also we must never forget that each time the state assumes a function or makes a decision for the individual, he must lose some of his freedom, which he can never recover.

Ontario's record over the last 25 years is proof of the wisdom of our doctrine, Mr. Speaker. We have always been confident of the people's ability to progress under adequate and suitable guidance. Over the last 25 years, we have developed practical and realistic principles to the end that we have achieved maximum development of our physical resources, and all of this by utilizing private enterprise, the initiative of our citizens and, in every case, stimulated by the prospects of reward.

We stress private initiative for resource development with the government taking a supporting role. I emphasize supporting role, not the domineering role which our socialist NDP friends and our neo-socialist Liberal friends might very well take.

The validity of the doctrine is evidenced by the fruits thereof everywhere in this fair province of ours. Likewise, I suggest, the hazards of this kind of socialist policy are equally evident in countries like Sweden and, I suppose, tragically, in Great Britain as well.

Ontario voters saw the hazards. I would ask where are those 67 socialists who were going to run the government in '67?

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): They are there.

An hon. member: Not in the member's time.

Another hon. member: The member will not be needing them either now.

Mr. Meen: Mr. Speaker, I suggest to the leader of the unofficial Opposition, as hon. Leslie Frost would have said, he will have his kick at the bell all in the fullness of time.

Mr. MacDonald: The member is so right!

Mr. Meen: I think, Mr. Speaker, the NDP are in the same position as they were in 1951. It looks to me as if they are going to stay there, for they attempt to attract, on a parochial basis, interest on a local area basis. That is not the way to attract votes across Ontario.

Ontario voters know that the Progressive Conservative economic doctrine can produce the goods and services for our individual and social needs, for educational programmes and to provide for our further social programmes as the requirements develop.

There is more to this development we have enjoyed here in Ontario than just doctrine. We have had the leaders, and leaders of great integrity and ability. The foundation was laid by the hon. George Drew in 1943 to 1948. He established at that time and through that period a vast expansion of educational programming which has gone on to this day. He then battled for and, I might observe, against a strong Opposition of the day and secured conversion of our southern Ontario system from the hodge-podge of 25, 50, 66⅔ and 60 cycles to a standard of 60 cycles throughout this province. He did it over the extreme, vociferous, opposition of the day. The cost of that programme is being borne today by all of us and it is a quite economical cost. I might mention it is $5 a kilowatt a year, and that is not too expensive.

Today, as a result of that frequency standardization, we have had enormous industrial growth and we are still enjoying that growth.

The Drew administration laid the groundwork for our modern highways; stressed reform rather than punitive measures in our penal system; created The Department of Travel and Publicity, selling Ontario abroad; and it set up the important and significant Department of Planning and Development. Then I suppose we all remember the airlift of some 10,000 skilled technical personnel from across the pond. That was a most imaginative undertaking in itself.

As the leader of the Opposition well knows, relations between Queen's Park and Ottawa under the Liberal regime of Mitchell Hepburn had fallen to an all-time low by 1943. Hepburn would rant and rave against virtually all of Mackenzie King's plans, whether they were good or bad.

Mr. Speaker, it was Mr. Drew who reestablished communication with Ottawa. Commenting on this later, Mr. Drew had this to say, "We are Canadians first, last and all the time. That is the spirit in which we will meet the tasks before us."

On Mr. Drew's resignation in 1948 to enter the Federal House, the hon. T. L. Kennedy, long time member of this Legislature, was appointed interim Prime Minister—

Mr. MacDonald: Where did the hon. member get resignation? He was defeated!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: How many seats did the member for York South have after that?

Mr. Meen: —until a new leader could be elected in 1949.

We are honoured, Mr. Speaker, to have his nephew with us in this Legislature today, the hon. member for Peel South (Mr. R. D. Kennedy). And then in 1949, a most remarkable 12 year era began, with the hon. Leslie Frost's election as the leader of the party, and Premier of the province, and his assumption of the guidance of our ship of state.

Mr. MacDonald: He has now revealed how he balanced the Budget.

Mr. Meen: He further improved relations with Ottawa. In fact, he developed a true rapport with the Prime Minister, the hon. Louis St. Laurent, at that time. It was he that brought the seaway despite the foot dragging of the United States government. It was he, together with Ottawa who negotiated with the state of New York to bring that into being. He set up the Ontario water resources commission, on which our Prime Minister of today was one of the first commissioners.

Mr. G. Bukator (Niagara Falls): Was that good?

Mr. Meen: He is the father of our Ontario hospital insurance programme. The Frost philosophy of our party could be put in a nutshell as follows: "It was to develop the province, and get more people to make the wheels of the economy go round. And with that taxes and revenues that came from the expansion of the economy to increase our standard of living."

And he did indeed! Mr. Speaker, I think it is entirely fitting that we recognize the contribution of Messrs. Frost and Drew. We are delighted that both these outstanding Canadians are in good health, and very active. I am sure we all wish them well.

Our present leader and Prime Minister, John P. Robarts, carries on the tradition established by those who have gone before, with that same dedication, sincerity, ability, and absolute vigour. Under his stewardship, we have continued our remarkable growth which we experienced earlier. The educational facilities have been vastly expanded—we now have 21 universities in this province. And when I think back to the beginning of that 25 year period, when you could count all the universities on one hand, you can see that we have had an enormous expansion of our academic facilities. These are going a long way towards meeting the needs of our society today.

In addition, an entirely new level of education has been instituted with the colleges of applied arts and technology in 19 different regions of this province. These fill that void between the university level of achievement and the high school level with not too much in between. These 19 colleges are doing a great job, I suggest, of filling that space.

We have made new and significant strides in the field of transportation with the GO system, and our highways, and so on. There is also the legal aid programme of Ontario which I have already mentioned. Industrial expansion continues at a rapid rate and Ontario wages are way above the national average even when Ontario is counted into that average. Our unemployment figures are below the national average even when Ontario is again counted into the average.

Mr. MacDonald: And so our lower minimum wage level is among the lowest.

Mr. Meen: In picking John P. Robarts as one of three outstanding leaders of 1967, Douglas Fisher said this:

> He's been the national statesman of the last few months. His patient positive chairmanship of the Confederation of tomorrow

conference was a remarkable example of effective, unassuming leadership.

Mr. Speaker, under the leadership of the Prime Minister and guided by the principles, the validity of which is well established over the last 25 years of dynamic progress in this province, we face the challenge of a new session in this our second century. We face it with vigour and enthusiasm Mr. Speaker, I wish to second the motion made by my colleague to adopt the Speech from the Throne.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition) moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, before moving the adjournment of the House, on Wednesday we will proceed with what has become known as cleaners' day. We will resume the debate after we reach the orders of the day. The leader of the Opposition will resume the debate to be followed by the leader of the New Democratic Party (Mr. MacDonald), to be followed by myself, and from then we will resume the normal course of the debate.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 5:20 o'clock, p.m.

APPENDIX

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF THE MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

(117 members)

First Session — Twenty-Eighth Parliament

Speaker: Hon. Frederick M. Cass **Clerk of the House: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.**

Member	Party	Constituency	Post Office Address
Allan, James N.	P.C.	Haldimand-Norfolk	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Apps, Syl	P.C.	Kingston and the Islands	50 Roden St., Kingston
Auld, Hon. James A. C.	P.C.	Leeds	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Bales, Hon. Dalton	P.C.	York Mills	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Belanger, J. Albert	P.C.	Prescott and Russell	Sarsfield
Ben, George	L.	Humber	1134 Dundas St. W., Toronto 3
Bernier, Leo	P.C.	Kenora	Hudson
Boyer, Robert J.	P.C.	Muskoka	620 University Ave., Toronto
Braithwaite, Leonard A.	L.	Etobicoke	Suite E, 1500 Royal York Rd., Weston
Breithaupt, J. R.	L.	Kitchener	90 Church St., Kitchener
Brown, John L.	N.D.	Beaches-Woodbine	339 Millard Ave., Newmarket
Brunelle, Hon. Rene	P.C.	Cochrane North	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Bukator, George	L.	Niagara Falls	Box 280, Chippawa
Bullbrook, James E.	L.	Sarnia	881 Tudor Close, Sarnia
Burr, Fred A.	N.D.	Sandwich-Riverside	4005 Howard Ave., Windsor
Carruthers, Alex	P.C.	Durham	Garden Hill
Carton, Gordon R.	P.C.	Armourdale	217 Sandringham Dr., Downsview
Cass, F. M.	P.C.	Grenville-Dundas	Chesterville
Connell, Hon. T. Ray	P.C.	Wentworth North	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Davis, Hon. William G.	P.C.	Peel North	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Davison, Norm	N.D.	Hamilton Centre	100 Delaware Ave., Hamilton
Deacon, D. M.	L.	York Centre	Glenburn Farms, Unionville
Deans, Ian	N.D.	Wentworth	38 Beaconsfield Dr., Hamilton
Demers, J. C. G.	P.C.	Nickel Belt	Chelmsford
De Monte, Dante M.	L.	Dovercourt	29 South Kingslea Dr., Toronto 18
Downer, Rev. A. W.	P.C.	Dufferin-Simcoe	Box 239, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Dunlop, Edward	P.C.	York-Forest Hill	45 Charles St. E., Toronto 5
Dymond, Hon. Matthew B.	P.C.	Ontario	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Edighoffer, Hugh	L.	Perth	147 Nelson St., Mitchell
Evans, D. Arthur	P.C.	Simcoe Centre	Box 87, Bradford
Farquhar, Stan	L.	Algoma-Manitoulin	Box 421, Elliot Lake
Ferrier, Rev. William	N.D.	Cochrane South	552 Tamarack St., Timmins

Member	Party	Constituency	Post Office Address
Gaunt, Murray	L.	Huron-Bruce	Wingham
Gilbertson, Bernt	P.C.	Algoma	R.R. #1, Richards Landing
Gisborn, Reg	N.D.	Hamilton East	26 Martin Rd., Hamilton
Gomme, Hon. George E.	P.C.	Lanark	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Good, Edward R.	L.	Waterloo North	175 Tennyson Place, Waterloo
Grossman, Hon. Allan	P.C.	St. Andrew-St. Patrick	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Guindon, Hon. Fernand	P.C.	Stormont	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Haggerty, Ray	L.	Welland South	R.R. #1, Sherkston
Hamilton, Maurice	P.C.	Renfrew North	R.R. #5, Pembroke
Haskett, Hon. Irwin	P.C.	Ottawa South	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Henderson, Lorne C.	P.C.	Lambton	R.R. #3, Oil Springs
Hodgson, R. Glen	P.C.	Victoria-Haliburton	P.O. Box 240, Haliburton
Hodgson, William	P.C.	York North	R.R. #1, Kettleby
Innes, Gordon W.	L.	Oxford	R.R. #1, Woodstock
Jackson, Donald	N.D.	Timiskaming	Box 333, Kirkland Lake
Jessiman, James	P.C.	Fort William	127 South May St., Fort William
Johnston, Allister	P.C.	Parry Sound	South River
Johnston, R. M.	P.C.	St. Catharines	10 Canal St., St. Catharines
Johnston, W. Erskine	P.C.	Carleton	Carp
Kennedy, R. Douglas	P.C.	Peel South	2065 Camilla Rd., Cooksville
Kerr, George A.	P.C.	Halton West	377 Brant St., Burlington
Knight, Ron H.	L.	Port Arthur	Box 109, Mobile Village, R.R. #2, Trenton
Lawlor, Patrick D.	N.D.	Lakeshore	154 Lake Promenade, Toronto 14
Lawrence, A. B. R.	P.C.	Carleton East	90 Sparks St., Suite 500, Ottawa 4
Lawrence, Hon. Allan F.	P.C.	St. George	35 N. Sherbourne St., Toronto 5
Lewis, Stephen	N.D.	Scarborough West	342 Millard Ave., Newmarket
MacDonald, Donald C.	N.D.	York South	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
MacKenzie, Harold	L.	Ottawa Centre	Box 1279, R.R. #2, Ottawa
MacNaughton, Hon. C. S.	P.C.	Huron	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Makarchuk, Mac	N.D.	Brantford	15 Lynwood Dr., Apt. 601, Brantford
Martel, Elie W.	N.D.	Sudbury East	46 Ferguson St., Capreol
Meen, Arthur K.	P.C.	York East	95 Lord Seaton Rd., Willowdale
Morin, Jules	P.C.	Ottawa East	101 Wurtemburg, Ottawa
Morningstar, Ellis P.	P.C.	Welland	97 Alberta St., Welland
Morrow, Donald H.	P.C.	Ottawa West	2975 Richmond Rd., Ottawa 14
McKeough, Hon. Darcy W.	P.C.	Chatham-Kent	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
McNeil, R. K.	P.C.	Elgin	R.R. #2, Springfield
Newman, Bernard	L.	Windsor-Walkerville	1290 Ypres Blvd., Windsor
Newman, William	P.C.	Ontario South	Balsam P.O.
Nixon, Robert F.	L.	Brant	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Olde, Neil L.	P.C.	Middlesex South	Melbourne

Member	Party	Constituency	Post Office Address
Paterson, Donald A.	L.	Essex South	1 Georgia Ave., Leamington
Peacock, Hugh	N.D.	Windsor West	1555 Pelissier St., Windsor
Pilkey, Clifford G.	N.D.	Oshawa	801 Regent Dr., Oshawa
Pitman, W. G.	N.D.	Peterborough	1364 Gordon Ave., Peterborough
Potter, Dr. R. T.	P.C.	Quinte	276 Charles St., Belleville
Price, Henry J.	P.C.	St. David	27 Bloor St. E., Toronto 5
Pritchard, Mrs. Ada	P.C.	Hamilton West	93 Bold St., Suite 904, Hamilton
Randall, Hon. Stanley J.	P.C.	Don Mills	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Reid, Pat	L.-Lab.	Rainy River	P.O. Box 187, Fort Frances
Reid, Tim	L.	Scarborough East	38 Guildcrest Dr., Scarborough
Reilly, Leonard M.	P.C.	Eglinton	639 Yonge St., Toronto 5
Renwick, James	N.D.	Riverdale	Suite 15, 20 St. Dennis Dr., Don Mills
Renwick, Mrs. Margaret	N.D.	Scarborough Centre	Suite 15, 20 St. Dennis Dr., Don Mills
Reuter, Allan E.	P.C.	Waterloo South	45 Main St., Galt
Robarts, Hon. John P.	P.C.	London North	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Rollins, Clarke T.	P.C.	Hastings	R.R. #1, Bancroft
Root, John	P.C.	Wellington-Dufferin	Orton
Rowe, Russell D.	P.C.	Northumberland	546 Lakeshore Rd., Cobourg
Rowntree, Hon. H. Leslie	P.C.	York West	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Ruston, Richard F.	L.	Essex-Kent	Box 4, South Woodslee
Sargent, Eddie	L.	Grey-Bruce	868-2nd Ave. E., Owen Sound
Shulman, Dr. Morton	L.	High Park	378 Roncesvalles Ave., Toronto 3
Simonett, Hon. J. R.	P.C.	Frontenac-Addington	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Singer, Vernon M.	L.	Downsview	111 Richmond St. W., Suite 603, Toronto 1
Smith, Gordon E.	P.C.	Simcoe East	P.O. Box 128, Orillia
Smith, John R.	P.C.	Hamilton Mountain	42 Sunninghill Ave., Hamilton
Smith, Richard S.	L.	Nipissing	676 McIntyre St. W., North Bay
Snow, James W.	P.C.	Halton East	589 Argus Rd., Oakville
Sopha, Elmer W.	L.	Sudbury	Box 1206, Sudbury
Spence, John P.	L.	Kent	Muirkirk
Stewart, Hon. William A.	P.C.	Middlesex North	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Stokes, J. E.	N.D.	Thunder Bay	Box 62, Schreiber
Trotter, James B.	L.	Parkdale	227 Riverside Dr., Toronto 3
Villeneuve, Osie F.	P.C.	Glengarry	Box 27, Maxville
Welch, Hon. Robert	P.C.	Lincoln	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Wells, Hon. Thomas L.	P.C.	Scarborough North	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
White, John H.	P.C.	London South	119 Base Line Rd., London
Whitney, Norris	P.C.	Prince Edward-Lennox	R.R. #1, Consecon
Winkler, Eric A.	P.C.	Grey South	Hanover
Wishart, Hon. Arthur A.	P.C.	Sault Ste. Marie	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Worton, Harry	L.	Wellington South	15 Queen St., Guelph
Yakabuski, Paul J.	P.C.	Renfrew South	Box 219, Barry's Bay
Yaremko, Hon. John	P.C.	Bellwoods	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Young, Fred	N.D.	Yorkview	717 Woburn Ave., Toronto 12

MEMBERS OF THE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

Hon. John Parmenter Robarts, P.C. Q.C.	*Prime Minister and President of the Council*
Hon. Thomas Ray Connell	*Minister of Public Works*
Hon. Matthew Bulloch Dymond, M.D.	*Minister of Health*
Hon. John Yaremko, Q.C.	*Minister of Social and Family Services*
Hon. Henry Leslie Rowntree, Q.C.	*Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs*
Hon. Allan Grossman	*Minister of Reform Institutions*
Hon. William Atcheson Stewart	*Minister of Agriculture and Food*
Hon. Charles Steel MacNaughton	*Treasurer*
Hon. Irwin Haskett	*Minister of Transport*
Hon. James Alexander Charles Auld	*Minister of Tourism and Information*
Hon. William Grenville Davis, Q.C.	*Minister of Education, and Minister of University Affairs*
Hon. John Richard Simonett	*Minister of Energy and Resources Management*
Hon. Stanley John Randall	*Minister of Economics and Development*
Hon. Arthur Allison Wishart, Q.C.	*Minister of Justice and Attorney General*
Hon. George Ellis Gomme	*Minister of Highways*
Hon. Rene Brunelle	*Minister of Lands and Forests*
Hon. Dalton Arthur Bales, Q.C.	*Minister of Labour*
Hon. Robert Stanley Welch, Q.C.	*Provincial Secretary and Minister of Citizenship*
Hon. Thomas Leonard Wells	*Minister without Portfolio*
Hon. William Darcy McKeough	*Minister of Municipal Affairs*
Hon. Fernand Guindon	*Minister without Portfolio*
Hon. Allan F. Lawrence	*Minister of Mines*

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF STANDING COMMITTEES

Agriculture and Food

Messrs. Belanger, Burr, Carruthers, Downer, Edighoffer, Evans, Farquhar, Gaunt, Gilbertson, Good, Hamilton, Henderson, Hodgson (York North), Innes, Johnston (Carleton), MacDonald, Makarchuk, Morningstar, McNeil, Newman (Ontario South), Olde, Peacock, Pitman, Renwick, Mrs. (Scarborough Centre), Rollins, Rowe, Ruston, Sargent, Smith (Simcoe East), Snow, Spence, Villeneuve, Whitney, Yakabuski—34.

The quorum of the said committee to consist of seven members.

Education and University Affairs

Messrs. Bullbrook, Carruthers, Deacon, Dunlop, Good, Johnston (St. Catharines), Lawlor, Lawrence (Carleton East), Lewis, Martel, Morrow, Newman (Windsor-Walkerville) Newman (Ontario South), Pitman, Potter, Pritchard, Mrs., Reid (Scarborough East), Rowe, Smith (Hamilton Mountain), Snow, White—21.

The quorum of the said committee to consist of five members.

Government Commissions

Messrs. Apps, Ben, Bernier, Boyer, Bukator, Deans, Demers, Downer, Evans, Ferrier, Gaunt, Gilberston, Good, Hodgson (York North), Jackson, Jessiman, Johnston (St. Catharines), Johnston (Carleton), Kennedy, Morningstar, Morrow, Olde, Paterson, Price, Renwick (Riverdale), Rollins, Shulman, Singer, Smith (Simcoe East), Smith (Hamilton Mountain), Smith (Nipissing), Snow, Sopha, Stokes—34.

The quorum of the said committee to consist of seven members.

Health

Messrs. Apps, Belanger, Ben, Braithwaite, Brown, Carton, Demers, Dunlop, Johnston (Carleton), Meen, Morin, Potter, Pritchard, Mrs., Reid (Rainy River), Reid (Scarborough East), Renwick, Mrs. (Scarborough Centre), Rowe, Shulman, Smith (Hamilton Mountain), Trotter, Winkler—21.

The quorum of the said committee to consist of five members.

Highways and Transport

Messrs. Belanger, Bernier, Bukator, Burr, Davison, Deacon, Deans, Evans, Gilbertson, Haggerty, Hamilton, Hodgson (York North), Innes, Jackson, Jessiman, Johnston (Carleton), Johnston (St. Catharines), Kennedy, Kerr, Knight, Lawrence (Carleton East), MacKenzie, Martel, Morin, McNeil, Newman (Windsor-Walkerville), Olde, Root, Smith (Simcoe East), Smith (Nipissing), Snow, Whitney, Yakabuski, Young—34.

The quorum of the said committee to consist of seven members.

Labour

Messrs. Apps, Bernier, Boyer, Braithwaite, Demers, De Monte, Gisborn, Haggerty, Jessiman, Johnston (St. Catharines), Knight, Lawrence (Carleton East), Makarchuk, Morningstar, Newman (Ontario South), Pilkey, Root, Rowe, Smith (Hamilton Mountain), Sopha, Yakabuski—21.

The quorum of the said committee to consist of five members.

Legal Bills and Municipal Affairs

Messrs. Ben, Dunlop, Edighoffer, Hodgson (York North), Jessiman, Johnston (St. Catharines), Kennedy, Kerr, Lawlor, Lawrence (Carleton East), Meen, Morin, Newman (Ontario South), Potter, Renwick (Riverdale), Sargent, Singer, Smith (Hamilton Mountain), Sopha, Winkler, Young—21.

The quorum of the said committee to consist of five members.

Natural Resources and Tourism

Messrs. Allan, Apps, Bernier, Boyer, Bullbrook, Davison, Demers, Evans, Farquhar, Gilberston, Henderson, Hodgson (Victoria), Jackson, Jessiman, Johnston (Parry Sound), Knight, MacDonald, Makarchuk, Martel, Morin, McNeil, Newman (Ontario South), Paterson, Reuter, Reid (Rainy River), Rollins, Sargent, Smith (Simcoe East), Smith (Nipissing), Snow, Spence, Stokes, Villeneuve, Yakabuski—34.

The quorum of the said committee to consist of seven members.

Private Bills

Messrs. Belanger, Bernier, Bukator, Bullbrook, Carton, Deacon, Deans, Demers, De Monte, Ferrier, Gilbertson, Good, Haggerty, Hamilton, Henderson, Hodgson (York North), Innes, Jackson, Jessiman, Johnston (Parry Sound), Johnston (St. Catharines), Kennedy, Lawlor, Lawrence (Carleton East), MacDonald, MacKenzie, Meen, Morin, Morningstar, McNeil, Newman (Windsor-Walkerville), Olde, Peacock, Pilkey, Pitman, Potter, Price, Pritchard, Mrs., Reil (Scarborough East), Reuter, Rollins, Root, Singer, Smith (Simcoe East), Smith (Hamilton Mountain), Sopha, Villeneuve, Whitney, White, Yakabuski—50.

The quorum of the said committee to consist of seven members.

Privileges and Elections

Messrs. Belanger, Bernier, Braithwaite, Breithaupt, De Monte, Downer, Dunlop, Henderson, Kerr, Lawlor, MacKenzie, Meen, Potter, Price, Renwick (Riverdale), Rollins, Root, Shulman, Singer, White, Winkler—21.

The quorum of the said committee to consist of five members.

Public Accounts

Messrs. Allan, Breithaupt, Carton, Gaunt, Kerr, Meen, Newman (Ontario South), Peacock, Renwick (Riverdale), Trotter, White, Winkler—12.

The quorum of the said committee to consist of five members.

Standing Orders and Printing

Messrs. Boyer, Breithaupt, Davison, Downer, Farquhar, Hamilton, Hodgson (Victoria-Haliburton), Hodgson (York North), Innes, Johnston (Carleton), Martel, Olde, Price, Pritchard, Mrs., Reid (Rainy River), Ruston, Smith (Simcoe East), Snow, White, Yakabuski, Young—21.

The quorum of the said committee to consist of five members.

Welfare and Reform

Messrs. Belanger, Ben, Brown, Burr, Carruthers, Dunlop, Edighoffer, Farquhar, Gilbertson, Hodgson (Victoria-Haliburton), Hodgson (York North), Kennedy, Morningstar, Potter, Pritchard, Mrs., Renwick, Mrs. (Scarborough Centre), Rowe, Ruston, Trotter, Villeneuve, Whitney—21.

The quorum of the said committee to consist of seven members.



Legislature of Ontario Debates

No. 5



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

First Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Wednesday, February 21 ,1968

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1968

5

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Wednesday, February 21, 1968

Presenting reports 97
Department of Trade and Development, bill to establish, Mr. Randall, first reading 97
Ontario Development Corporation Act, 1966, bill to amend, Mr. Randall, first reading 97
Ontario Housing Corporation Act, 1964, bill to amend, Mr. Randall, first reading 98
Sheridan Park Corporation Act, 1964, bill to amend, Mr. Randall, first reading 98
Elderly Persons' Housing Aid Act, bill to amend, Mr. Randall, first reading 98
Transportation of Fowl Act, bill to repeal, Mr. Stewart, first reading 98
Threshing Machines Act, bill to repeal, Mr. Stewart, first reading 98
Steam Threshing Engines Act, bill to repeal, Mr. Stewart, first reading 98
Provincial Auctioneers' Act, bill to amend, Mr. Stewart, first reading 98
Injured Animals Act, bill to repeal, Mr. Stewart, first reading 98
Statement re the capital region tourist council, Mr. Auld 99
Statement re Operation Mississauga, Mr. A. F. Lawrence 99
Question to Mr. Davis re the second instalment of student awards, Mr. MacDonald 100
Questions to Mr. Yaremko re The Day Nurseries Act, Mr. Ben, Mrs. M. Renwick 100
Question to Mr. Yaremko re adoption of children, Mrs. M. Renwick 102
Questions to Mr. Haskett re studded tires, Mr. Young 102
Question to Mr. McKeough re a standard building code for Ontario, Mr. Ben 102
Question to Mr. Brunelle re sale and leasing of Crown land for summer resort locations, Mr. Sopha 103
Questions to Mr. Davis re school boards, Mr. Good 104
Question to Mr. Gomme re land expropriation, Mr. Breithaupt 104
Questions to Mr. A. F. Lawrence re explosions in the INCO coal plant, Mr. Martel 106
Questions to Mr. Wishart re Canadian Oil investigations, Mr. Sargent 106
Question to Mr. McKeough re unconditional grants, Mr. Sargent 107
Question to Mr. McKeough re basic shelter exemption, Mr. Sargent 107
Question to Mr. Davis re commission on post-secondary education, Mr. Sargent 107
Question to Mr. Davis re superannuated teachers, Mr. Pitman 108
Question to Mr. Davis re teacher salary negotiations with school boards, Mr. Pitman 108
Questions to Mr. Randall re the Los Angeles trade office, Mr. Sargent 109
Question to Mr. Randall re employee morale in his department, Mr. Shulman 113
Questions to Mr. Randall re land use and housing, Mr. Lawlor, Mr. Trotter 114
Questions to Mr. Robarts re committee to oversee smelter location, Mr. Ferrier 115
Question to Mr. Bales re certification of plumbers and electricians, Mr. Shulman 115
Questions to Mr. MacNaughton re the Ontario Hospital at Whitby, Mr. Shulman 115
Question to Mr. Stewart re appointment of a fruit and vegetable inspector, Mr. Makarchuk 116
Question to Mr. Gomme re bypass, Mr. Jackson 116
Question to Mr. Dymond re air pollution, Mr. Burr 116
Question to Mr. Yaremko re The Vocational Rehabilitation Services Act, Mr. Burr 116
Questions to Mr. A. F. Lawrence re exposure to sulphur dioxide, Mr. Martel 116
Resumption of the debate on the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Nixon 117
Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Nixon, agreed to 134
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to 134

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 21, 1968

The House met at 2.30 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are pleased to welcome as our guests today, in the east gallery Bloor collegiate institute of Toronto; and in the west gallery Mallow Road public school, Don Mills.

Petitions.

Clerk of the House: The following petitions have been received:

Of Laurentian University of Sudbury praying that an Act may pass changing its name to Laurentian University and in French to Université Laurentienne; and for other purposes.

Of Carleton University praying that an Act may pass ratifying a certain deed of conveyance.

Of the board of directors of Kenora general hospital and St. Joseph hospital praying that an Act may pass establishing Lake of the Woods district hospital.

Mr. Speaker: Presenting reports.

Hon. R. S. Welch (Provincial Secretary and Minister of Citizenship): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present the following reports:

1. The public accounts of the province of Ontario for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1967; 2. The Provincial Auditor's report of the province of Ontario, 1966-67.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Introduction of bills.

THE HOURS OF WORK AND VACATIONS WITH PAY ACT

Mr. D. Jackson (Timiskaming) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Hours of Work and Vacations with Pay Act.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the member would hold that until the proper order, which is introduction of bills, which I had called and to which we will revert.

Motions.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Mr. Speaker, on the presentation by the hon. Provincial Secretary of the auditor's report; will he answer a question please?

Mr. Speaker: I would think that there would not be any need for a question at this time. The member for Grey-Bruce can perhaps ask it in an appropriate way at an appropriate time.

Mr. Sargent: He has presented the report; when can we ask about it?

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the member would look at the report, then direct his question.

Introduction of bills.

DEPARTMENT OF TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT

Hon. S. J. Randall (Minister of Economics and Development) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to establish The Department of Trade and Development.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Speaker, by way of explanation, the bill changes the name of The Department of Economics and Development to The Department of Trade and Development and extends and clarifies its duties and powers.

THE ONTARIO DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION ACT, 1966

Hon. Mr. Randall moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Ontario Development Corporation Act, 1966.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Speaker, the amendments are in section 1 where the definition of industry is broadened, and in section 2, where the objects of the corporation are extended to include assistance in the provision of sites, equipment, premises, facilities and services.

In section 3, the powers of the corporation are extended, principally to include forgiveness of loans.

In section 4, loans forgiven or guaranteed loans unpaid are paid out of the monies appropriated and not out of the assets of the corporation.

In section 5, this provision is transitional to permit broader terms for loans provided for by this Act, to be applied to loans made after the first day of December, 1967.

THE ONTARIO HOUSING CORPORATION ACT, 1964

Hon. Mr. Randall moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Ontario Housing Corporation Act, 1964.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Speaker, the amendments are to make it clear that the corporation has the power to borrow by way of charge or mortgage on its real property, and to provide for the guarantee by the Provincial Treasurer of Ontario of any such charge or mortgage made by the corporation.

THE SHERIDAN PARK CORPORATION ACT, 1964

Hon. Mr. Randall moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Sheridan Park Corporation Act, 1964.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Sargent: Still no housing!

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Speaker, the clause added enlarges the objects and powers of the corporation.

THE ELDERLY PERSONS' HOUSING AID ACT

Hon. Mr. Randall moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Elderly Persons' Housing Aid Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Speaker, the amendments place the Act under the jurisdiction of the Minister who now administers it; and also add charitable corporations to the corporations eligible for grants.

THE TRANSPORTATION OF FOWL ACT

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to repeal The Transportation of Fowl Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, it is felt that this bill may be repealed because succeeding legislation that has been passed since the bill was first introduced takes care of the provisions in the bill.

THE THRESHING MACHINES ACT

Hon. Mr. Stewart moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to repeal The Threshing Machines Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

THE STEAM THRESHING ENGINES ACT

Hon. Mr. Stewart moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to repeal The Steam Threshing Engines Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): We are moving forward today—coming into the twentieth century already.

THE PROVINCIAL AUCTIONEERS' ACT

Hon. Mr. Stewart moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Provincial Auctioneers' Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, I might say the intent of this bill to amend The Provincial Auctioneers' Act is simply to transfer the authority for the granting of a licence to a provincial purebred livestock auctioneer from the Minister to the commissioner of livestock, with the right of appeal from the commissioner to the Minister in case the applicant is denied the licence.

THE INJURED ANIMALS ACT

Hon. Mr. Stewart moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to repeal The Injured Animals Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: The Injured Animals Act repeals conditions covered in succeeding legislation passed since a bill was first introduced into this area of legislation.

Mr. Speaker: I think the members of the House should join me in extending greetings, on his natal day, to the Minister of Labour (Mr. Bales), who works so hard and is celebrating today.

Hon. J. A. C. Auld (Minister of Tourism and Information): I know the members from eastern Ontario, and Ottawa particularly, will be interested to learn that I have today, authorized the establishment of a separate tourist council to serve the Ottawa area. This will be known as the capital region tourist council, serving the same area as the national capital commission, except for those parts of the commission area in the province of Quebec.

The capital region tourist council becomes the 33rd tourist council in Ontario. Formerly it was part of the Lower Ottawa Valley tourist council.

Formal establishment of the new council means that it will be eligible for an annual grant of up to $5,000 from The Department of Tourism and Information, paid on a matching basis.

Mr. Speaker, the nation's capital is one of Ontario's leading tourists attractions and it is my hope the establishment of a separate travel council to serve the Ottawa area will give further emphasis to tourism promotion in eastern Ontario.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence (Minister of Mines): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, in view of the widespread interest in the press and mining industry, I thought that I should give the House a very brief interim report on the staking rush north of the Elliot Lake area on Monday, which the department calls Operation Mississauga.

As you know, sir, this is an area of 90,000 acres or so that was opened up for staking Monday last. As of noon today, in the Sault Ste. Marie office there have been a total of 304 claims recorded; in the Sudbury office a total of 105 claims recorded; and the departmental officials on the spot estimate, because staking is still continuing in the northern part of the area, there will be approximately 2,000 mining claims staked in the Sault Ste. Marie division and about 500 in the Sudbury mining division when the operation and all of the work has been completed.

As some of the members may know, one of the "hottest" areas, so to speak, in the whole of the area was Ten Mile Lake, which we visited on Monday. I am now informed that several women, including a go-go dancer, successfully staked claims in that "hottest" area—and I am referring to the area, not the go-go dancer. This would certainly indicate to me, in any event, that a competent prospector should have been able to get in there and get around somewhere in that particular area.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Is this a personal report?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: As well as the go-go dancer there were approximately 1,500 men in the bush area on Monday.

Mr. MacDonald: No wonder there were so many men!

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: In the estimation of the department, considering the mammoth operation that was involved, the huge area and the number of people and the new procedures adopted by the department, the whole operation has gone off extremely smoothly.

As of last night there were only four disputes filed in Sault Ste. Marie.

When one considers the type of operation and the area, I don't know whether we have been very lucky or whether the whole thing is the result of very competent planning in the department, but I certainly think it is the latter.

Mr. Speaker: Is there a question?

Mr. G. Ben (Humber): I have a question—

Mr. Speaker: No. I would ask the member for York South if he is prepared and would care to place his questions, because my view the other day was that the leaders of the Opposition parties should have the first right to ask their questions.

Mr. MacDonald: Thank you Mr. Speaker, unaccustomed as I am to this kind of treatment.

My first question is to the Minister of Transport: Since the incremental highway cost study completed by The Department of Transport in 1963 represents an updating of the report of the select committee on toll roads, would the Minister make it available to the House in order to facilitate our considerations of highway costs and revenues?

Hon. I. Haskett (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, if the report referred to was an internal one to the Minister; it is not my intention to release it.

Mr. MacDonald: I have two questions for the Minister of Education. The first one is, what action does the Minister intend to take

on the auditor's report presented to his department last fall regarding allegations of Leo Juhani against R. D. Schoales in the architectural department of the London board of education?

Hon. W. G. Davis (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, the member realizes that this is basically a legal problem, and I understand that the report has been directed to the Department of the Attorney General for consideration.

Mr. MacDonald: May I ask, or give notice to the Attorney General, as to whether he can comment on what has happened to the report?

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): I would be glad to have the question, and see if I can find the answer.

Mr. MacDonald: I will send the hon. Minister a copy. My second question to the Minister of Education is: What explanation is there for the fact that students at the George Brown college of technology and applied arts are still awaiting the second instalments of student awards which were due on January 1?

Hon. Mr. Davis: The Department of University Affairs began issuing cheques to the students qualifying under the provisions of the Ontario students award programme, the non-repayable part, on January 2, 1968, and this process has been going on since that date.

I should point out that contrary to the wording of the question, there was no undertaking that all the cheques would be paid on January 1. The understanding was that they would be made available early in the second term, and this is the second stage in the programme. The first stage resulted in the payment of, I believe, some $22 million, under the Canada student loan part of the programme, which cheques were paid in the first term.

On January 2, there were some 63 cheques forwarded to the students of George Brown and since that date there have been a total of 146 awards to the students of that college. If students have not received that cheque, and if the hon. member has any one or two or three in particular in mind, and he would let me know, I would be delighted to look into them.

Usually it is for one of three or four reasons. Perhaps the institution has not provided us with the certification necessary or the student has yet to provide the necessary information on other awards, or that he is in fact in attendance. We must have this information prior to the second part of the award. It could be that his application form was returned, or it could be that he has applied very recently for either a supplementary award or perhaps even in some instances an initial award.

In other words, his application may not have come in during September or October. But I repeat, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member knows of an individual or two or three who for some reason do not understand what the regulations may be, I would be delighted to look into the cases.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the hon. Minister of Social and Family Services, notice of which has been given. Frances S. Pearl, executive director of cradleship crèche, yesterday stated, as reported in the *Globe and Mail* this morning, that the new Day Nursery Act regulations deprive many low-income families of subsidized day care and service, and force mothers to makeshift arrangements. Would the Minister please answer this charge—is it true?

Hon. J. Yaremko (Minister of Social and Family Services): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Scarborough Centre has a question along these lines and perhaps she might ask it too.

Mrs. M. Renwick (Scarborough Centre): Mr. Speaker, I have the same question—does the Minister realize that the new regulations published under The Day Nurseries Act have the effect of depriving needy working mothers of the use of already scarce day nursery services?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, I may say at the outset that I received copies of these questions just when you called "orders of the day", having been one of those who had the opportunity of taking the grand circle tour of Metropolitan Toronto.

I would first like to answer the question of the hon. member for Scarborough Centre. Actually, an understanding and a reading of the present regulations indicates that the needy, working mother does come within the scope of the regulations as they are now. And I can assure the hon. member that no needy, I underline "needy", working mother is or will be deprived of these services.

However, there have emerged other problems, in relation to the day nurseries. On Friday afternoon last, I had the opportunity of meeting with representatives—both directors and executive people—from a number of day nurseries, and we had a very thorough discussion on some of the problems which

have emerged. I do not think, however, that they in the main relate to the point raised by the member for Scarborough Centre for as I say, "no needy mother is or will be deprived of this care".

Now, in relation to the question of the member for Humber; incidentally, Mr. Speaker, the last phrase, as I read the question before me is, "Would the Minister answer this statement". The member took the privilege of paraphrasing this to make "statement" a "charge". I just state that as an aside.

Mr. Ben: I beg the Minister's indulgence, I did not paraphrase the question, I read it exactly as it was.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Well, my copy has: "Would the Minister please answer this statement?"

Mr. Ben: Yes, that is what I stated.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: No, you used the word "charge".

Mr. Ben: I am sorry, the word "charge" in the preamble was changed to "statement", but there was no change in the question. "Would the Minister please answer this charge" is exactly as it was.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, the copy I have—

Mr. Speaker: I might point out to the members that the copy which I have has the word "charged" changed to "stated" and the word "charge" in the final question also changed to "statement". Now, it could be that there was not a proper liaison between my office and the member for Humber, but the question that I have reads that way.

Mr. Ben: I will shake hands with the Minister later and call it a draw.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Perhaps you might speak to Miss Pearl and find out whether she was making a statement or a charge.

Mr. MacDonald: Perhaps you might answer the question and quit the quibbling.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, Miss Pearl was at that meeting. I may say that in relationship to the problems under the day nurseries, the question is, who is in a "low-income" family? I may say that it was interesting for me to find out that one of the families in this area that was having some problems had an income of $10,000.

An hon. member: Over her lifetime.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I may say, Mr. Speaker, that that was their current income.

I may also say this, that we are in the process now of reviewing all the regulations, bearing in mind the interest of the children to be served.

That is the point of view we will be taking, and I can assure the hon. members who are asking these questions, and other hon. members who have written to me in regard to some of the problems, that that is the point of view which we will be having in mind when we undertake our review.

Mr. Ben: Will the Minister accept a supplementary question?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Ben: This is a little unfair but it is with reference to the answer given. What does the Minister define as being "needy"?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, that is all set out in the present regulations. I would be happy to send over a copy of the regulations to the member and he will see for himself but, as I say, they are presently under review.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Scarborough Centre still has a question.

Mrs. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister if he would accept a supplementary question?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mrs. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, in the Friday conference the Minister spoke of, was there no mention of the fact that the per diem cost of $4.63 a day was, in fact, based on last year's operational figures of six months and will, in fact, come out higher than this cost?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, I do not recall that specific item but the supplementary question, I think, is not related to the main question that the hon. member asked about the "needy working mother". The present regulations are geared to exactly that—the needs of the family.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): They are not geared to those things.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, that is the way the regulations are geared; they are being reviewed to see what extension we can make—

Mr. Lewis: Why are you reviewing them?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: —in order to make sure that the facilities achieve the purpose for which they are intended.

Mr. Ben: What the Minister means is that he is giving them the gears.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Scarborough Centre still has the floor; is there another question?

Mrs. M. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, I have another question for the Minister of Social and Family Services. Will the Minister amend immediately the terms of reference in the Minister's advisory committee on adoption and foster care to include, in section 1 of the order in council, a specific reference to the policies and practices to be adopted by his department and the children's aid societies of Ontario with respect to the adoption of brothers and sisters, siblings?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, the matter of adoptions is governed by The Child Welfare Act, and I bring to the attention of the hon. members section 84, subsection 1, which reads as follows: "Every children's aid society shall endeavour to secure the adoption of Crown wards"—and I stress the following words—"having regard to the individual needs of each ward".

That is the key—the "individual needs of the ward"—that is the guideline for children's aid societies to follow in respect of placing of children. There is no need for an amendment to the order in council.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, might I ask the Minister if he would just answer the question—will it be amended to deal particularly with siblings or just with individual children?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, as I ended up my remarks, there is no need, in my opinion, to make an amendment to the order in council.

Mr. Speaker: I wonder if the member for Humber would allow the member for Yorkview to direct a question to the Minister of Transport? I believe he has to leave—I am not sure whether he is going down to that other city or not—but I think we would wish to facilitate his withdrawal.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Speaker, thank you very much, I have a question for the Minister of Transport. Has the Minister taken steps to investigate the accident at Manotick, R.R. 3, in which Bonnie Brownlee was injured by flying studs from a tire of her father's car? Is the Minister satisfied that tire studs are being properly inserted into the studded tires being used in Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Speaker, this is the first incident of this kind that I have learned of since our studded tire regulations came into effect. Though it appears that this accident was an off-highway one, we are deeply concerned about the safety of studded tires and an inquiry is already under way into this occurrence which, I understand, happened on the family farm. In the course of the inquiry I think you can be sure that the tire will be carefully examined and its source ascertained.

Mr. Young: Mr. Speaker, could I ask the Minister a supplementary question?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Yes.

Mr. Young: In a case like this, how is responsibility fixed for an accident of this nature?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I think this is just an ordinary case of third party coverage. This occurred on the family farm and it was the father driving the car from what I understand.

Mr. Young: No, I was thinking of responsibility for, perhaps, improper insertion of studs—if they were improperly inserted.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: It might be premature to speak on this angle. Let us get the inquiry over and see what comes of it.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Speaker, perhaps the hon. member and the Minister who just sat down ought to read the article in the Ontario Motor League publication which stated that driving studs should not be used on pavement, that they are a danger and a hazard.

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs, notice of which has been given. Pending the possibility that the federal government may introduce a uniform building code for Canada, is the government prepared to take steps to end the morass of red tape by imposing a standard building code for the province of Ontario?

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to inform the House briefly about what is being done in this matter at the present time by my department.

The staff of the community planning branch, as members may know, both encourages and advises all municipalities about the

need for and the benefits of building bylaws, as well as other important factors relating to the quantity and quality of the housing stock in Ontario. The draft bylaw that the staff recommends is either the national building code of Canada or the shorter form.

Over 300 copies have been distributed to local councils and planning boards since the beginning of 1966. We believe that these documents provide a sound basis for local building bylaws.

Recently two conferences were organized for the sole purpose of achieving a full understanding of building bylaws. In both cases my staff worked closely with the staff of the national research council. For the information of the House, one conference was held in the Lakehead, and the other was at Picton for all the municipalities in the county of Prince Edward.

In general, the idea that the same structural standards should apply to the same type of buildings throughout the province is supported and we are considering a variety of means by which the benefits of such an approach will be fully understood and from which we can expect to see a reduction in unnecessarily different building standards.

About a year ago my staff put forward a suggestion for another format of the national building code to the associate committee responsible for the code. We are informed that the committee which is appointed by the national research council and is composed of building officials, professionals, government people, building contractors, will be formally deciding about the suggestion when it meets next month.

The suggestion is that a different format of the national building code be made available by building types. The primary benefit would be to the smaller and rural municipalities which argue that the full national building code is more than they need.

It is my intention to ask officials in the Metropolitan Toronto area to meet with me and my staff about one building bylaw throughout the metropolitan area. I will be guided, of course, by whatever arises out of the meeting, but I do not preclude the possibility of legislation to accomplish this most desirable goal.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Highways if I have got up in the right place in the pecking order that you have apparently established.

(1) Are statistics kept or compiled in respect to the happening of accidents—personal injuries, fatalities and property damage—at specific points and places on highways within the jurisdiction of the province?

(2) Are such statistics available to the public upon request?

(3) If not, why?

Hon. G. E. Gomme (Minister of Highways): Mr. Speaker, in answer to the hon, member's question I might say that the statistics referred to are kept and compiled by The Ontario Department of Transport and any information in respect to them should be directed to the Minister of that department.

Mr. Sopha: May I ask a supplementary question? Would the Minister agree with the Minister of Transport in that he told me last night in the elevator of the Royal York hotel that they were kept by The Department of Highways?

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, a question to the—

Mr. Speaker: May I interrupt the member for just a minute? The member for Sudbury had another question which has been around for some time.

Mr. Sopha: Est-ce-que le gouvernement a envisagé la possibilité de cesser la vente des terres de la Couronne et de substituer à sa présente politique, le louage de ces terres pour des sites de villégiature?

Has the government considered the possibilities of putting an end to the sale of Crown land and substituting for the present policy of the government a lease of these lands for summer resort locations?

Hon. R. Brunelle (Minister of Lands and Forests): Monsieur le Président, en réponse à la question de l'honorable député de Sudbury, je puis affirmer que le Ministère des Terres et Forêts envisage la possibilité de louer des sites de villégiatures, lesquels étaient depuis quelques années, offerts en vente.

Il a toujours été de pratique courante de louer des terres dans l'Ontario et différentes catégories de terres ont été offertes en louage seulement, telles que des terres situées dans les parcs Algonquin et Rondeau, des territoires de chasse, des camps de pêche temporaires, certaines terres d'agriculture et autres terres ne devant servir que pour usage temporaire.

Le louage des terres permet d'exercer un contrôle plus adéquat, pendant la période de location, une chose plus difficile à faire lorsque les terres ont été vendues.

Mon Ministère revise régulièrement sa politique dans ce domaine.

Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of those who may have missed the odd word in reply to the question posed by the hon. member for Sudbury, his question is as follows:

Has the government considered the possibilities of putting an end to the sale of Crown land and substituting for the present policy of the government a lease of these lands for summer resort locations?

The answer, Mr. Speaker, is that The Department of Lands and Forests already has under consideration leasing of the type of cottage site that for a number of years has normally been available for sale.

The practice of leasing public lands in Ontario is not new and many types of lands have only been available on a lease basis—for example, lands in the older parts such as Algonquin and Rondeau, sites for hunting, fishing and commercial outpost camps, some agricultural lands, and lands where occupation was not considered to be of a permanent nature.

One of the considerations in favour of leasing is the controls which may be exercised during the term of a lease and which are difficult to exercise when the fee in the land has passed. Our present policy on this subject is currently under review.

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Education. It is in two parts:

Who will be responsible for the payment of election costs for the election of the new county school boards in municipalities where no municipal elections will be held this fall?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, the question of elections will be considered at the time the bill is introduced and discussed here before the full House.

Mr. Good: The second part Mr. Speaker:

Does the interim committee representing all school boards in the county have the authority to hire and pay a qualified interim secretary; and if so would such costs be assessed against the existing school boards?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, the custom so far in the last few days, and the committees have only been at work a week or ten days, has been that the regional offices have provided secretarial assistance to the interim committees. On some occasions personnel from the existing boards—from perhaps some of the larger boards—have been made available.

In those cases where provision has not yet been made, the regional offices will provide secretarial service to the interim committee on request.

Mr. Good: Mr. Speaker, may I ask a supplementary question? Does that mean that they may or may not hire an interim secretary?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Oh, I am sorry, Mr. Speaker; yes they may.

Mr. Good: Thank you.

Mr. J. R. Breithaupt (Kitchener): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the hon. Minister of Highways.

Would the Minister inform the House as to whether or not the expropriation by his department of part of the Eastside conservation area in the city of Kitchener for use as a maintenance yard in connection with the Conestoga parkway has been rescinded, in view of the availability of an alternative site in the vicinity of Courtland Avenue and the Conestoga parkway, which was previously approved by department officials for the purpose?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Speaker, in answer to the question of the hon. member for Kitchener I would like to read two letters which have been written to the city clerk of the city of Kitchener:

Dear Mr. Pritchard:

I have been directed by the Hon. George Gomme to reply on his behalf to your letter of January 17 advising that the council of the corporation of the city of Kitchener has passed a resolution strongly objecting to the acquisition by The Department of Highways of part of the Eastside conservation area for use as a maintenance yard in connection with the Kitchener-Waterloo expressway.

On receipt of your letter a careful analysis of all factors which led to our decision in this regard was undertaken once more and from an economical and operational point of view, the subject site remains the only one satisfactory for our purposes.

As you are no doubt aware our intitial investigations to select a suitable location for this maintenance yard commenced in June, 1966. Since that time virtually every possible site that had potential in meeting our requirements has been investigated.

Because of the complex road system that is being constructed prime importance in this particular instance is selecting a central

location that will provide the most efficient economical means of maintenance, and also a location that will provide direct access to construction completed in the early stages of the overall project.

Cost of developing the site is of course a major factor to be considered, but of equal importance and which perhaps at times is not given due consideration, is the cost of operating from the location selected. Rejection of the Courtland Avenue site referred to in the resolution was primarily because of the above factors.

It is not centrally located, making maintenance of the northern sector of the expressway much more difficult and costly. Approximately one-half mile of city streets plus a railway crossing would have to be negotiated by our equipment to gain access to the expressway.

In view of the maintenance cost-sharing agreement we have I feel it important to ensure that you are aware of the substantial additional cost that could be incurred and the less than efficient service that could result if the physical location of our site in relation to the actual work area is not seriously considered.

The establishment of maintenance yards in urban areas and the reaction to the same is not new to the department, nevertheless our prime objective must be to provide the highest possible maintenance standard for the motoring public at all times, and in cases such as this we extend every effort to develop and maintain our location in a manner consistent with the surrounding area. Our plans for the development of the site in question are well advanced and special attention has been given to providing a facility that will not seriously effect the surrounding lands or the natural state of the site proper. It was our intention to only clear an area of bush in the interior of the site sufficient in size to locate the required buildings and yard area in an endeavour to have only the entrance roadway visible to the surrounding lands. The buildings themselves were to be of a pleasing appearance and we also propose housing our sand salt stockpile in a recently developed structure for this purpose. All roadways and driving surfaces would be paved and the maintenance of the yard would at all times be of the highest standards.

In view of the objections that have been raised, and considering all facts, our only alternative course of action, which is one we do not recommend, is to establish two new patrol yards outside the city limits of Kitchener. This will undoubtedly result in higher initial development costs with the duplication of facilities required, higher maintenance costs because of the additional travelling involved and less than ideal service being provided in an emergency.

It would be appreciated if you consider our position in this matter. We would be pleased to hear your views.

Signed by my Deputy Minister, A. T. C. McNab.

On February 20 Mr. McNab again wrote to Mr. Darrah, the city co-ordinator, corporation of the city of Kitchener:

Dear Mr. Darrah:

Your letter of February 12 has been reviewed in detail with all representatives of The Department of Highways who had undertaken the investigation and attended the council meetings regarding the establishment of a maintenance facility for the Kitchener-Waterloo expressway.

Unforunately, some misunderstanding appears to have developed with respect to this matter, as I am advised that at no time did our representatives agree that the Courtland Avenue site referred to in your letter was approved as a maintenance yard site. It was agreed, however, that a reinvestigation of the Courtland Avenue area would be undertaken, but subsequent study revealed that all of the possible sites in the vicinity of Courtland Avenue for various reasons were unsatisfactory.

In view of our present situation, and rather than attempt in this letter to explain all the factors which contributed to the selection of the Eastside conservation area, I agree that a further meeting with the council committee would be most beneficial. If you would be kind enough to advise me when this would be convenient I will be pleased to arrange to have senior officials of the department in attendance.

Again signed by my Deputy Minister, A. T. C. McNab.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Sudbury East has the floor. I would draw to his attention that one of his questions is directed to a Minister who is not now in his seat

and I would ask him to withhold that question until the Minister comes, or until tomorrow.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): I would like to direct a two part question to the Minister of Mines.

Has the Minister investigated the circumstances surrounding the explosions which occurred in the INCO coal plant at Copper Cliff in September of 1967 and again on February 4, 1968?

Can the Minister advise the House what steps are being taken by INCO, and/or his department, to ensure the safety of the men working in this area?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, the House will appreciate that I received this question just before coming into the House, but I can say that because the department takes a very serious view of these explosions, I am in a position to give the House some explanation.

These were explosions which occurred as a result of the flash combustion of coal dust. The explosion on September 27 was investigated by the department; the explosion that occurred on February 4 is still being investigated.

The mines inspection branch, as a result of their investigation of the September explosion, did issue some instructions to the company and the branch is now satisfied that these instructions have been followed out by the company. These include, among others, that the explosion vents are to be checked weekly and a steam purge provided. This has now been done by the company, to replace the water spray to preclude the possibility of a smoldering fire in any part of the system after a shutdown of the system.

There are other improvements that are still under study.

Mr. Martel: A supplementary question, if I might.

Mr. Speaker, will the Minister advise us as to the findings and the recommendations after the investigation is completed regarding the second explosion?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

I may say for the benefit of the House there were no fatalities—luckily there were no fatalities—and luckily there were no injuries in either of those explosions.

If the member will permit it I will send him the results of the investigation. If he then deems it necessary to bring it to the attention of the House again, I would be glad to answer a question at that time.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Grey-Bruce has been struggling for some time.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, I thought you might like to know that Mr. Farquhar Oliver is in the audience here today.

A question to the hon. Attorney General:

Why was a subpoena issued to the hon. Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs (Mr. Rowntree) and Mr. J. R. Kimber in the Canadian Oil investigation on Monday, October 16, 1967?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, I would say I do not know what prompts this question except curiosity.

Mr. Sargent: Is that right? A can of worms here.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: The subpoenas were subpoenas to witnesses issued out of a Quebec criminal court. An action had been commenced in Montreal—at least, a proceeding had been commenced in Montreal by a person who held a civil judgment in a Quebec court, not against these persons but against, I understand, a company, and the subpoenas were issued to witnesses.

The usual practice is to proceed to have the subpoenas authorized or, as we say, backed by an Ontario court. So an application was accordingly made to a judge of the high court to have the subpoenas backed, and we were advised then that the criminal proceedings were withdrawn and the subpoenas became redundant. Nothing more was heard of it.

Mr. Sargent: Will the Minister tell the House if there is any conflict of interest on the part of the Minister of the Crown here involved? Would you state that?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I would say none whatever, Mr. Speaker; I do not see any connection. These were subpoenas to witnesses who might have some knowledge—I presume they had some knowledge of the matter, a proceeding in Quebec which was subsequently withdrawn.

Mr. Sopha: What knowledge do they have?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I do not know if they have any.

Mr. Sopha: Did you not bother to find out?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I only said I presumed it was thought they had some knowledge.

Mr. Sopha: Well, you did not take the trouble to find out.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Why should I?

Mr. Sopha: Why should you not?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, these were subpoenas to witnesses. I am informed action was withdrawn.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The Minister has answered the question and supplementary questions. The member for Grey-Bruce will pass to the next question.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sargent: Do you not think the Minister should have tried to find out?

Mr. Speaker: The member will please take his next question. He has been answered.

Mr. Sargent: A question to the very able and distinguished new boy on the front bench, the Minister of Municipal Affairs. I say that with tongue in cheek. This is an easy one; he can answer it.

In view of the fact that the payments to municipalities range from $3.50 per capita to $7 per capita under the unconditional grant system, does the Minister plan to revive The Municipal Unconditional Grants Act to give equity to all municipalities in Ontario on a population basis?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member is aware, the Ontario committee on taxation made certain recommendations regarding the municipal unconditional grant. The government has asked for submissions by municipalities and other interested groups on all aspects of the committee's report and this, of course, will include the recommendations concerning the unconditional grant.

The grant was revised last year and among the matters taken into consideration at that time were the relevant burden of taxation and the cost of municipal services in the various municipalities.

As the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. MacNaughton) announced last Friday, it is proposed to increase the per capita grant to all municipalities, by 50 cents per capita in 1968, and to add $1 per capita to the grant to municipalities in northern Ontario. No further revision of the rates of subsidy are contemplated until the government has had an opportunity to review the proposals of the Ontario committee on taxation and the submissions thereon by the municipalities.

Mr. Sargent: A further question to the Minister.

Will the Minister advise the House how he plans to implement the tax saving of up to $50 as he has quoted on the basic shelter exemption as promised last year? How does he plan to do it?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, the granting of a basic shelter exemption to all householders in Ontario is a major innovation. It has not been attempted, to my knowledge, in any other jurisdiction in Canada. I might add that despite references to the contrary, the state of Oregon did not extend the benefit to tenants and the state of Wisconsin's scheme applies only to elderly persons with a very limited income, and a form of means test is involved in that subsidy.

The states of Michigan and Minnesota grant a relief from state income tax on the basis of realty taxes paid or, in the case of tenants, deemed to be paid. We, of course, do not have the direct vehicle of a personal income tax form in this province.

I want to emphasize, Mr. Speaker, that ours will be a unique programme. The details of the methods by which the government proposes to implement the programme are at present being worked out by my department and by The Department of the Provincial Treasurer. The government, I would hope, would be in a position to make a statement on this matter in the very near future.

Mr. Sargent: But he still does not know how he is going to do it.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sargent: A question to the hon. Minister of Education.

On June 5, 1967, the Minister announced the establishment of a commission with the explicit duty of studying post-secondary education in Ontario and offering the province a course of development from now to the period 1980—*Hansard* page 4266. Two hundred and five days later, today, the members of that commission have not been named. Would the Minister advise the House why the members of this commission have not been named?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I think that if the hon. member had been here the other day when the member for Peterborough (Mr. Pitman) asked a similar question, perhaps the answer might have covered both questions. However I shall go through it again, Mr. Speaker.

If the member reads *Hansard* very carefully he will discover that the proposed commission I mentioned in June was to cover the period from 1970 until 1980; we felt we were in a position within the province, with the assistance of the committee on university affairs, council of regents and others, in which our plans were pretty well set until 1970.

As I indicated to the member for Peterborough, since the announcement of the general outlines of the proposed commission there had been discussions, not only related to the terms of reference which we find are generally acceptable, but there have been discussions since with respect to the structure and personnel, that is, the make-up of the committee, the number of full-time members that were required, and the method it will use to operate as far as their studies are concerned.

I also indicated to the member for Peterborough that there would be in the estimates of The Department of University Affairs—not Education—a specific sum allocated in the coming fiscal year for the work of the commission. I further indicated, Mr. Speaker, that just as soon as we were in a position to detail to a greater extent the work of the personnel, I would be delighted to inform the members of the House.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Peterborough.

Mr. W. G. Pitman (Peterborough): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the hon. Minister of Education?

Has the Minister made any decision regarding the request of the superannuated teachers of Ontario for re-calculation of pensions granted prior to January 1, 1966?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, as the member knows there were certain changes made to The Teachers' Superannuation Act in 1966, providing for the alteration from ten years to the seven years of service. This was to conform to the Canada pension plan and this altered certain benefits under the Act.

Since that time, we also amended the regulations to provide for an increase in the payment of minimum pension benefits to what we referred kindly in this House as the retroactive group plus the other superannuated teachers. But during all the re-calculation or alterations in the teachers' superannuation legislation regulation, a further group—5,400 of them I believe—were not covered by the change from the ten to the seven. They had made representations to the government requesting that some consideration be given to their problem.

I should point out, Mr. Speaker, for the information of members of the House, that what they are requesting, on the material submitted by Dr. Sheppard, the actuary to the teachers' superannuation commission, would actually cost in the neighbourhood of $1.5 million in the first year. It would further involve a capitalization of over $16 million to bring about this change in benefit.

This matter has been under consideration by the government and I am not in a position today, Mr. Speaker, to inform the hon. member just what, if anything, will be done.

Mr. Pitman: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker.

Could the Minister indicate possibly when this kind of decision could be made in the coming year?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I am not in a position to tell the hon. member today the exact time when such a decision may be made. I can only tell the hon. member that we have had several discussions with the group involved and if memory serves me correctly I believe they are coming to see the Minister again a week today or a week tomorrow. I am not sure of the exact date.

Mr. Pitman: Thank you. Mr. Speaker, may I direct another question to the Minister of Education? In view of the unprecedented action of the Ontario secondary school teachers' federation, requesting 28,000 teachers across the province not to sign contracts until all salary negotiations with individual boards have been completed, would the Minister indicate whether he plans any action which would encourage earlier settlement of these negotiations?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, as the member well knows, perhaps better than any other member in the House, the question of contract between the board and the teacher has been one of the very significant aspects of education in this province.

While there are difficulties, as I read in the press, at the present time with these negotiations, I think that it is fair to state that the avenues have not been fully explored, and there has been no conclusion with respect to the negotiations. It is felt that these should continue, and the department is not, or does not, propose to become involved at this moment.

Mr. Speaker: The Minister of Economics and Development has some answers to questions asked previously and I am sure that the questioners would be pleased to receive them.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The questions were asked earlier when I was unable to give answers. I am delighted to do so now. The first one was from the hon. member for Grey North—

Mr. Sargent: For Grey-Bruce!

Hon. Mr. Randall: For Grey-Bruce, I am sorry. It is a six-part question, and I will answer it in some detail because I think this is the information that the hon. member wants.

The questions were:

(1) Will the Minister advise the cost of opening the Los Angeles office? (2) How many people from Ontario went down to the opening? (3) Who were they? (4) Who paid their expenses? (5) How much money was spent at the opening? (6) How many other U.S. offices are we paying for?

The answers are:

(1) There was no actual expenditure involved in opening the Los Angeles office since this took place in November of last year. The official opening was incidental to the Ontario Unlimited programme carried out in Los Angeles during the period from January 22 to 26, 1968. The budget for the Ontario Unlimited programme was $30,000. Of this, $26,915 was spent.

(2) Thirty-five participated in the programme, ten of whom were trade mission members from Ontario industry.

(3) Representatives of government, business, research and industry.

(4) The round-trip economy air fare was paid by the department for the sales mission members who assumed all other expenses they incurred. This has been the trade development policy since 1963. Of the remaining 25 participants, one person paid all of his own costs. The expenses of the remaining 24 participants were paid by the department.

(5) A sum of $26,915 was spent as previously stated for the overall programme which included accommodation for meetings, hotel accommodation for participants, expenses of participants and official luncheon for 450 businessmen, and two receptions for the showing of "A Place to Stand".

(6) The department has offices in New York and Chicago as well as Los Angeles. Task force locations in the United States are Atlanta, Boston and Cleveland.

Mr. Speaker, the Ontario Unlimited programme places under one umbrella, the complete spectrum of the department's efforts to attract industry and capital to Ontario and to promote export trade.

Each year, approximately 20 sales opportunity missions are conducted for which 10-12 manufacturers are selected and go abroad to meet scheduled buyers and thus increase the export of Ontario products. The sales mission, scheduled for Los Angeles, consisted of 10 representatives of companies in Woodstock, Hamilton, Stratford, Kitchener, Lindsay and Toronto, and their products ranged from truck trailers to packaged machinery, electronic equipment, machine tools, commercial antennae, processed meats and other foods. It is the policy of my department to provide economy fares from Toronto to the destination and return. All other expenses such as vicinity travel, hotel accommodation, meals, and so on, are paid for by the individual sales mission members.

Once a month, my trade and industry branch conducts a business opportunity mission in a statistically selected city in the United States. The purpose of this business mission is to provide United States business interests with a comprehensive portrayal of Ontario, and specifically to outline the opportunities that exist for branch plants, joint ventures and licensing arrangements in the province.

Two or three times a year, I, as the Minister, participate in a regularly scheduled business opportunity mission by hosting a business luncheon to which we invite selected businessmen who represent the full spectrum of local business interests. At the business mission luncheon, which was held on January 24, 450 businessmen were present.

A business opportunity mission was scheduled for Los Angeles and was comprised of the director, deputy director and four members of the trade and industry staff. As a result of this portion of the whole programme, my staff conducted 90 interviews with Los Angeles businessmen who expressed an interest in the aforementioned areas.

Panel discussions were held during the week as follows:

(a) Economics: The economists elaborated on the various facets of the Ontario economy, describing the growth potential, manufacturing capability and comparative advantages of the Ontario business climate with the rest of Canada and the U.S.

The various programmes of The Ontario Department of Economics and Development were outlined, particularly as they were related to business development and future planning concepts of the government.

Ontario's regional development programme, Design for Development was expressed in some detail with a brief description of each of the ten economic regions in the province.

(b) Ontario development corporation: Representatives reviewed incentives and grants available to industry from the corporation, in addition to outlining the department's equalization of industrial opportunities programme.

(c) Sheridan Park corporation: Research to develop new and better products and processes is undertaken at Sheridan Park. This research assists Ontario companies' competitive position in world markets and provides a sound basis for propagating provincial economic growth.

The conference on Sheridan Park community dealt with the philosophy behind a research community centre; described the physical layout and the organizations presently established there; the co-ordinating role played by the Ontario research foundation, and research incentives available to industry.

To present the above, the following staff members participated: three economists from the office of the chief economist; the managing director and a staff member from the Ontario development corporation; the president of the Sheridan Park corporation; the president of the Ontario research foundation, and a director of the Warner Lambert Pharmaceutical Co., a company established in the Sheridan Park community.

4. Immigration: As part of a continuing programme to attract skilled workers to Ontario, the director and one staff member from my department's immigration branch attended. During the week, they discussed Ontario with 198 people who had expressed an interest in moving to our province.

Included were people with such backgrounds as mechanical engineers, a meteorologist, skilled aero space production workers, school teachers, and even a university professor.

5. Film Showings: To project Ontario's image as that of a progressive, resourceful, dynamic, industrial province, two showings of Ontario's Expo film, "A Place to Stand", were held at the Screen Directors' Guild Theatre in Los Angeles. This exceptional film, one of the highlights of the Ontario pavilion at Expo 67, gave our audiences of over 900 a visual portrayal of our province, and was received most enthusiastically.

Mr. Young: What question is the Minister replying to that merits this kind of—

Hon. Mr. Randall: Sit down and you will find out.

Mr. Young: What is the question? What is the question you are answering?

Hon. Mr. Randall: You sit down and you will find out.

Mr. Young: Just let the House know what it is you are replying to.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Just sit down and you will find out.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

The question was quite in order, and was placed by the member for Grey-Bruce last week. The Minister took it as notice and he is now answering it. I admit that it is quite a full answer, but it is right on the point of the question.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: I would like to make this comment. I fully anticipate that when, at some point, a question is asked that has excessive verbiage in it, we are going to be checked. I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, with all deference, that it becomes your responsibility to check the abuse of an answer which has the amount of excessive verbiage in it that this has.

Mr. Speaker: I will be most pleased to check any abuse in an answer, and when I find, in my opinion, that the questions are being abused, I will also be pleased to take action. I have not as yet had any occasion to check abuse of verbiage in questions, and I assure you that had I wished to, I could have done so on many occasions this early in the session. The Minister will please finish his answer.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Three speaking engagements before 750 Los Angeles and vicinity businessmen were undertaken during the three days of the programme; 100 members of the Los Angeles chamber of commerce world trade division attended a meeting addressed by my Deputy Minister, Mr. Clarkson; I addressed 450 businessmen attending a luncheon held in conjunction with our business opportunity mission and the Prime Minister addressed 200 members of the annual meeting of the Canadian Society of Los Angeles.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Randall: To take advantage of the above events, the official opening took

place on January 23, 1968, although in actual fact, the office had been functioning since mid-November 1967.

Participants in this event were myself, my Deputy Minister, the director of trade ministry branch, and our Los Angeles local representative, the Canadian Consul General, Los Angeles, the Hon. G. MacIntyre was also in attendance. Our publicity team syndicated news stories and photographs to the California media, and arranged for television and radio interviews so that the United States business community would be appraised as to how our Ontario trade office in Los Angeles can best serve them, and how all investment in Ontario can mean mutual profits to Ontario and California businessmen.

The publicity team syndicated stories and pictures to Ontario news organizations so that Ontario manufacturers would be advised of new U.S. investment prospects, and the fact that the province had established an office to represent them in southwest United States.

Mr. Speaker, the overwhelming success of the Ontario Unlimited programme in Los Angeles indicates that we should continue this type of function on a periodic basis, which we intend to do during the fiscal year in the cities of New York, Chicago, and Philadelphia, and perhaps this will avoid any further questions.

The objectives of this first Ontario Unlimited programme and those that follow, Mr. Speaker, are: To service Ontario sales missions; select reliable agents and distributors; the opening of new branch plants in Ontario; joint ventures with Ontario manufacturers; bring in new technology by licence agreements; assist Ontario manufacturers in branch plants or licencing abroad; seek development capital, and seek out opportunities for Ontario engineering services.

Ten Ontario manufacturers from across the province, processing materials ranging from sophisticated electronics to delicate cookies, travelled to California on this sales mission. As a result of weeks of preliminary work by our office in California, these companies were each able to interview on the average of 12 agencies and procuring companies during the week, for a total of 120 industrial contacts. All companies reported initial success.

And whereas it is too early to assess the results which will develop from this trade mission on the long term, first reports indicate Muirhead Instruments of Stratford will open an office in Los Angeles as a result of this trip, and expect $500,000 in sales in the first year.

Now we get to the cookies. Colonial Cookies of Kitchener has selected agents who will purchase and sell on a continuing basis.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. Will you state your point of order?

Mr. H. Peacock (Windsor West): Mr. Speaker, my point of order is that a statement of this length, on which members are not permitted to comment once it is completed, is out of order.

Mr. Sopha: Hear, hear.

Mr. Peacock: And that answers to questions—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: That is a repetition of the old abuse, and yet we are told the Opposition "wastes the time" of the House.

An hon. member: Was the question out of order?

Mr. MacDonald: No, but the answer is.

Mr. Peacock: Mr. Speaker, further to my point of order, the Minister has raised a number of matters, not related to the question on which we do not have permission, under the rules, to comment.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: You lit the fire—

Mr. MacDonald: Do not talk about wasting time, if this is what you are going to do from the cabinet benches.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order!

There is no question, in my opinion, but that the answer being given, is relevant to the question. But it would appear to be unnecessarily lengthy, and I would ask the Minister to complete his statement.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. If they will listen very carefully now, perhaps, the question which the hon. member asked is to be answered in detail and he will not have to ask it again.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Speaker, Colonial Cookies of Kitchener has selected agents who will purchase and fill, on a continuing basis, $300,000 worth per year. It is estimated that

initial sales for this, our 93rd Ontario trade mission, will approach $2 million.

A telephone conversation just exchanged with an Ontario company on this mission, has indicated the firm is bidding on $1 million worth of California business as a result of participating in the mission.

The ultimate results of any business opportunity mission requires a great deal of follow-up and development work, sir. Preliminary indications are that this business opportunity mission to Los Angeles has produced concrete results as follows:

Five branch plant prospects, three of which will, in our estimation, invest in Ontario within 18 months; the products are electronics, hardware items, and cosmetics and drugs. One of the companies has visited Toronto since the mission, and has not only placed orders in Canada for parts, in excess of $500,000, but has obtained information on three specific locations—two in mid-western Ontario, and one in north-eastern Ontario.

In fact, he has visited one of those sites and expects to return within two weeks for a further study. The company will employ up to 500 women.

Two other companies are expected to visit Ontario prior to the end of March. Nine joint venture prospects were interviewed, four of which are expected to take action within 18 months. The products involved are chemicals, toys, handling equipment and plastics. Two of the companies are already looking for a partner with the assistance of the trade ministry branch, and the other two are expected to take action by May 30.

Eighteen manufacturing arrangements and licencing prospects contacted our mission; the products ranged from food packaging and distribution to chemicals, service industries and automotive accessories. One of the companies has authorized a distributor to take the necessary action to be in production as soon as possible, with the result that it could become a joint venture or a branch plant.

Mr. Sargent: Just like your HOME programme.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Another has provided us with samples of the products under consideration, and these are now in the hands of a manufacturer in the Georgian Bay area—he may even be in Owen Sound. A third company has visited Toronto in the meantime and has conducted interviews with an interested Ontario company to assemble, and later on, manufacture components.

Mr. MacDonald: How long is the Minister going to defy the Speaker's request to bring this to an end?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Our marketing prospects and our marketing staff participated in this business opportunity mission and developed 35 industrial food and demand contracts. This material has been sent to over 3,000 Ontario suppliers. Correspondence has now been undertaken by over 25 Ontario firms directly with California and area companies as a result of the commercial intelligence developed by this programme.

I can only say, Mr. Speaker, to my hon. friend, and those who have objected to this lengthy answer to the question, that we do not wait for opportunity to knock in this province, we go looking for it.

Mr. Sopha: Obviously the government should start a baloney factory.

Hon. Mr. Randall: If you do not want the questions answered, do not ask them. Ask them and we will give you all the details.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Well, we have another one here, it will not be so long but it will be just as interesting, and I give it to you with all humility.

Mr. MacDonald: With the usual humility.

Hon. Mr. Randall: This question, Mr. Speaker, is from the hon. member for High Park. And, Mr. Speaker, this is a question like, "When did you stop beating your wife?". I point to our accomplishments in the past few years—

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): On a point of order. Can I ask the question before the Minister answers?

Hon. Mr. Randall: No, I do not need the question; the hon. member has already read the question, I just give the answers.

Mr. Shulman: I have read no question to this Minister.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I point to our accomplishments in the past two years—

Mr. Speaker: This, perhaps, was a question which was withheld on a day when the Minister was out of the House and perhaps reached his office later. If the member for High Park wishes to have the answer, perhaps he would ask the question now.

Mr. Shulman: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Ben: It will take another two hours—

Mr. Shulman: May I ask, Mr. Speaker, that we get an answer, not a long speech extolling the virtues of this department.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Speaker: The member will ask his question.

Mr. MacDonald: Okay, if you want to abuse the rules of the House!

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a comment. If there are to be inferences drawn, as have been drawn by the hon. member for High Park when he asks this question, then he must expect that inference to be met by the Minister who is responsible. If it takes an hour, or an hour-and-a-half, we will meet the inferences that are put into these questions. To begin with, this is an abuse of the question period and if this is going to be the way the questions are to be phrased and to be used, then the members must expect these answers.

Mr. Shulman: What steps is the Minister taking to improve the poor employee morale in his department as reported by his Deputy Minister in his memo of September, 1967?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Speaker, I thought the question had been asked. I apologize to the member. I did not read the question because I thought that he had already asked it, but I will be delighted to answer his question. I hope he will listen with interest and give me the opportunity to answer it my way, as he has asked the question his way.

I point to our accomplishments in the past few years to prove my point. I am prepared to document this at some length if the hon. member wishes.

The hon. member's question refers to a departmental survey by questionnaire—a tool used by progressive management everywhere —carried out by The Department of the Civil Service at the request of my Deputy Minister. The objective of the survey was to determine in what areas we should undertake training programmes to further improve the effectiveness of our staff.

I understand from The Department of the Civil Service that more than 30 such reports have been carried out by them and that Ontario is the first government in Canada to establish such a research programme. Unless surveys of training needs including employee attitudes are carried out, training programmes cannot concentrate on the problem areas.

The hon. member in his question refers only to an area in which the survey indicated some training would benefit. No reference was made to "poor employee morale" in either the memorandum or the abstract. Among the areas where some training could be usefully carried out, a "morale problem" was mentioned. I would be very suspicious of any report which said that we were already perfect.

Generally, the survey was very favourable; for example, we found—and I quote:

> The ratings respondents gave to the administrative ability of their supervisors were very favourable. Ninety per cent of them gave ratings of "excellent", "very good" or "fair"; 95 per cent gave a similar evaluation of their supervisors' technical ability and 93 per cent of the sample rated their supervisors' ability to deal with people as "fair" or "better".

An inconsistency was found between this rating and work organization. However, this was put down to the wording of the question which was perhaps somewhat unclear. The respondents also indicated that any deficiency in work standards did not deter from the efficiency of the employees.

Eighty four per cent of the respondents felt that the frequency with which they were able to discuss their jobs with their supervisors was satisfactory. The survey indicated that respondents generally are very satisfied with the amount of supervision in the department, their job responsibility and the opportunity to show initiative and independence. Furthermore, relationship among fellow employees, the nature of their work, job security and the chance for achievement and accomplishment were favourably rated by the respondents.

The chairman of the civil service commission has reported, and I quote:

> The Department of Economics and Development has one of the best records in the service in regard to employer-employee relationships and this study should help to reinforce the staff development programmes already undertaken by the department.

Perhaps the hon. member was not aware that my department has won 14 national and international awards in the last three years. Eleven of these were awards of merit and excellence for our publications.

In 1966 and 1967 my department's industrial development programme placed among

the top three in North America as judged by the society of industrial realtors.

My department has been applauded by the press on the establishment of its time-saving central typing services, its efficient records management programme, its specialized library service, its functional printing service, and the design, development and management of Ontario's pavilion at Expo 67 which was rated one of the top five pavilions at Expo.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I can only say to the hon. member that if these accomplishments suggest low employee morale, then this and all other government departments should have more of it.

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Speaker, I have a short question.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, may I ask a supplementary question?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I will take notice of the supplementary as soon as they submit the question, sir.

Mr. Speaker: Would the Minister allow the member for Lakeshore to place his question which was also held back pending the Minister's appearance?

Mr. Shulman: I am sorry, but did you refuse a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker: Yes.

Mr. Shulman: Then on a point of order, sir, I would like to point out that section 4 of his abstract reads "employee morale presents a problem." He had better read his own survey.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please! The member for Lakeshore.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Mr. Speaker, a question to the hon. Minister of Economics and Development. Did the Minister, through his department, or through the Ontario housing corporation, give consideration to the use of 135 acres, known as the Mimico reformatory grounds, which is presently being sold to The Department of Public Works, for the purposes of housing?

Part 2—what conclusion did the Minister arrive at and what were the reasons that caused the hon. Minister to come to whatever conclusions he reached?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity of answering this question for the hon. member. I did give consideration to the possible use of the Mimico reformatory grounds for housing purposes and we have a standing order with all departments of the government if any land is to be sold will they contact us first.

In doing so I was concerned not only with the need for residential development in Metropolitan Toronto but also with the necessity of the borough of Etobcoke maintaining its economic viability through a properly balanced residential industrial assessment.

In view of the fact that Ontario housing corporation has already developed, or is developing, 13.8 of its Ontario housing development in the borough of Etobicoke and will this year be developing the balance of its Thistletown holdings, I concur with the findings and wishes of the borough officials that industrial development represented the highest and best use of the Mimico reformatory grounds.

Mr. MacDonald: I thought you felt housing was an important problem.

Hon. Mr. Randall: It still is. Mr. Speaker, I have—

Mr. MacDonald: There are many other things with higher priority.

Hon. Mr. Randall: There is a question from the hon. member for Parkdale (Mr. Trotter) which I would like to answer. There were 600 lots in the first phase of Bramalea. Subsequently, 93 lots were returned to the Ontario housing corporation largely due to the inability of the individuals concerned to obtain mortgage financing. However there was a waiting list for these lots. They were picked up by other individuals and builders.

I have a question here from the hon. member for Windsor West. I do not know if he was satisfied with the answer the other day but if he was not I will be glad to answer the question as I now have it. Would you prefer me to answer the question?

Mr. H. Peacock (Windsor West): Mr. Speaker, my question last Thursday was answered by the Minister, not in quite as voluminous a manner as he is answering today, but if he has further information I would be pleased to have it.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I would be pleased to send you any information. I did not know whether you got sufficient information the other day but I now have more. If you want it you are entitled to it.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the Minister would send it to the inquiring member.

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): Mr. Speaker, I have a four-part question of the hon. Prime Minister.

(1) Has the government committee to oversee the smelter location for Texas Gulf met with the company recently? (2) What is the present state of affairs concerning the smelter location? (3) Can the Prime Minister indicate when a decision will be announced? (4) Does the Prime Minister intend to replace those members of the committee who no longer hold provincially elected positions?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, there is a cabinet committee which has dealt with the question of a smelter in connection with the Texas Gulf mine. We are, as a government, in constant touch with the company and they are presently carrying out research to decide what type of smelter will best meet the requirements of the ore that is being taken out of their mine.

I am informed that to date they have spent about $200,000 on this research. The research is continuing. I am not in a position to tell the House when it will be complete, but I am able to say that no decision has been made as to where this smelter will be constructed, or what type of smelter it will be. We continue, and will continue, to interest ourselves in this question because we are anxious that the smelter be constructed where it will be of the greatest benefit to the province.

Mr. Ferrier: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Provincial Treasurer. Has Texas Gulf and/or Ecstall Mining Company paid any taxes to the province of Ontario? If not, when will they become liable for provincial taxes?

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Provincial Treasurer): Mr. Speaker, in answer to the hon. member's question, the answer to the first part is "yes", and having said "yes", I think the second part is not applicable.

Mr. Speaker: The member for High Park.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, thank you. I have a question for the Minister of Labour. Will the Minister consider setting a time limit for certification of plumbers and electricians?

Hon. D. A. Bales (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, in reply to the question of the hon. member for High Park: When the certification programme for these particular trades of electricians and plumbers was started some three and a half years ago, it was anticipated that the certification of electricians would be completed by November, 1966. That was extended by six months. Those in the plumbing trade had a two-year period to obtain their certificates and this was expected to be completed by November, 1967.

We have further reviewed our policy since that time and in the case of master electricians and plumbers we are now and have been issuing certificates for those applicants who can show they are qualified without examination. On this basis, it does not seem necessary to officially extend the deadline.

Mr. Shulman: I have a question for the Ontario Treasurer. Did the civil service commission conduct an inquiry at Whitby Ontario Hospital last year?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Speaker, I am almost obliged to take this question as notice and ask the hon. member to help me. Does he mean an Ontario hospital; does he mean the Ontario hospital service; does he mean the Ontario hospital insurance commission? If he would enlighten me, then possibly I could provide him with the answer needed.

Mr. Shulman: I am sorry. The Ontario mental hospital in Whitby.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that the civil service commission did conduct an inquiry in the Ontario Hospital at Whitby.

Mr. Shulman: Would the Minister accept a supplementary question?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Really, Mr. Speaker, I am not in a position to answer a supplementary question other than to say that I believe the inquiry was conducted, but to go any further with an answer I would have to take the question as notice, I think.

Mr. Shulman: May I submit the question for a later answer?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes.

Mr. Shulman: Actually there are two questions:

(1) During the inquiry were the three members of the commission ordered off the grounds by The Department of Health? (2) What was the purpose of the inquiry?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Speaker, I will take those questions as notice, although I am at some loss as to why they were not incorporated in the original question.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Brantford.

Mr. M. Makarchuk (Brantford): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Agriculture and Food.

(1) Did the Minister receive a request from the Timiskaming-Cochrane potato growers association for the appointment of a fruit and vegetable inspector? (2) Will an appointment be made? If so, when? If not, why not?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, the answer to the first part of the member's question is "Yes, I did receive a letter from the Timiskaming-Cochrane potato growers association. An appointment will be made as soon as we can find a suitable man to fulfill the job.

Mr. Speaker: The Minister of Highways has the reply to a question asked previously in the House.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Speaker, it is a reply to the question from the hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Jackson) last Monday.

The question was:

> Has the Minister's department consulted with The Department of Municipal Affairs regarding the probable economic advantages to the township of Teck if the proposed bypass around Chaput Hughes townsite is changed from the north side to the south side of Highway 66, and extended to connect with the south end of Main Street in the townsite of Kirkland Lake.

The answer is: The inquiries to The Department of Municipal Affairs indicate that a consultant for the municipality is studying land use in the township of Teck. The recommendations of this study would have no significant bearing on the location of the proposed Chaput Hughes townsite bypass, since neither the north or south bypass is in excess of 800 feet from the existing Highway 66, an access to the business district is no problem.

The highway location north of the town would in no way detract from the feasibility of commercial or industrial development. It could be said that a bypass to the south, which would, of course, be controlled access, might detract from the orderly development of any proposed commercial areas.

Mr. F. A. Burr (Sandwich-Riverside): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Health.

What action is being taken at the present time by the Minister to reduce the transboundary flow of air pollution from the Ecorse-Zug Island area of Michigan into the Windsor area of Ontario?

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, this is a matter which lies within the jurisdiction of the federal government through the joint international commission. Since Ontario has membership on this commission, we know that there is currently in progress an investigation of this transboundary flow to determine the source and the extent of it.

Mr. Burr: A question for the Minister of Social and Family Services. When does the Minister intend to cause The Vocational Rehabilitation Services Act passed on June 23, 1966, and given Royal assent on July 8, 1966, to be proclaimed?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, The Vocational Rehabilitation Services Act was one of 11 Acts passed at that time. During 1967, we have had the opportunity of implementing nine of those 11 Acts. Implementation requires the passing of regulations so that they are available and ready at the time that the Act is proclaimed.

I may say to the hon. member it is astonishing the amount of paper work that is necessary to transfer an idea, or an Act, into a service or a maintenance grant, in the hands of the recipient. However, we have done this on a continuous basis. The two remaining are before us now at this very moment, and probably first thing tomorrow morning I will be signing the regulations in respect to this Act.

They will be presented to Treasury and be processed for as early a proclamation as possible. I do point this out, that payments for the operating costs of the sheltered work shops will be made retroactive to April 1, 1967.

Mr. Speaker: I believe there are some other Ministers with answers to questions.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, I believe on Thursday last, the member for Sudbury East asked a question in this form:

> Would the Minister give the House the name of the person in charge of the study, and the possible health effect of long-term exposure to sulphur dioxide among workers in the Sudbury area, as announced by The Department of Mines on February 2, 1968.
>
> Will the group doing the study hold public hearings? If so, will they visit Sudbury for that purpose?

In answer to that question, Mr. Speaker, I may say that for several years The Department of Mines, with the assistance of The Department of Health, has been conducting

surveys in regard to airborne dust, sulphur dioxide concentration, and like matters in the smelters, iron ore plants and refineries in the Sudbury area.

Just recently, however, a further request was made of the department and as a result of that request, it was decided that a survey more in depth than what had been carried on in the past would be conducted for the Sudbury area. As a result, Dr. Ernest Mastramatteo, the chief of the occupational health services of The Department of Health, has been placed in charge of a study of the possible effects of long-term exposure to sulphur dioxide among the workers in the Sudbury area.

It is not planned to hold public hearings but parts of the study will be conducted in Sudbury as well as in Toronto. A conservative estimate of the study would be about one year, when an initial report would be ready, and the study will comprise a review of morbidity and mortality among workers employed for many years in occupations involving sulphur dioxide exposure.

In the study, cognizance must be taken of the effects of age, smoking habits and intercurrent respiratory infections.

Mr. Martel: Mr. Speaker, could I ask a supplementary question of the Minister, on the answer he has given?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: May I hear the question first before I indicate whether or not I want to answer it, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Martel: Is it possible for groups to make submissions to the Minister or to the doctor conducting the survey?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: First of all, this is a study, as I understand it, involving more statistics. Questionnaires are answered among the workers themselves, rather than a seeking-out of submissions or briefs from groups. It is basically the study, as I understand it, of a number of histories of workers in the area.

If, in the estimation of The Department of Health, there is any need for briefs on the subject from some groups or organizations, I am sure there will be publicity to that effect at the time. But at the moment it is not understood whether there will be any need for public hearings or the need for briefs from groups.

As far as The Department of Mines is concerned, we are going to leave that up to the doctors and the medical personnel and The Department of Health itself.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: First order, resuming the adjourned debate on the motion for an address in reply to the speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor at the opening of the session.

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): We have had a lengthy and useful question period this afternoon. I am not one of those that would object unduly when the administration feels that they want to answer with all of the detail they can possibly find. I believe that the question period in this House must be strengthened and in the years of my brief experience it has become a more and more effective tool of democracy. As long as both sides respect their responsibilities in this regard, I am sure it will become even more useful.

Beyond this, I realize that although this, in a manner of speaking, opens the debate on the Throne message from the Opposition side of this House, and is therefore an important occasion—and I believe it is an important occasion—there is no doubt that the minds of many of us, and certainly the citizens of this province are on the other House, the federal chamber this afternoon, as they see the governmental crisis unfolding there. All of us as politicians naturally are interested in the same thing and I am sure that the members of the House would join me in hoping that the administration will be supported to continue their programme of reform.

I am reliably informed—and perhaps this is the sort of report that can be made under these circumstances; I expect a bit later in the session we will have reports on the results of the hockey games as we get into the finals—I am reliably informed that the government did receive an adjournment today, not having been granted unanimous consent to put forward the motion of confidence and it may very well be Friday before that is debated.

It is interesting, you know, when we look at the stability that a top-heavy majority has been able to achieve in this particular chamber for some years, to look back on the history that was mentioned by, I believe, the seconder of the address in reply yesterday. He was quite interested in the 25 years of government that the Progressive Conservatives have been responsible for here. And since there does not seem to be any particular rush to our deliberation, I thought it might be of

some interest to recall the last time that a minority government was defeated in this chamber.

If my reading of history is correct, Mr. Drew, who was mentioned in the debate yesterday, was leading the House. And in the amendments to the address of that year—1944—the Liberal Party was in the position of the alternative to the alternative. Their amendment was critical of Mr. Drew's imposition of obligatory religious education in the schools of this province. When the vote was taken, the minority Conservatives, of course, supported the government, as did the CCF in those days, and so the Liberal sub-amendment was not carried.

But a few moments later, on a more general amendment that was put forward by the official Opposition of the day led by Mr. Jolliffe, the Opposition did consolidate their forces and the government went down to defeat.

It has not happened since because, as usually occurs, a government that is in a minority position is normally looking for an opportunity to return to the people as soon as possible and this opportunity was afforded at that time. Mr. Drew was successful at the next following election and the party has been successful at the polls since that time.

Mr. Speaker, this is the first opportunity I have had to extend to you, sir, my congratulations on your election to the chairmanship of our proceedings. I deeply regretted at least one comment that appeared in the metropolitan press following your election, which I felt was completely in error and certainly misleading of my views as to your election.

I was present in the House while you carried out your previous responsibilities and I, for one, feel that they were not carried out to perfection on all occasions. Without raising that point now, I would like to say that I feel that your background, precision, and your force of character will certainly be of use in the ordering of our debates.

I would say to you, also, that I have my responsibility as leader of the Opposition to see that we carry on an extensive survey and review of the workings of the government in the year past and a critique of their policies for the future. It may very well happen, your honour, that our responsibilities, at least in the judgment of one of us, might interfere and I know that you will agree with me that if that unfortunate event does occur that both of us would be acting in the greatest of good faith.

It might be appropriate at this time to mention that in the background of Mr. Speaker and myself there is one common root. I understand that Mr. Speaker's father-in-law was a supporter of E. C. Drury, whose funeral we attended yesterday. And, of course, my father's association with that government is well known.

There seems to have been a certain divergence in our paths since then, but this association is of some interest to me and I thought I would raise it.

An hon. member: He will come back.

Mr. Nixon: I hope, Mr. Speaker, that in your position of independence you would have found it in your heart to agree with the amendment that I presented to the House the second day of our sittings, when I felt that we as a Legislature should undertake an orderly review of those rules and regulations which do command and govern the activities of this House and its ancillary committees.

I still believe that under your leadership in the next three or four years we might well strike some sort of a committee, perhaps under your own leadership and with the co-operation of your immediate predecessor, who has not been present in the House as yet, so that a committee from all sides can effectively and carefully review the rules of this House.

I was surprised and really quite deeply disappointed that the suggestion that the committee on standing orders might undertake such a review was not accepted by the government, but certainly I was shocked that the NDP did not support the Opposition in this regard. I mean this most seriously, that in the first division of the House we, as two Opposition parties who between us command 58 per cent of the votes of this province, could not see our way clear towards the establishment of a principle that would result, if not in the next months, in the next few years, of a completely new look at the rules and regulations that govern the activities in the Legislature.

I cannot for the life of me understand—

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): We explained why! Read it in *Hansard.*

Mr. Nixon: —the incoherence of the NDP leadership in siding with the government in that important issue. If there was ever a matter of importance in which that Opposition group could co-operate it was in that particular regard, and I am naive enough to have believed, before I put the motion, that

the government might give it serious consideration too.

I believe that in the future this must come about. The Premier (Mr. Robarts) is very wary of what he likes to call "witch-hunts", but we on this side are very concerned with the ordering of the business of the Legislature, to improve its efficiency and to put a fair position for all concerned, all hon. members, both backbenchers supporting the government and others; so that our views can be put effectively before the House, and permit us all to move away from what has become a partisan straight-jacket in the review and discussion of important matters of policy.

My own feeling has been that in the standing committees as they have changed and degenerated in the last two years, there is a hope for the expansion of the true participation of all of us as elected members in the business of government. We know where the responsibility lies.

The gentlemen immediately opposite are extremely proud and defensive of maintaining their own control of that responsibility. But somewhere between responsibile government as the Premier recognizes it, and republicanism on the other side, there is a broad area of improvement which in my view involves an upgraded committee system.

We have had this argument in the past and it is not my intention to repeat it at this time. But I would say that we on this side of the House, and there are two parties, the official Opposition and the NDP, have a united responsibility not to nit-pick back and forth among ourselves. I trust there will be a minimum of this so that we can coordinate and consolidate our approach in response to those people who are supporting government policy. And I invite the participation and co-operation of the NDP in resolutions of the type that I put before the House a few days ago which would have led to a review and a reorganization of the rules and regulations of this honourable chamber.

Mr. Speaker, it is in order, I believe, to extend my congratulations to the mover and seconder of the address. I was prepared to do this, but because our deliberations already this afternoon have been quite lengthy, I do not believe either of them are in the House, nevertheless I listened to their comments with much interest. The mover, the member for Hamilton Mountain (Mr. J. R. Smith), with a background in education, will, I hope, take an active part in the review of education policies and estimates, and I look forward to his remarks on those matters. I felt that if perhaps there was any criticism in his approach at all, it was that he seemed to have joined that very large group in this House of sycophantic supporters of the Premier. However, I suppose that we will get used to listening to this stuff and it has to come forward every session until the Premier shows some embarrassment, and I suppose it will go on.

The member for York East (Mr. Meen) dwelt to some extent, and I see that he is taking his place now, on the shortcomings of the provincial housing policy. Certainly we on this side agree. This is a matter of grave concern which will no doubt occupy the time of our debate later in the session, and I intend to deal with it more specifically in the course of my remarks today.

The Minister himself undertook lengthy answers this afternoon regarding some aspects of housing policy. It has always been my view, of course, that one Minister of the Crown should have under his direct supervision, control and responsibility, all of those arms of government that deal not only with housing, but with the development of urban communities.

This is not the case in the organization of government at the present time, and it does not appear that we are going to have the advantage of such reorganization at this session. Since the House last met, and since the election, there have been numerous changes in the cabinet and being personally acquainted with, and on very good terms with those men so honoured with new responsibilities, I thought I would deal very briefly with some of these changes. The member for the Kent area, the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. McKeough), has in my view, one of the top responsibilities in the administration.

With the pressures and resistances to changes in municipal affairs that are obviously needed and, in that pat phrase of Opposition parties—long overdue—he is going to have to exercise the greatest of diplomacy and on the other side of the coin, firm leadership in bringing into being, in this province of Ontario, a new approach to local government which will meet modern needs.

I had the great pleasure of meeting his immediate predecessor in the halls of the Royal York just a few days ago. I do not know what brought Mr. Spooner to town but he seems to be thriving even though he is not a member of the administration.

Mr. MacDonald: Perhaps he is thriving because he is not a member of the administration.

Mr. Nixon: In talking to him in a friendly way, I was struck once again by his strong grasp of the matters of municipal affairs. I suppose at some stage in the minds of individuals of this House and across the province his grasp was perhaps a bit too strong, almost autocratic, because it became obvious that he knew as much as, or more than, all of his advisors in the department and certainly was quite prepared to react in an independent way, and in a strong way to petitions which were put before him.

But I think we must remember that much of the legislation in this province, as it pertains to municipal affairs, has within it clauses which leave a great deal of discretion to the Minister. This is something that I want to bring to the incumbent's attention because those clauses are put there for a purpose, so that the final decisions on matters involving municipal affairs responsibilities are not always entered into by a committee of civil servants meeting at 801 Bay Street.

It is the Minister's responsibility to exercise his prerogatives as, unfortunately, a court of last resort in some matters pertaining to municipal affairs. And I hope that the new Minister will soon gain that confidence, as I am sure that he will—he has never impressed me as a person who lacks in that particular ingredient—so that he will perhaps more readily reach his own decisions which are put to him by the statutes of this province. The Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Brunelle), who answered so capably "en français" earlier this afternoon, had double the responsibility following his appointment after the election.

In my view, and I stated it at the time of the election, there should be one person in the cabinet of this province who will speak for the development of our natural resources. He might very well have associated with him, in some sort of a subsidiary capacity, those other members of the House who would perhaps be granted semi-cabinet rank and would deal specifically for the mining industry, the forestry industry and so on.

It is my firm conviction that the cabinet council is becoming unwieldy and unmanageable, so I felt that when the hon. Minister from Cochrane North received the double appointment, that this might be the beginning of some coordination of the natural resource development responsibility. But such was not the case. The appointment of the Minister of Mines (A. F. Lawrence) came about just last week. But the Lands and Forests Minister has played host to many of us at his facilities at Moonbeam on Rennie Lake and on some occasions—

Hon. R. Brunelle (Minister of Lands and Forests): A good suggestion!

Mr. Nixon: —these functions were even on behalf of the Liberal Party. I do not know whether the leader of the government knew about that but this is something of which he should be aware. But a responsibility that comes to the Minister of Lands and Forests, in the session following an election, is to coordinate a plan of a tour of the northern part of the province for new members and old members as well. Frankly, I look forward to such a tour; my experience in the past is that those of us, the majority here coming from southern Ontario, are completely out of touch with the frontiers of this province.

There is the realization that the geographic centre of Ontario, in fact, lies north of Kapuskasing, and that it is only through the good offices and facilities of The Department of Lands and Forests that we, as elected members, can be treated to a first-hand view of the problems and the advantages of northern life and the tremendous frontiers that still lie there as far as the development of natural resources is concerned.

It is my hope that the House can reach a point where we can consider an adjournment at least towards the end of June, and it may well be that the leader of the government would have to then undertake a new session of the Legislature in the fall so that our business could be more efficiently conducted. But at some time during the summer and fall months, I hope there will be an opportunity for those of us, and I think it would involve everyone in the chamber, to tour the north once again, meet municipal officials, and those with responsibility in natural resources development. I put it to him that if he has not started such a plan he should get Mr. Rhynes working on it immediately.

There is one other new member in the cabinet who is present this afternoon to whom I would like to refer briefly, more as an introduction to an important topic of discussion, as well as to extend my good wishes and greetings to the Minister without Portfolio, the member for Stormont (Mr. Guindon).

It has been my responsibility to attend both federal-provincial, as well as both constitutional conferences, one organized by Ontario, known as the Confederation of tomorrow conference, in Toronto, and the one

chaired by the Prime Minister of Canada in Ottawa three weeks ago.

The hon. Minister from Stormont was there in the official delegation of the province for obvious reasons besides his ability, of course, as an advisor to the administration. His French extraction and his knowledge of the language and, of course, his strong singing voice would recommend him to any delegation. But I would say that the matters that were discussed at these two provincial conferences extend to all of us, as citizens in this province, a real new view as to what Canada is in actuality and what, we trust, she will become in the next few years; that we on this side are prepared to strongly and enthusiastically support practical measures which will implement the recommedations of the bilingualism and biculturalism commission as they apply to this province. I have said this before, and surely this is an occasion where it is necessary for me to make it clear again to you.

Mr. Speaker, when we talk about practical application, we are not interested in matters of window-dressing which, through their symbolism, might encourage those people in the province of French-Canadian extraction to believe that we are interested in their welfare and advancement without, in fact, giving them the substance of that particular concern. We know, in this Legislature a year ago, there was some considerable discussion involving all three parties as to the need for the provision of education in the French language in those communities where the students would make good use of it.

I applaud the decision by the government that this would come about. There is a committee presently meeting which is ironing out the details of this particular change. But surely we must see concrete evidence very shortly that the government of the day is prepared to make the necessary changes so that the French-speaking citizens of Ontario will have similar rights as far as their municipal affairs, their appearances in courts, and all of the areas in which the province of Ontario does impose its jurisdiction and responsibility on the citizens, are concerned.

Now a question was asked today in French by the hon. member for Sudbury (Mr. Sopha), and it was answered effectively from the government side. I believe that it is necessary, if we are going to come to grips with this as a continuing order of business, that there should be someone sitting at the *Hansard* desk who would be bilingual and prepare to make the translations for *Hansard* as they are needed.

I think it would be a needless expense for us to consider simultaneous translation in this chamber at this time; we do not know what the future will bring. But certainly there are no hon. members present who cannot understand the English language, and there should be programmes brought into a plan in the near future so that those of us as private members, and certainly the large body of civil servants who deal with French-speaking constituents across the province, would be able to have instruction in the French language.

It seems to me there should be somebody down by the reception desk at the front door so that when our citizens come in they may be greeted in the language of their choice. I know that in the funds provided by the government for the servicing of the Opposition offices, that we have been fortunate in gaining the services of a bilingual secretary so that letters that are received by our members, and by myself, in French can be answered in the same way. I trust that the Premier's office is equipped in a like manner.

But what I am talking about here, Mr. Speaker, are not the show-window applications of bilingualism but the practical solutions that are expected, and I believe needed, by the 600,000 French-speaking, or at least bilingual, citizens of this province. And so, I am quite convinced that the other side of the coin of accommodation that I have been describing to you in the last few moments, lies in an improvement, a dramatic and extensive improvement, in our methods of French instruction and language instruction in general in other parts of this province.

I have a son who is just entering grade 9 in our local collegiate, which is an average school, probably above average in many ways, and yet I find that when he returns to his home to do his preparations for the lessons of the next day, he is learning the same vocabulary lists that gave me trouble back in 1939 or 1940.

While the instruction in language has undoubtedly improved in many centres in this province, the general rule is that it is still archaic, inefficient, and the graduates have no more command of the second language than have we who were graduates of grade 13 some years ago.

I would say that the answer does not lie in waiting for us to have sufficient numbers of bilingual teachers so that this responsibility can be carried out in all of the classrooms of the province. We have been very remiss in the development of an educational television system in this province wherein we could have the sort of instruction which, by the end

of the matriculation year, would graduate students who not only had a facility and knowledge of the spoken and written French language, but an appreciation for its culture in literature.

Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to ram down anyone's throat obligatory courses in language instruction. It is obviously acceptable, however, with anyone who is associated with education, that liberal education—I use the word with a small "l"—involves far more development of a language curriculum than we have had in this province in years gone by.

I would say also that these two constitutional conferences which really opened the door to the changes I have been discussing with you this afternoon, have been of great importance in bringing home to the minds of the citizens wherever they are found in Canada, and particularly in Ontario, an understanding of what is needed if we are going to maintain and strengthen the unity of the nation. And it is with a great deal of regret that I would say to you, sir, that Ontario has effectively killed federal initiatives relating to the entrenchment of a bill of rights in the Canadian constitution.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Nixon: The chief law officer of the Crown in Ontario, the Attorney General (Mr. Wishart), presented a well-researched position at the federal-provincial conference three weeks ago. And while his speech was clothed in legalities and soft phrases, it in fact was woven into the rope that strangled the proposition put forward by the federal Minister of Justice in the federal government for the entrenchment of a bill of rights. In my view, Ontario must lead by agreeing to take the steps necessary to remove basic civil liberties from a direct power of any jurisdiction.

These are rights that should be returned to the people and entrenched in a truly Canadian constitution; not only freedom of speech, assembly, religion, liberty and the press but also the unique cultural rights of Canada's peoples. Now, it is true that no one would object for a moment for the types of rights—somebody has called for a motherhood rights, freedom of the press, and so on—from entrenchment, but there are still many areas in this province and in this nation where the rights of the French people to the sort of thing that has been recommended by the Laurendeau-Dunton report is very much in question.

If it could be decided that a means of entrenching these rights could be acted upon beyond the reach of any temporary majority in any Parliament or assembly, then it would surely be in the best interests of strengthening our democracy.

If the Attorney General was speaking for the Premier and stating Government policy, his fear is that parliamentary supremacy would then be in jeopardy but in my view, if one's fundamental individual freedoms are assured, then the supremacy of Parliament has its effect on all consequential legislation and matters of government. The problem in this, of course, is one that has been recognized at both of these conferences. It was raised by Premiers and delegations on both occasions and that is, "How are we going to entrench a bill of rights in a constitution which is, in fact, a statute of a foreign government?"

I use that word "foreign" in the proper meaning of the term. A statute is an enactment of the Parliament at Westminster, and while we ourselves feel a strong connection to that particular Parliament, it has, over the years, lost entirely its responsibility for any direction in our affairs. So the very thought that there should be a series of petitions that would be arrived at somehow in Canada by the consent of the provinces under the direction of the government of Canada, a series of petitions that would be taken across the water and laid on the table of the Parliament of Westminster, is completely impractical, if not unthinkable.

In my view, our responsibility is surely to arrive at some reasonable means whereby our constitution is patriated and that there is a straightforward method of amending it with justice for all, even if it is so cumbersome that it requires the unanimous endorsation of every province.

There should be some means whereby it can be accomplished. My feeling is that there should be one last petition to the Parliament at Westminster, asking for the repeal of The British North America Act, or else to set in motion some machinery that frankly I cannot visualize whereby the Act itself would be changed in the area in which it derives its force from Great Britain to Canada.

Probably the best way would be to repeal that statute in such a way, and with such timing, that it would be replaced by a constitution that would be arrived at by a series of conferences, beginning with the two that we have already had in Canada in the last four or five months. Frankly, I was most heartened at the attitudes taken at these conferences, and the realization that positions that appeared intransigent to begin with, were, in fact, flexible to the extent that they will meet

our needs in the establishment of a new constitution.

I do not know whether time limits can be set, I suppose, we can propose them, but if we could, in the next five years, undertake the work, and the putting away of prejudice, and the broadening of mind to set up a constitution that establishes a nation not as we remember it, or maybe not as we wish it were right now, but as it actually is; a constitution with the breadth that would permit us to undertake another cenutry of development. This would be one of the greatest accomplishments that any government could achieve.

Mr. Speaker, these matters associated with the two conferences are of great concern. I really felt an enlargement of my own view, particularly in Ottawa—that is my personal reaction—when I felt that at that conference there was specific action being taken, not only by the Prime Minister of Canada and the Prime Minister of Ontario, or the Premier of Ontario to avoid confusion, but by the leaders of governments across Canada.

We, as Opposition leaders, the member for York South and myself, were there as observers and I do not believe it would be reasonable for us to be included in the specific delegation under the circumstances described in the terms of reference in those two conferences. There may be a time in conferences in the future when the Opposition parties should be represented directly on the delegation, but our responsibility, of course, is here in this chamber.

Do we express our views whether they commend the position taken by the government, or are critical of it and offer alternatives that we believe might better meet the case? If we are going to entrench a bill of rights, surely first must come some means whereby we repatriate our constitution under terms that will set up our nation in a manner in which we, as Canadians, can be proud.

Now in these matters, we are aware of the difficulty in achieving a unified approach among all provinces and the government of Canada. I can only hope that the fresh approaches that have been taken in the last few months will be carried over into a possibility that will bear fruit in the near future.

Mr. Speaker, this would surely be a time as well for me to congratulate the members opposite, and particularly the leader of the members opposite, in their success in the election on October 17. I have already indicated in my remarks that the administration which returns 69 supporters was favoured only by the votes of 42 per cent of those taking part in the election last October, but I am delighted that we were able to come through the campaign without anyone waging any personal vendetta and that we were able to stick to the issues as we saw them.

For my part, I am completely against the approach that politicians in some areas, and even in Ontario sometimes take, that a sense of the jugular is needed, that is a location of the jugular vein is needed in order for politics to have an impact on the people; I believe that there is in an enlightened community, the best prospect of democracy to work when stress on policy is maintained and where the political leaders and the candidates of all parties participate in an active approach to campaigning.

Now in my view, one of the responsibilities that is incumbent on the leader of the government under these circumstances is not to set himself apart perhaps, as far as his supporters are concerned, on a pedestal and as far as we are concerned, just away somewhere else, and not take part in an active campaign with those who seek to replace him. No, there is no thought in my mind that the member for London North is afraid of any kind of a confrontation with Opposition leaders or members, and, as he himself has said, there have been opportunities in the past in the Legislature for that to come about, and I know that in the next few hours, in the next few days, he will have a position to state his own views and from my own experience he can do so very forcefully.

If we are going to make democracy work, and if we are going to make it move ahead and involve the citizens of a province like Ontario, seven million people who feel very far removed from the government itself and even provincial politics—then it is incumbent upon us all, whether we are leaders or candidates, to take part in the support of debate that would engender interest and engender involvement in a discussion of the issues of the day.

Now this, the Premier steadfastly refused to do. If it is his decision, I believe he was poorly advised. He has confidence, just as the Minister of Municipal Affairs has confidence, in his own ability and he is not afraid of these confrontations.

Why then did it not come about? Because surely that sort of thing would involve the citizens of Ontario in a discussion of these issues. I well remember one occasion which by almost a subterfuge the CTV television outlet in Ottawa undertook to have the leader of the government and the leader of the

Opposition in the studio at the same time. I think perhaps it was the station director's idea that he would have some sort of a debate, or at least a confrontation there.

Well, when we heard about it, of course, I was very quick to accept and went up to Ottawa—I have a feeling that you would not have the same difficulty with the CTV outlet in Toronto, but the independence of the station down there certainly came to the fore. While we were both present in that particular station, answering questions one after the other on different programmes, there would have been a chance for us to confront each other on a public television network and say something about the campaign and the issues.

I was quite interested to see that while the leader of the government was very friendly and affable, as he always is under these circumstances, he had a platoon of minions who were very white lipped and trembling around him and they were most annoyed with the circumstances.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): White lipped and trembling?

Mr. Nixon: Oh yes, there was a speech writer at his right hand and a public relations officer at his left hand; a chauffeur behind him and a bodyguard around. But you know, it seems to me that if we are to get in step with the times we will have to be prepared to undertake that sort of thing, and we are also going to have to prepare to bring television into this chamber on occasions other than opening day.

You might be very quick to say: who would want to listen to the debates; who would want to hear the leader of the Opposition or anyone else carrying on at length?—I will say it for you. But surely there is some means whereby we could put out over the television network some sort of a programme day by day which would highlight the participation of private members and those who have special responsibilities, such as Ministers and Opposition leaders.

The problem of who is going to edit it has not been insurmountable in the past, and I believe we could do this again. In the same vein, I think that a regulation that prohibits those people in the press who make use of tape recorders from actually picking up verbatim debate is ridiculously out of date and that they would share the same responsibility for reporting with someone who is in the gallery with a paper and pencil.

There is no personal animosity associated with politics in this province. I trust that is true and that it will maintain in that vein. We have responsibilities that we are prepared to carry out. Sometimes the debate would become heated, but unless we involve the citizens of the province more in day-to-day activities of government, and involve through an up-graded committee system, we are not fulfilling the responsibility we have for "evolutionary democracy"—the Premier's own phrase.

We know that democracy has evolved in this province. The first governor, John Graves Simcoe, came over here and while he had a Legislature of 16 members he did not take much advice from them. He had the established church at his right arm, the military at his left arm, and the business community at his back.

Things have changed considerably, although not completely since that day. Now, when His Honour comes to the Legislature to preside at its opening, the only words that he can speak on his own are "pray be seated" and sometimes he has to have advice on that.

My point is this. Democracy is evolutionary and we must not get the idea that the present level of our achievement is perfection itself. The Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Randall) was humble enough to admit that even he has not achieved perfection and surely today we must be prepared to admit the same thing.

I would be prepared to recommend to you, sir, and to the people of Ontario, that the improvement would be replacing the Conservatives with a Liberal administration, but this is not the kind of evolutionary democracy I have in mind. We must be very sensitive to the needs of the participation of people across the province, individuals in some cases, but those groups who have some special knowledge and requirement to appear before Legislature meeting in committee. We were honoured and pleased to receive the executive of the Ontario federation of agriculture in our caucus yesterday. I understand that they had an opportunity to meet the Premier himself, as they always say, and the cabinet.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: They do every year.

Mr. Nixon: Yes, that is true, and they go in there, the doors are closed, there are two uniformed guards on the outside, and who knows what goes on; who knows what commendation or criticism of the government; who knows what commitments the government and the Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. Stewart) are prepared to make. Why not use our committee rooms—large

committee rooms, air conditioned, indirectly lit, public address systems, lots of seats? These people—the federation of agriculture, the farmers' union, the Ontario medical association, the house builders group, all of these people should have an opportunity, if they choose, to come before these committees with the reponsible Minister there and his deputies and advisors present as well, who would not be hamstrung by rules that would prevent them from taking part in the discussion. All of these petitions and briefs would be put forward in the full light of government that is not *in camera*—it is out in the open. Government today is on camera, and it is on camera every day.

I want to say a few words about the campaign. It is already history—not quite ancient history—but leading from the campaign are a good many requirements that face the present administration.

It has always been my understanding of democracy that a government must stand on its record, that it must not go to the people with a great list of promises—costly, and some not so costly—at the time of the election.

The leader of the present government took over that responsibility in 1961. Since that time he has been favoured with massive support in this House and certainly across the province in returning the members supporting the Conservative Party. He has had prosperous times. He has had a period of high employment. He has had the option of dealing for a few years with the Progressive Conservative Party federally and, latterly and much to his relief, the Liberal Party. So everything has been in his favour.

Surely the opportunity for the Premier of this province and his administration to accomplish those things that he felt were needed in the best interest of Ontario was there in every measure, full measure pressed down. And yet, when the election campaign was called, he felt constrained to move from constituency to constituency offering promises that would be whispered into his ear by local candidates and others in the know, and it really became a source of embarrassment to Conservatives as well as others as he progressed across the province in this way.

In fact, it amounted to a $100 million pork barrel in which he was prepared to promise a bridge, an auditorium, a new road, all of these things. As a matter of fact somebody said he was prepared to promise a bridge when there not even a river, and it really got to that point.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I am just interested in where I promised a bridge.

An hon. member: They are going to make a river there.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I would like to read for you some of the election promises, and certainly there is a bridge—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Where did I promise a bridge?

An hon. member: They do not even know where the river is.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: No, I do not.

Mr. Nixon: Certainly this list is by no means complete but it begins with (a)—bridges across the Trent at Campbellford and Hastings; (b)—a super highway through Lanark—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I never mentioned either of them.

Mr. Nixon: And my good friend the Minister of Highways (Mr. Gomme) and I had an opportunity to discuss this at more than arms' length on more than one occasion.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Never mentioned either of them.

Mr. Nixon: Item (c)—more money for mining municipalities—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: That was done during the last session.

Mr. Nixon: Item (d)—student fares on the GO transit system and the extension of the system to Newcastle.

(e)—A million dollar sewer and water project for Red Lake, and I should tell you, Mr. Speaker—I would say to you, Mr. Speaker, announced by notification in every local mail box on election morning.

(f)—$150,000 to Shoal Lake fisheries and a $35,000 loan to Wallace Keep Plastics at Keewatin (both announced on the Friday before the people went to the polls).

(g)—44 more miles of hard surface on Highway 72 for the people of Sioux Lookout. You know I got the impression that the member for Kenora (Mr. Bernier) was either going to be Minister of Mines or he was going to have this new highway and I guess he has settled for the easier package.

Mr. Speaker, if I may go on—a parks commission for the Ottawa valley—which was announced by the hon. Minister just today.

In fulfillment of that pledge, a new liquor store in Lucknow—and I have no doubt that this will be one of those—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Never heard of it. I guess I had better get a list of the promises.

Mr. Nixon: Hamilton—a theatre auditorium for Hamilton and, of course, we could go on referring to the basic shelter exemption and so on. Really when I call it a $100 million pork barrel, I am talking as the Minister of Mines would say "in conservative terms," because it is going to be much more than that.

So really, in many ways, for the good fellowship of the Premier, the fact that he does not allow personalities to enter into politics—and believe me I appreciate this—his campaign was worthy of that old master Maurice Duplessis. He was in a situation where he could have—the Premier very well could have—carried out an expensive and much needed reform of the electoral law of this province which he did not do—a little window dressing in the two years before, but nothing was accomplished.

The Premier likes it the way it is. He then progressed to the province offering these bribes to the electorate, bribes with their own funds which really were successful in many areas, there is no doubt about that—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Quite wrong, I did not—

Mr. Nixon: But I would say to you, Mr. Speaker, that what he hid—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I must admit the auditorium in Hamilton—I did not mention the bridge, I did not mention the highway, I did not mention any of that.

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Provincial Treasurer): How about the liquor store in Lucknow?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I am interested in the Premier's interjections. As usual he is saying that he is not personally responsible, the same sort of reaction we get when he is asked about the financing of his parties, "I know nothing about it, I am not concerned with the financing of the party at all."

The leadership of the Conservative Party is really not like Pontius Pilate. They must accept the responsibility for these matters and I set them to you in great seriousness. But really, the thing that was most undemocratic in the Conservative approach to the recent campaign was not so much the Port Vale approach—we have come to expect that from the Conservatives—but the concealing of matters of urgent public importance from the public, from the electorate at that time.

It was not many days after the election when we were told by the Premier personally that he was going to impose an inflexible method of changing the jurisdiction for school administrations in the province. Now this surely was something that should have been discussed during the election campaign. It happened to have been in the Liberal programme and we did discuss it because we believe that larger areas of jurisdiction would be efficient.

We will talk about this when the the bill is before us, but the Premier did not have the fortitude to bring that out, to say, "If elected, not only will I build you an auditorium in Hamilton, but I am prepared to impose these inflexible boundaries that are going to be put before the House."

Beyond this, he did not accept the refusal of federal medicare as any kind of a provincial issue. It was well after the election when he came out with his intransigent position which means that Ontaro will not have the advantages of this federal porgramme and, of course, he did not at that time indicate that the funds of the Ontario hospital services commission have been seriously depleted during the past year and that we might have to raise them in substantial proportions.

We look forward to a discussion of the Budget and I do not want to trespass on the prerogative of the hon. Provincial Treasurer, but we know very well that during the centennial year and the election year, both the hon. gentlemen sitting opposite, the Premier and the Provincial Treasurer, were proud of the fact that there would be no new taxes, that good Conservative management had left us in this strong, viable, economic position. But the election was not long over before the government turned around with all the gratitude of a dog on the constituents of the province of Ontario and raised the liquor prices. They raised and predicted a substantial increase—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Ottawa raised the liquor—

Mr. Nixon: Yes, but you did too, and you raised it more than anybody else—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Nixon: —and imposed the new premiums for hospital services.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: We still have the cheapest liquor prices in Canada.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I mentioned a moment ago that one of the matters of some concern that should have been put before the people by the Premier, as it was by the Opposition parties, was the need for the involvement and acceptance of the province of Ontario in the federal medicare programme. I think it is essential that I spend a few moments at this time to say to you and members of the House that we believe the government's decision to stay out of federal medicare is deeply regrettable, and that the Provincial Treasurer himself and the Premier have been guilty of misleading the people of the province of Ontario in their discussions of this very issue.

I want to spend a moment talking about the four basic requirements which must be met by any province before they can have the advantages of participation in this federal programme. The first is that our medical coverage in the province must be comprehensive. There is no problem with that, I know of very little medical insurance here that could not easily be upgraded to reach the minimum standards that would allow us to come in under the comprehensive requirements.

Portability is something that has always confused me, if you want to know the truth, sir, because surely it can be made portable as far as Ontario is concerned. If members are people living in this particular province and they take out medical insurance from Ontario, we would pay benefits to them if they were out of the province, unless, of course, they changed their domicile to some other jurisdiction. But this is a federal responsibility that I suppose must wait until our provinces take part within the next two or three years.

Now the third one is universality—that word that gave the seconder to the Throne debate such difficulty. He is surely aware of the universal requirements that are already imposed upon Ontario by custom and by statute in this province. They may say that our hospitalization requirements are not universal, but heaven help you in this province if you do not have hospitalization. You go down to the Toronto general hospital and you will be charged $54.30 per day, so that unless you come under the protection of the Ontario hospital services commission, you certainly cannot live in the province of Ontario.

The same is really true about a mobile insurance while we permit these people, and I think that this is a grave mistake, who do not choose to carry liability insurance not to have it in this province, then surely the area of universality is one in which this government has already moved by virtue of its previous policies.

Universality, as it applies to medicare, hinges on the achievement of a 90 per cent comprehensive coverage in the first year, going up to 95 per cent in the years following. I believe that we can still accomplish this readily in this province, and if the government so desires, we could accomplish it during this session so that we would be prepared to accept federal medical insurance on July 1 of this year. My statistics would indicate that we do have medical coverage for 94.4 per cent of our citizens. Not all of this is comprehensive by any means but, as I said a moment ago, it would not be a difficult task by legislation to require the upgrading of this coverage so that it would come under the requirements of the federal statutes.

Now all this 90 per cent is presently covered in my view—and the statistics are fairly definite in this regard—under OMSIP, which has close to two million members and PSI which has about 1.7 million and the county co-ops. I have not been successful in getting a specific number associated with them; we are well above 70 per cent involvement in comprehensive medical insurance here that would be construed by the federal government as being government-operated. Now I am not at all in favour—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Talk to MacEachen, he will not—

Mr. Nixon: —in having a panel of insurance carriers operating in this province, but it is clearly understood that any organization which can be verified to be non-profit and which is giving the minimum benefits—and I suppose the yardstick would be OMSIP benefits—that would be correlated to government operation would be accepted. I do not know what private conversations the leader of the government has had with federal Minister of Health, but it is generally understood through statements made by the federal government that this would be construed as government operation.

My own feeling is that we should seriously consider the expansion of OMSIP to the 90 per cent stage itself. We know the heart rending decisions that were taken in the late 50's when the federal Liberal government brought in hospitalization but did not take that final step—they said any province that wants to can take part, but it is going ahead anyway.

They left it somewhat in abeyance and I can remember hearing from the former member for Brant that the Minister of Health Paul Martin at that time, paid some visits to the government here in order to work out some of these details. It was not until the government change in 1957 that the new leader of the federal administration, Mr. Diefenbaker, simply said—enough of this pussy-footing, we are simply going to impose hospital insurance and any province that does not come in will have to bear the consequences; they are certainly going to have to pay their share.

Much the same thing is happening now. We have the decision by the federal government that medical insurance is not only the law of the land but it is going to be the law of the land and that provinces can enter as they see fit and as is their responsibility. In my view, we in Ontario do meet the four requirements of government operation and universality if we were prepared in this Legislature to pass a statute which said that it was illegal for medical insurance to be offered from any profit making concern. Surely we must extract the profit motive from this very important public concern.

I was quite interested to watch a television programme, I guess a month or so ago, when Mr. Colin Brown from London was being interviewed as to his personal objections to what he called socialized medicare, and to hear him say over television that he was the sole agent through which health insurance for the public service of Ontario was purchased from the London Life Insurance Company. There had been questions put to the Premier in the last few days which he has not seen fit to answer in this regard, but in my view—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I answered the question asked.

Mr. Nixon: —this is a very serious matter indeed, when you receive some of the most vehement objections to a modern medicare proposal from those who are themselves financially interested with the government of Ontario in perpetuating the status quo.

I know Mr. Brown to be a man of ability. Certainly he has been successful in his business. He is a citizen of London who undertook on his own to wage a very effective campaign involving full page ads in the major Ontario dailies against this federal programme. How effective they were I am not prepared to say, but surely in his position as being financially involved with the government of Ontario in this regard he was very seriously involved in a conflict of interest in this connection.

But I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, that if Ontario were to opt into the federal formula for medical insurance we would then have at our disposal $160 million of federal funds. That is a ball park figure but it is not too far out—$160 million in federal funds to be disposed of by the government of this province on the priorities that they themselves set.

There is no fifth requirement in the federal programme that says we must involve this money in reducing premiums or building hospitals or buying drugs, or anything. The priorities that the Provincial Treasurer has put on our expansion are related to housing, education and roads, all of them very commendable features indeed and all that matters is that we will have to finance, whether we get extra federal funds or not.

The point is this, that these $160 million would not necessarily have to be directed towards the subsidizing or expansion of our provincial medical insurance programme. We meet those 90 per cent requirements now.

My own feeling is that it would not be morally proper to spend that money on other than upgrading our hospital and medical societies, expanding the area of those who receive specific assistance in this regard. I believe that one of the major problems associated with the financing of health care is in meeting the needs for drugs of those suffering from chronic illness and the older citizens and those who are pensioned.

I know that all of us here receive phone calls and letters from constituents which would bring tears to your eyes when you realize the difficulties they are facing in raising a family that has been afflicted with diseases that are so expensive to treat and keep under control. So this $160 million would, in fact, be receivable by this province without strings attached.

The Provincial Treasurer, with the attitude that he is going to save the nation from involvement in a waste of medicare programme in one breath, goes to Ottawa on the next occasion and demands more federal money in

the form of block grants without strings attached so that the federal government can be more deeply involved in provincial responsibilities. Here is where you could have done it.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: What block grants are you talking about?

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): The billion dollars you asked for!

Mr. Nixon: I am talking about the requests, demands—as they come out in the newspapers —that have been put before the government of Canada by the government of the province, whose spokesman is the Provincial Treasurer in this regard, for a larger share of federal revenue so that we can maintain our responsibilities here. Here is the programme where you can get the money just the way you want it without restriction, and certainly it appears to me—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: No, you are wrong.

Mr. Nixon: —that you have done the province a grave disservice indeed in not seeing that Ontario would take the lead in expanding medical insurance across our nation.

We presently pay our own way through premiums for medical services. The subsidies that come in support of OMSIP are largely for administration, which is surely an area in which government must accept responsibility, and for those people who receive special assistance, I believe, to the extent of $70 million. This is a commendable programme and one that we certainly support. But, realizing that we are paying our own way, it is not a tax, it is a premium. Call it what you will, but the government of the day would have the option of maintaining that premium structure or reducing it through the use of these federal funds. These matters are of grave concern.

Also of concern is the efficiency of the administration of the health services in this province. Really, I cannot see why an enlightened administration would not amalgamate OMSIP and OHSC into the Ontario health services commission, use it in a fully computerized manner, set it up with its ancillary committees of professional people so that we will not be at loggerheads with the doctors and professional organizations as we have been in the past; and move into this area which is obviously going to come about in two or three years, whether you like it or not, and which would certainly be an example to many of the other provinces of Canada.

The cry of save the nation and save the economy of the nation comes from the two leading members of the administration, the Provincial Treasurer and the Premier. The Premier is quick to recommend on the other hand that the other administration appropriate a billion dollar fund for the economic development of other parts of Canada and when it was put to him—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I did not say other parts, I said Canada.

Mr. Nixon: All right. All right. For Canada.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Not just right here in this province.

Mr. Nixon: That is right. It depends who the audience is. When the Premier is meeting with the Maritime Premiers he likes to give the impression that their welfare is really his top priority. But this billion dollar fund, which would be added on to the projected $700 million deficit that is already in the books of the Minister of Finance at Ottawa, is a very serious matter indeed. When questioned about the importance of this deficit—I should have his very words here—they almost indicated, "well, we might as well have a real deficit as the one we have got."

I can remember politicians across this country being critical of C. D. Howe in his attitude towards that famous million dollars. The Premier has heard this before, but it really applies, because compared to C. D. Howe, the Premier, in his "what's a billion" attitude surely leads the field in fiscal irresponsibility.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Pretty weak. Pretty weak.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, my comments on medicare have been by no means definitive and I know that there are many here in this House, in my own party and elsewhere, who will want to get into one of those magic arguments involving numbers and how many billion dollars are needed here and how many hundred million are needed there.

My view and the view of this party is that the medical insurance statute at the federal level provides the framework in which this province can very safely move into an area of comprehensive medical insurance. I would predict that it will be done within three years, and that since we have the definite commitment from the Premier that it will not be done this year, we have ample opportunity to set our house in order so that we can readily take part in medicare at the very first opportunity.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: A new government in Ottawa and away we go.

An hon. member: I think you are right, I think it is government.

Mr. Nixon: If we might make some predictions along those lines, I do not think there is any doubt that the present administration is going to be supported by a vote of confidence on Friday and we can continue with the reform legislation we have.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sopha: Do you people support the irresponsibility that is going on?

Mr. Nixon: As a matter of fact, it never was made clear who the leader of the government of Ontario was supporting at that great clambake, as the member for Sudbury called it, down in Maple Leaf gardens. We do not know whether he wants Mr. Stanfield to be leader of the government or not. He never indicated his support.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: And I never will!

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Who are you supporting?

Mr. Nixon: Well, I am going to support the winner.

Mr. Sopha: And I am for Judy.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Are you? The only thing I missed in the election campaign.

Mr. MacDonald: You are scared to do otherwise.

Mr. Sopha: She was after you once.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, if I may continue with my remarks, we have been treated in the Speech from the Throne to a blueprint of vague generalities. There is quite a contrast between its predictions this year, and what we were able to read in the Speech from the Throne last year. There is nothing like an election year to bring out the advertising agencies in all of their panoply. We had GO transit and the home ownership made easy programme and the programme for wild rivers. We have not heard so much about that recently. It did not catch a-hold, did it? It did not catch a-hold.

This year, the Speech is a fairly thin one and its specifics are few and far between. But we are told that a new system of metropolitan government is going to be imposed in the Ottawa area, following some extensive studies. Certainly it seems to be accepted there with very few difficulties so far.

But my feeling, Mr. Speaker, is that the new Minister and the government—the administration as a whole—has a tremendous responsibility to get away from a piecemeal approach to the renovation of local government.

We have been treated to at least nine studies in depth of various areas of the provinces. There have been the recommendations from the Beckett committee on The Municipal Act and related Acts, reported 18 months ago, I believe, and the Smith report just last fall contains a surprisingly detailed outline for a method of procedure. And still this government will pick out one sitting duck somewhere in the province and move forward with a new method of government for them.

In my view, this is no longer adequate, that we look at even the proposals for Ottawa and we find that the regional government is going to be designated Ottawa-Carleton, as far as the area is concerned.

This region will comprise Ottawa, Eastview, Rockcliffe, Carleton county and Cumberland township in Russell county.

In order to have the school boundaries correspond, two and a fraction administrative school areas will have to be moulded together and those are: Ottawa, Eastview and Rockcliffe, which is one; Carleton county, which is the second, and Cumberland township in Carleton county, which is the third, or at least another part.

But it has never been made clear, certainly not by the Premier in his Galt statement about school boundary changes, that there would be any relationship between these new school administrative units and a new approach to regional government in those areas where the government screws up its courage to the point where they can make an announcement.

As a matter of fact, the Premier emphasized the fact that there would not be any relationship between any new approaches to regional government and the new county boundaries for education.

I suggest that this is a very serious matter, a matter in which the government is embarking on yet a further mistake, because we do need a new approach to regional government and this must be co-ordinated with education.

For education to be simply another separate jurisdiction, with overlapping boundaries, must be inadmissible at this stage.

The government of Ontario, through its various agencies and departments, now has,

I am told, 35 separate sets of boundaries overlapping and criss-crossing across Ontario. One of these is, of course, the regional approach to education. There are others.

Highways, conservation, I am afraid I could not list all 35, so do not ask me right now.

If we are going to take a rational approach to regional government, a part of it must surely be to pick out an area in which the responsibilities of the government of Ontario are going to be rationalized, and where citizens and those officials in the field will be able to deal with the government in a much more orderly fashion.

There may be some good reason why conservation must continue to have boundaries outlined by river valleys. Frankly, I am not completely convinced of that, although the chairman of the select committee on conservation might want to take me aside and convince me again. If we are going to spread out—regionalize—the responsibilities of this government, as some means whereby we can take the lead in establishing regions of local government, then this government certainly is not effective in that regard.

I would suggest that flexibility and consultation must be the keynote of any programme of this type. We cannot adopt a concept of an inflexible mould into which all local governments must be compressed. When I read that, I think once again of Premier Smallwood and his comment at the Confederation of tomorrow conference that the federal government was guilty of the same thing in providing inflexible programmes into which all provinces had to fit themselves.

He said it is like that old allegory myth about Procrustes—was that the name?—and Procrustes had a house by the side of the road in which he welcomed visitors one and all. His hospitality was of the highest order —when you were shown to the sleeping chamber there was a bed of only one size and if you were too tall he chopped off your legs and your head, and if you were too short, he stretched you out to fit.

While Smallwood's reference was to the federal administration, and there may be some truth there, surely the same myth applies to the attitudes of the government of this province. Now, specifically in the changes that are required for new school administrative units, for the Premier, without adequate consultation even with his own Minister I believe—Oh, you want to protest on that?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Complete consultation.

Mr. Nixon: Complete consultation, I see. Well he sure looked surprised. He sure looked surprised.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Announced while the Prime Minister was out of the country.

Mr. Nixon: Well he sure looked surprised.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Well, we wrote the speech together.

Mr. Nixon: The point is that the Premier has built a Procrustes bed for the province of Ontario into which the counties must be fitted. He will stretch it if need be, but he is not prepared to cut any parts off of it because this inflexible approach is what is really the main objection by those citizens across the province who feel that the programme outlined in the speech from Galt is subject to. I was speaking last night in Kitchener—a good Liberal stronghold—and Waterloo, and the area there in which there is a great deal of support—and the position there—

Mr. MacDonald: A pretty shaky stronghold. Another day is coming.

Mr. Nixon: Yes, the NDP had their victory parade that night, but this is surely an example where the inflexible approach taken by the Prime Minister and the Minister of Education (Mr. Davis), if indeed he was involved in this, shows through to the discredit of modern government because this consultation was not entered into effectively and certainly the flexibility is not there. But I would say that we cannot have the alternative of *ad hoc* solutions being revealed bit by bit upon inquiry by interested parties, or by announcement in the Speech from the Throne as regards Ottawa. A little bit of a solution in one corner of the province is not meeting the needs elsewhere.

However, since the regions have failed in most instances to come forward with proposals, regional government must be pushed forward by this province. Now pushing it forward does not mean an imposition; since all the basic studies that should reasonably be done under the general terms of reference have now been completed the government must now set forth definitive proposals for regional government. Regional government can be begun at once by a phased approach involving group participation in controversial matters and immediate action in areas of agreement.

Such a two-stage approach would involve the publication of a master plan for Ontario. Now this is more than just a master plan for

regional government; the government must put forward what they believe is a reasonable alternative to the present system which everyone agrees can be, and must be, improved. Now this master plan would have contained with it, the transportation studies that must surely be available linking Metropolitan Toronto those large regions to the north, northeast and northwest not served by GO transit at the present time.

It must contain the long range policy that the administration is prepared to take with the preservation of the valuable lands in the Niagara peninsula and other fertile agricultural areas. It must contain specific proposals for the preservation and improvement of the recreation areas in the Haliburton and Muskoka regions of this province, but basically it must lay out the government's plan for a regional government. Whether it is the Smith committee recommendations, which I doubt, whether it is the specific recommendations by Plunkett, or any of these other ones, I doubt, but it would be the government policy.

Now this is not to be put forward in any inflexible way. There are many parts of it which could be implemented within a year by the action of this Legislature and would be well accepted, as really the changes in Ottawa appear so far to be well accepted.

The second stage in this particular programme would be to set up the machinery for early public hearings on those more contentious aspects of the master plan which by their nature require ventilation and a formation of public opinion in group attitudes, and it is in this connection where you people on the government benches can make use of those of us who do not have the responsibilities of government, whether we support you or not in the committee system. I hesitate to raise it again, but here is a vehicle whereby those people who have some specific objections to the programmes set forward by the government do not have to line up at the Premier's door and go in and close the door and undertake this sort of negotiation. There is nothing wrong with that but—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Thank you. I am glad to know there is nothing wrong with it.

Mr. Nixon: Well, that is fine and I do accept your participation in this. But the committee system would provide the sort of quorum which would mean that the views of those people back home in the areas directly concerned would be known, and so would the responsible member from the area as well as the Minister, who must in the long run accept the responsibility. Standing committees of the Legislature with enhanced status and initiative ought to be active in this area, calling before them individual and corporate witnesses and actively seeking out briefs in response to specific government proposals based on the plan that I am now calling for.

There must be a continuing dialogue of this kind in our evolving democracy to prevent the feeling arising in the electorate that the individual is being swept along on a millstream, or that he has lost touch with government completely.

Now the complexities of regional government demand not one programme, but at least four. The thought is that the imposition of county government is as inapplicable there as I believe it should be inapplicable in the imposition in school government. There must be a separate approach and separate plans for those heavily industrialized urban areas which, in the case of the school programme, were separated out. As well as that, those growth areas—the many cities in this province, that are looking forward to ten years of rapid expansion and change, the rural areas, and there are still many of them which do not look forward to much change in the next 10 or 15 years, and of course, northern Ontario, which, because of its very organization at the present time, must be dealt with in a special and separate way.

We propose such a scheme. We proposed such a scheme in our election platform, in contrast to the Conservative position which simply brushed those difficulties under the rug, and we are ready to see its implementation now. We are talking about time limits. I suggest that within five years we can have a new constitution. I believe that within 18 months we can remake the business and local government here to maintain and strengthen local autonomy and bring about an efficiency that is sadly lacking in many regions of this province.

Now I know that the Minister of Economics and Development is concerned with the change of name in his department; his responsibility, as the leading economist, is being transferred to the Provincial Treasurer. and that is something of great interest.

Mr. Sopha: The Provincal Treasurer is empire building, I guess.

Mr. Nixon: But the ministry of development, which is what is left to him, is in a position, in my view, to do much more for the equal development of this province. We had quite a debate on this matter at least during the northern part of our tours during

the election. There were a lot of times when the hon. leader of the government and myself and the hon. member for York South found ourselves moving around northern Ontario at the same time.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I do not recall seeing the leader of the Opposition any place in the north.

Mr. Nixon: The Premier travels in a private plane and it is very difficult to meet with him, but I usually found that when he came to the town afterwards, he was prepared to make some accommodation with regard to northern affairs. I was quite put out really, and I thought it was unworthy of the Premier following the election to hear his comments with regard to northern Ontario. They were tantamount to saying, "If you are not going to vote Conservative, we are not going to be very worried about you".

Hon. Mr. Robarts: When did I say that?

Mr. Nixon: When the Premier went up into the north I can remember a comment he made saying, "When I come up here all I hear is complaints". I believe those complaints were very well founded and the fact that a majority of northern members are found in Opposition indicates that the people would agree with that position.

But in my view, the Minister of Economics and Development must undertake some sort of a special programme for northern development, which would involve a head office away from Queen's Park and away from Bay Street. It would involve a funding that might be very similar to the Atlantic development board in the federal sense, so that there would be these funds available that would be administered by northerners themselves.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: You mean the billion dollar fund I was talking about?

Mr. Nixon: No sir.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: That might be used in northern Ontario.

Mr. Nixon: Believe me, your billion dollars was a recommendation to another government, which is characteristic.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Quite right. For all of Canada.

Mr. Nixon: Well this is my recommendation to you.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: We have a fund.

Mr. Nixon: My feeling is this, that there is something new in this as well. The Premier has heard many of these arguments before and he is quick to say so, but in this northern development fund there should be legislation passed which would make available not only the public funds that the government from time to time would ask the Legislature to appropriate, but there should be an emphasis on the involvement of private funds as well in the development of our resources in northern Ontario.

Now you have a responsibility, we all have a responsibility here, to see that the Ontario development agency has funds to support industries in many areas across Ontario which have been bypassed in the economic development that we have been proud of for a good many years. But still, we must be very much aware of the feeling expressed not by everybody but expressed by Walter Gordon among others, by the members of the Watkins committee reporting last week, that there is far too great a tendency for us to sell out our birthright to foreigners—I use that word in its correct sense—and allow them to impose their management and their profit-making decisions on us.

I do not believe that any government can react in an unplanned way and simply kick out this sort of capital, we cannot get along without it, but surely there is an obligation on this government, as there is on the government at Ottawa, to provide better facilities and more opportunities for our citizens who may have several hundred dollars in a sock, or under the mattress, to invest in the development of our own country and our own resources.

I am proposing that the Ontario development agency expand its operation. Perhaps it should be completely separate from the ODA with a specific northern development guaranteed fund which would solicit public funds and guarantee the same rate of interest as we are prepared to pay for those who buy the bonds of the province of Ontario—a good investment.

This money can then be used specifically for the development of our own natural resources when there is some concern as to where the smelter in the Timmins area should be located. We should be able to do more than just use moral suasion to see that it is located in Ontario and in a properly selected economic place. We should be there with funds, public funds and private funds, that

would be administered by this growth corporation so that we can involve ourselves in our own development.

Frankly, there are all sorts of difficulties associated with this but until we give our own citizens in Ontario and Canada some sort of an open-door opportunity to invest in something that is other than moose pasture, then we are not serving them properly and we are not meeting our responsibilities in the development of our own products. I said a moment ago that not many of us realized that the geographic centre of the province is north of Kapuskasing. The Minister of Mines is now very much aware of the importance of that area. The Minister of Tourism and Information (Mr. Auld) looks as if he has survived his visit to the northland as well, but surely this government can take the steps necessary in order to accomplish this very important matter of giving our citizens an opportunity of buying a stake in Ontario.

Mr. Chairman, it is approaching six o'clock. I will start on the next section of my remarks as I know how anxious you are that the time be used efficiently. I am very much concerned with one quote that I noticed in the Smith report in my perusal of that weighty volume. It comes from section 46, page 424, and it says:

> We have no particular quarrel to pick with the existing grant for general welfare systems. This is not to say we are satisfied with the present system of financing welfare in Ontario, far from it. We find that the overall provision of welfare services in Ontario, including the fiscal dimension, is so wanting when judged by what are at once feasible and acceptable standards, that to suggest adjustments to the grant system would be akin to prescribing aspirin when only surgery will save the patient.

I actually was struck by the artistic flights of the authors of the report on some occasions. I have a compendium of these that I will be reading to you later in my remarks, because this is surely the place where the severe criticism of the administration must be made public, where we have an opportunity to inquire of the government what they are going to do to change the situation like that.

In the minute that remains to me, before I go on to discuss welfare matters in this province, I know that all of us—many of us are new members—are almost overwhelmed with the problems that come to us from our consituents, and sometimes it is worse than others. I have heard you come back after Sunday and you say, "Boy I got a lot of phone calls this week-end," and that is true. You know that they come sometimes more frequently than others.

This last week-end, I had the great misfortune to have two constituents of mine, both young men under 35 with family responsibilities, farming on a going concern, come to the realization that they were losing their sight and that they have been certified completely incapacitated in this regard. They both have young families and, in one case, the representatives of The Department of Social and Family Services provided through the CNIB a white cane for the gentleman and said that his wife, who was a trained teacher, would certainly be able to support the family and that was the extent that they would go.

That the two small children, both under three, would have to be cared for by this man who was totally blind—and it seems to me, the human indignity associated with a decision of that type—simply does not fit what most of us as hon. members would expect in this day of enlightened responsibility in a welfare field. I say there were two cases similar to that. The third one was a case where a lady phoned me and told me that the OPP had crashed into her 1967 Cadillac and that the car that she had been given to use was a 1964 Beaumont and what was I going to do about it.

So, you do get the extremes under those circumstances but when this debate resumes, Mr. Speaker, I would—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: What advice did the hon. leader of the Opposition give her?

Mr. Nixon: I told her that she had better phone the insurance adjuster. When this debate resumes, I would be glad to have an opportunity to discuss the welfare system in the province in more detail.

Mr. Nixon moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we will resume this debate.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 6:05 o'clock, p.m.

No. 6



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

First Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Thursday, February 22, 1968

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1968

5

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Thursday, February 22, 1968

First report, standing committee on standing orders and printing 137
Tabling report, Royal commission on coroners' inquests, Mr. Robarts 138
Presenting reports, Mr. Welch 138
Tabling reports, Mr. Stewart 138
Smiths Falls, town of, bill respecting, Mr. W. E. Johnston, first reading 139
Nepean township, bill respecting, Mr. W. E. Johnston, first reading 139
United Church-Evangelical United Brethren, bill respecting, Mr. Good, first reading 139
Peel county, bill respecting, Mr. Kennedy, first reading 139
Hamilton, city of, bill respecting, Mrs. Pritchard, first reading 139
Eastview, city of, bill respecting, Mr. Morin, first reading 139
Ottawa separate school board, bill respecting, Mr. Morin, first reading 139
Ontario county, bill respecting, Mr. W. Newman, first reading 139
Oshawa Young Women's Christian Association, bill respecting, Mr. Stokes, first reading 139
Barrie, city of, bill respecting, Mr. Olde, first reading 139
Ottawa, city of, bill respecting, Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence, first reading 139
Oshawa, city of, bill respecting, Mr. Stokes, first reading 139
Community Foundation of Ottawa and surrounding district, bill respecting, Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence, first reading 140
Lake of the Woods district hospital, bill respecting, Mr. Bernier, first reading 140
Canadian order of foresters, bill respecting, Mr. Makarchuk, first reading 140
Sault Ste. Marie, city of, bill respecting, Mr. J. R. Smith, first reading 140
Thessalon, town of, bill respecting, Mr. Paterson, first reading 140
Wool and Gift Shops, Toronto, Ltd., bill respecting, Mr. Deacon, first reading 140
Windsor, city of, bill respecting, Mr. B. Newman, first reading 140
Owen Sound Young Men's and Young Women's Christian Association, bill respecting, Mr. Sargent, first reading 140
Peterborough, city of, Mr. Pitman, first reading 140
Peterborough (2), city of, Mr. Pitman, bill respecting, first reading 140
Kitchener, city of, bill respecting, Mr. Breithaupt, first reading 140
Lutheran Church-Missouri synod, bill respecting, Mr. Breithaupt, first reading 140
London, city of, bill respecting, Mr. White, first reading 140
Imperial Sewing Machine Company Limited and Imperial Sewing Machine Company (Kitchener) Limited, bill respecting, Mr. Singer, first reading 140
Rayside township, bill respecting, Mr. Demers, first reading 141
Kingston, city of, bill respecting, Mr. Apps, first reading 141
Brockville club, bill respecting, Mr. Apps, first reading 141
Renfrew county, bill respecting, Mr. Hamilton, first reading 141
Chalk River, village of, bill respecting, Mr. Hamilton, first reading 141
Toronto, city of, bill respecting, Mr. Hamilton, first reading 141
Toronto city mission, bill respecting, Mr. Hamilton, first reading 141
Trustees of the Toronto general burying grounds, bill respecting, Mr. Hamilton, first reading 141
Statement re undesirable practices in buying, selling, and distributing fruits and vegetables, Mr. Stewart 141
Question to Mr. Gomme re statistics of accidents, injuries, fatalities and property damage on highways, Mr. Sopha 142
Questions to Mr. Grossman re training schools, Mr. Lewis 142
Questions to Mr. Rowntree re gasoline prices in northern Ontario, Mr. Martel 144
Question to Mr. Dymond re mental hospital facilities for Brant county, Mr. Makarchuk 144
Questions to Mr. Welch re Ontario wines, Mr. Ben 145
Question to Mr. Randall re Mr. Arthur Pollington, Mr. Davison 146
Questions to Mr. A. F. Lawrence re staking programmes in northwestern Ontario, Mr. Knight 146
Question to Mr. Brunelle re lamprey eels, Mr. Knight 147
Question to Mr. Robarts re tenants' rights, Mr. Lawlor 147
Question to Mr. Brunelle re uniforms of Lands and Forests personnel, Mr. Worton 147
Question to Mr. Haskett re snowmobiles, Mr. B. Newman 148
Questions to Mr. Simonett re flooding, Mr. Paterson 148
Questions to Mr. Stewart re ARDA, Mr. Sargent 149
Questions to Mr. Randall re exhibits at San Antonio and Tokyo, Mr. Sargent 149
Question to Mr. Robarts re the London Life Insurance Company, Mr. Sargent 149
Question to Mr. Wishart re sentencing, Mr. Sargent 150
Resumption of the debate on the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Nixon, Mr. MacDonald 151
Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. MacDonald, agreed to 171
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to 171

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 22, 1968

The House met at 2.30 o'clock p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are always pleased to have visitors to the Legislature and today we welcome as guests students from the following schools: In the east gallery—Frank Oke vocational school, Toronto; and Royal Orchard senior public school, Thornhill; and in the west gallery—from St. Mary's separate school, Toronto and Bishop Strachan school, Toronto. I am sure the members are glad to have these young people with them.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Mr. M. Hamilton (Renfrew North), from the standing committee on standing orders and printing, presented the committee's first report, which was read as follows and adopted:

Your committee has carefully examined the following petitions and finds the notices, as published in each case, sufficient:

Of the Canada conference The Evangelical United Brethren Church praying that an Act may pass confirming its union with The United Church of Canada.

Of the corporation of the town of Thessalon praying that an Act may pass permitting it to exempt from taxation certain property occupied by the Thessalon curling club.

Of the corporation of the city of Belleville praying that an Act may pass authorizing it to enter into agreements with suppliers of cable television.

Of The Oshawa Young Women's Christian Association praying that an Act may pass exempting it from municipal and school taxes.

Of the corporation of the city of Sault Ste. Marie praying that an Act may pass permitting it to acquire land and buildings by agreement of lease; and for other purposes.

Of the corporation of the county of Renfrew praying that an Act may pass validating a bylaw of the said county which established the Cobden-Eganville high school district.

Of the corporation of the city of Kingston praying that an Act may pass permitting it to establish certain conditions precedent to the development or redevelopment of land.

Of the corporation of the city of Hamilton praying that an Act may pass authorizing it to extend tax credits to owners or shareholders of co-operative apartments and condominium units.

Of the board of trustees of the Roman Catholic separate schools for the city of Ottawa praying that an Act may pass permitting the election of trustees in staggered terms.

Of the corporation of the town of Smith's Falls praying that an Act may pass changing the name of the town to town of Smiths Falls and making such spelling as legal and lawful in the past as if spelled with an apostrophe at that time.

Of the corporation of the city of Peterborough praying that an Act may pass authorizing the Peterborough utilities commission to enlarge and improve the botanical park.

Of Herbert R. Balls, George R. Berry, Mrs. F. S. Browne, Anthony C. Butler, G. M. Demers, D. Donald Diplock, Stuart Godfrey, E. W. I. Keenleyside, Raymond C. Labarge, His Honour Judge Peter J. Macdonald, Miss Velma Reid, R. S. Rooney, I. Norman Smith, Robert W. Southam, Henry Stubbins, Fletcher Troop and Lloyd Vineberg praying that an Act may pass establishing the community foundation of Ottawa and district.

Of the corporation of the city of Peterborough praying that an Act may pass authorizing election to public office on the ward system.

Of the corporation of the village of Chalk River praying that an Act may pass confirming the boundaries of the said village.

Of the corporation of the county of Ontario praying that an Act may pass increasing the voting power of reeves and deputy reeves of some of the local municipalities.

Of the corporation of the city of Barrie praying that an Act may pass establishing a parks and recreation commission.

Of the trustees of the Toronto general burying grounds praying that an Act may pass authorizing it to acquire lands for burying grounds outside of the county of York.

Of the Owen Sound Young Men's and Young Women's Christian Association praying that an Act may pass exempting it from municipal and school taxes.

Of the corporation of the county of Peel praying that an Act may pass authorizing it to issue and sell sinking fund debentures.

Of the corporation of the city of London praying that an Act may pass abolishing the London railway commission; and for other purposes.

Of the corporation of the city of Oshawa praying that an Act may pass authorizing it to provide for in the current estimates, sums to cover deficits of the public transportation system operated by the public utilities commission; and for other purposes.

Of Lilth Standish, Thomas T. Standish and Gerrard S. MacLean praying that an Act may pass reviving the company known as Wool and Gift Shops (Toronto) Limited.

Of the corporation of the township of Nepean praying that an Act may pass authorizing it to require distributors of cable television to enter into financial agreement with the corporation.

Of the corporation of the city of Kitchener praying that an Act may pass authorizing it to issue and sell debentures to acquire certain lands; and for other purposes.

Of the corporation of the township of Rayside praying that an Act may pass authorizing it to issue and sell debentures for school purposes.

Of the corporation of the city of Toronto praying that an Act may pass to annul the condition that lands known as Clarence Square should be held forever as a public square; and for other purposes.

Of the corporation of the city of Windsor praying that an Act may pass authorizing it to enforce compliance with the standards of fitness for human habitation of dwellings; and for other purposes.

Of William W. Grant, J. Lawrence Pergau and George Edgar Heasman praying that an Act may pass making the Brockville club a corporation without share capital.

Of The Lutheran Church—Missouri synod praying that an Act may pass authorizing it to acquire and hold lands in mortmain.

Of the corporation of the city of Eastview praying that an Act may pass continuing the city in the name of the corporation of the city of Vanier, and la corporation de la cité de Vanier in the French language.

Of the Canadian Order of Foresters praying that an Act may pass authorizing it to apply to the Parliament of Canada for a special Act continuing the society under the name of Canadian Foresters Life Insurance Society, and in French, Foresters Canadiens Societé d'Assurance Vie.

Of the corporation of the city of Ottawa praying that an Act may pass authorizing it to regulate and license coin vending machines; and for other purposes.

Of Abraham Martin, Ruth Martin and Howard Martin praying that an Act may pass reviving the charters of Imperial Sewing Machine Company Limited and Imperial Sewing Machine Company (Kitchener) Limited.

Of Rev. Gordon V. Crofoot, Dr. Edward S. Fish, Mr. J. A. Northey, Mr. Harold D. Poole, Mr. Lawrence M. Stark, Miss Ivy M. Bunt and Miss Marjorie E. Finch praying that an Act may pass reviving the letters patent of incorporation of the Toronto city mission.

Of the board of directors of Kenora general hospital and St. Joseph hospital praying that an Act may pass establishing Lake of the Woods district hospital.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to table the report of the Royal commission to investigate allegations relating to coroners' inquests.

Hon. R. S. Welch (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present to the House the following reports:

Annual report of the liquor control board of Ontario for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1967.

The 1966 annual report of the Hydro Electric Power Commission of Ontario;

Public service superannuation fund report on the audit for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1967;

Annual report of the Ontario food terminal board for the year ending March 31, 1967;

Annual report of the Ontario stockyards board for the year ending June 30, 1967;

Report of the loans made under The Co-operative Loans Act during the period January 1, 1967 to December 31, 1967; and

Annual report of the Ontario telephone service commission for 1966.

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to table the report of the Ontario Department of Agriculture and Food, and the report of the agricultural research institute of Ontario.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): On a point of order, I wonder if the Premier

has arranged for the members of the House to have copies of the Parker report?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: It will be distributed here as soon as I have tabled it—

Mr. Nixon: That is fine.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: —and the arrangements have been made.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Is it worth reading?

Mr. Speaker: Reports.

Motions.

Mr. Sopha moves, seconded by Mr. Ben, that Mr. Deacon be substituted for Mr. Sargent on the standing committee on legal bills and municipal affairs; and that Mr. Braithwaite be substituted for Mr. Trotter on the standing committee on welfare and reform.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: Introduction of bills.

TOWN OF SMITHS FALLS

Mr. W. E. Johnston (Carleton) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the town of Smiths Falls.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

TOWNSHIP OF NEPEAN

Mr. W. E. Johnston moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the township of Nepean.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

UNITED CHURCH—EVANGELICAL UNITED BRETHREN

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting The United Church—Evangelical United Brethren.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

COUNTY OF PEEL

Mr. R. D. Kennedy (Peel South) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the county of Peel.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

CITY OF HAMILTON

Mrs. A. Pritchard (Hamilton West) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the city of Hamilton.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

CITY OF EASTVIEW

Mr. J. Morin (Ottawa East) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the city of Eastview.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

OTTAWA SEPARATE SCHOOL BOARD

Mr. Morin moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the Ottawa separate school board.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

COUNTY OF ONTARIO

Mr. W. Newman (Ontario South) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the county of Ontario.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

OSHAWA YOUNG WOMEN'S CHRISTIAN ASSOCIATION

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the Oshawa Young Women's Christian Association.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

CITY OF BARRIE

Mr. N. L. Olde (Middlesex South) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the city of Barrie.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

CITY OF OTTAWA

Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence (Carleton East) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the city of Ottawa.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

CITY OF OSHAWA

Mr. Stokes moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the city of Oshawa.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

COMMUNITY FOUNDATION OF OTTAWA AND SURROUNDING DISTRICT

Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the community foundation of Ottawa and surrounding district.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

LAKE OF THE WOODS DISTRICT HOSPITAL

Mr. L. Bernier (Kenora) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the Lake of the Woods district hospital.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

CANADIAN ORDER OF FORESTERS

Mr. M. Makarchuk (Brantford) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the Canadian order of foresters.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

CITY OF SAULT STE. MARIE

Mr. J. R. Smith (Hamilton Mountain) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the city of Sault Ste. Marie.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

TOWN OF THESSALON

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the town of Thessalon.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

WOOL AND GIFT SHOPS, TORONTO, LTD.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting Wool and Gift Shops, Toronto, Ltd.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

CITY OF WINDSOR

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor - Walkerville) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the city of Windsor.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

OWEN SOUND YOUNG MEN'S AND YOUNG WOMEN'S CHRISTIAN ASSOCIATION

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the Owen Sound Young Men's and Young Women's Christian Association.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

CITY OF PETERBOROUGH (1)

Mr. W. G. Pitman (Peterborough) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the city of Peterborough.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

CITY OF PETERBOROUGH (2)

Mr. Pitman moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the city of Peterborough.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

CITY OF KITCHENER

Mr. J. R. Breithaupt (Kitchener) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the city of Kitchener.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

LUTHERAN CHURCH—MISSOURI SYNOD

Mr. Breithaupt moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the Lutheran Church—Missouri synod.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

CITY OF LONDON

Mr. J. H. White (London South) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the city of London.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

IMPERIAL SEWING MACHINE LIMITED

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting Imperial Sewing Machine Company Limited and Imperial Sewing Machine Company (Kitchener) Limited.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

TOWNSHIP OF RAYSIDE

Mr. J. C. G. Demers (Nickel Belt) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the township of Rayside.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

CITY OF KINGSTON

Mr. S. Apps (Kingston and the Islands) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the city of Kingston.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

BROCKVILLE CLUB

Mr. Apps moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the Brockville club.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

COUNTY OF RENFREW

Mr. Hamilton moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the county of Renfrew.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

VILLAGE OF CHALK RIVER

Mr. Hamilton moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the village of Chalk River.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

CITY OF TORONTO

Mr. Hamilton moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the city of Toronto.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

TORONTO CITY MISSION

Mr. Hamilton moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the Toronto city mission.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

TORONTO GENERAL BURYING GROUNDS

Mr. Hamilton moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the trustees of the Toronto general burying grounds.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, before the Legislature undertakes the business of the day, I would like to ask your permission to introduce a matter which I deem to be of extreme importance to both the producers and consumers of agricultural and food products.

Several months ago it was brought to my attention there was some evidence that certain undesirable practices had crept into the buying, selling and distributing of fruits and vegetables in the province of Ontario.

In the face of this evidence and with the full co-operation of the Attorney General's office, a preliminary investigation into these charges was undertaken. The results of that investigation are now in my hands and on the basis of this evidence, it would appear that in some commodities at least the practice commonly known as "payola" may be in existence.

It has been reported to us, for example, that some buyers of fruits and vegetables in this province have been demanding and receiving from producers and producer groups, kick-backs and under the table commissions in return for the guarantee of certain market outlets.

This is a highly unethical practice, one that violates every concept of the free market and it is one that penalizes both the producer and consumer from a financial standpoint.

Having consideration for the evidence before us, and realizing the seriousness of this situation and the many undesirable implications it could have for the food industry, I wish to announce that a complete public inquiry will be held into these matters.

Chapter 94 of the statutes of Ontario 1962-1963, entitled The Ontario Producers, Processors, Distributors and Consumers Food Council Act, confers upon the chairman of the Ontario food council all the powers that may be conferred upon a commissioner under The Public Inquiries Act. A special meeting of the Ontario food council was held on February 20 to discuss this matter and the members of the council unanimously approved a resolution which called for investigation into discrimination and undesirable trade practices in the food industry.

I think it is important to note at this time, that the members of the Ontario food council represent the broad spectrum of interests in the food industry.

R. D. Beattie of Thamesford represents the primary producers. Mr. J. Douglas Small, president of the Schneider Meat Packing

Company in Kitchener represents the processors. Mr. Ivor Crimp, vice-president of Dominion Stores Limited represents the distributors and Mrs. W. A. C. Sheppard of the consumers' association of Canada represents the consumers. Mrs. Sheppard was unable to attend this special meeting, but was represented by Mrs. W. A. Breckin of the consumers' association of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, by order in council we have directed Mr. Douglas E. Williams, chairman of the Ontario food council to begin investigations into this matter and to report his findings as soon as these investigations are complete. Although the authority for investigation vested in the Ontario food council is quite broad, Mr. Williams has been directed to investigate particularly:

1. The sale and distribution of fruits and vegetables from shippers in Essex county;

2. The purchasing practices of wholesale and retail distributors of fruits and vegetables; and

3. The sale and distribution of fruits and vegetables from any part of Ontario.

As chairman of this investigation, Mr. Williams will have the full authority to summon any person and to require him to give evidence under oath and to require him to produce such documents and information as he deems requisite to this inquiry.

As Minister of Agriculture and Food in this province, Mr. Speaker, I consider this inquiry to be of very great importance. We in this Legislature must know and the producers and consumers of the food products are entitled to know whether or not these unethical trade practices have crept into the food distribution system.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister could tell the House the sources of the allegations of bribery?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: It reached us from various places, and I did not use the word bribery in any way.

Mr. Nixon: What about payola? If the Minister is going to use payola, does it not mean the same thing?

Mr. Speaker: The Minister of Highways has an explanation of a question and answer of yesterday, which I think we would like to have at this time.

Hon. G. E. Gomme (Minister of Highways): Mr. Speaker, yesterday the hon. member for Sudbury asked me a question which I answered, but he also asked a supplementary question. As a result of that I made some further inquiries in my department and I would like to give the question and the answer as I have it today.

The question:

> Are statistics kept or compiled in respect of the happening of accidents, personal injuries, fatalities and property damage at specific points and places on highways within the jurisdiction of the province? Are such statistics available to the public upon request? If not, why?

The answer: The statistics referred to are compiled in book form by The Department of Highways, with the exception of property damage amounts. While property damage amounts are on file, because of the limitation of space they are not included in the book. Books are available to consulting engineers, municipal officers, and other persons who by the nature of their work have a definite use for them, and can properly interpret the information. The publications may be obtained for $5 by the above-mentioned people from the traffic section, planning branch, Department of Highways.

Mr. Speaker: Yesterday, in the absence of the Minister of Reform Institutions, the member for Scarborough West withheld a question. I wonder if he would be prepared to ask that now?

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): To the Minister, Mr. Speaker:

1. Is it the Minister's intention to amend The Training Schools Act this session, with the object of deleting that clause which allows for the referral of children under the age of 12 to training schools?

2. Is it the Minister's intention to transfer in the near future the training school for under 12 year olds at Hagersville, known as White Oaks village, to the jurisdiction of The Department of Health?

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): Mr. Speaker, in rising to answer these questions, I would like to explain that I was away: "Let it be said for the record," as the hon. member for Sudbury says—that I was away on government business in Ottawa. In the hon. member's questions—

An hon. member: I do not know how much he got done but he was there.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am afraid even I could not help them out of the mess they are in up there, so I came back. Mr. Speaker, in the hon. member's question 1 he refers,

and I quote, "to that clause which allows for referral of children".

I can only assume that the hon. member means section 8 of The Training Schools Act under which children are admitted to a training school. The Ontario Training Schools Act, 1965, created a suitable framework for positive action to be taken for the child's welfare. The provisions of the new Act were based on the results of a study of the social and emotional needs of delinquent children, which had been carried out at the University of Toronto school of social work.

This study was supplemented by a world-wide survey of juvenile delinquency legislation, and an intensive inquiry by a committee of officials of the department with the participation of the school of social work. The committee studied recommendations of the Canadian corrections association and met on a number of occasions with juvenile and family court judges, and representatives of the children's aid societies.

The Act embodies legal safeguards for the protection of civil rights of children and their parents, including a right of appeal. Under this Act, the Minister divested himself of the power to admit youngsters to training schools by administrative decision. All future admissions had to be made only by court order. The Act carefully avoids labelling children either as "delinquent", or as "neglected", as all such labels have been found to be detrimental. Overall, the new training schools Act creates an atmosphere in which positive, progressive programmes of treatment and training are an essential facet in dealing with the total problem of juvenile delinquents.

Under section 8, a child may be admitted to a training school only on the following grounds, and I quote:

> That there is evidence that the parents or guardian of the child are unable to control him, or to provide for his social, emotional, or educational needs, and further evidence that the child's needs can best be satisfied in a training school rather than elsewhere.

And that is the end of the quote from the section.

No decision under this section can be directed against the child. It can only be made in a child's favour in the situations in which his welfare demands it and the facts, to be stated by the judge, justify it. Therefore, in view of the foregoing, and in the best interests of the children, the answer to the specific question is "No".

In relation to question 2:

> Is it the Minister's intention to transfer, in the near future, the training school for under 12 year olds at Hagersville, known as White Oaks village to the jurisdiction of The Department of Health?

I would remind the hon. member, Mr. Speaker, that the Ontario Legislature debate official report, Tuesday, March 2, 1965, afternoon session, page 877, records the following statement made by the hon. member—that is in reference to the bill which resulted in the new Training Schools Act, and I am quoting him:

> I think the bill is unquestionably a step forward. I do not deny it, every hon. member in this House doubtless agrees, it enunciates important principles. It is an advance in social legislation on the part of the hon. Minister, but, and this is of crucial importance, nowhere does the bill guarantee that the principle enunciated will govern the attitude and treatment within the training schools themselves. That, of course, is the total flaw in the substance of this bill.

And that is the end of the quote of the hon. member.

I am sure that the hon. member is aware that his fears expressed at that time were unfounded. In order to assure that the philosophy enunciated in this Act was carried out to its full extent and purpose, my department established White Oaks village for boys under the age of 12. It was established as a result of our research findings in bringing forth The Training Schools Act, 1965.

I am, indeed, and I speak for my staff as well, very proud that this school and its programme has been developed and is being operated by my department. White Oaks provides a cottage setting for boys under 12, admitted to the school after an adjudication in the juvenile and family court. The programme is developed upon the premise that the immediate need of these children is to feel secure, to be able to make and preserve trusting relationships with adults and each other. Control is established in an aura of mutual respect, and in terms of warm worker/child relationships.

The boys live in groups of eight to ten, each cared for by a team of five child-care workers. The teams are composed of men and women selected for their interest in the work, previous experience in working with children, and ability to understand the philosophy of the school.

The cottages form part of a small village which also houses some staff members and their families. The children of the staff intermingle and play with the boys from the cottages. We have integrated the community in such a way that the boys think of themselves as belonging to, and as part of, the village.

The children receive a great deal of personalized attention due to the high staff/student ratio of child-care workers. This is also carried forward into the educational programme, where small classes of seven to 11 pupils per classroom receive an individualized educational programme directed towards each child's specific needs by highly qualified and specialized teachers in such areas as remedial reading, and so on.

In addition to the team of child-care workers and teachers, the services of a psychiatric social worker are provided at White Oaks, and outside community resources are employed to their fullest extent in providing special services for children requiring them. In this regard, out-patient services are provided by the speech therapy clinic at the Brantford general hospital, the mental health clinic at Hamilton, and the children's psychiatric research institute in London.

The success of our programme at White Oaks village is so well recognized that the school of social work of Carleton University, Ottawa, is using this facility as a field placement for social work students. The child-care workers' course provided at the college of applied arts and technology, Toronto, has also recognized the value of this programme in the training of the students enrolled in this course, with the result that students have been receiving their field training at White Oaks village for the past two years.

The answer to the question, therefore, Mr. Speaker, again in the best interests of the children is, "No".

Mr. Speaker: Yesterday also, the member for Sudbury East withheld a question directed to the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs and perhaps he would ask it now.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): Is the government considering discussions with the oil companies in an effort to overcome the more than five cents a gallon differential being paid for gas by residents of northern Ontario, as compared to residents of southern Ontario?

Second, can the Minister advise the members as to the cost of transportation per gallon of gas to northern Ontario?

Third, why is there such a disparity in the cost of gas between the north and south?

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the officials of my department are, at present, evaluating data on this matter.

I am advised the geographical differences in price are unavoidable and exist in various regions of the province, including Metropolitan Toronto. With respect to the north, I understand that the differential has to do with the cost of freight, dealers' mark-up, and certain additional costs of handling. These costs vary according to the means of transportation employed and the distances involved between the shipper and the receiver.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Order please, the member for Sudbury East apparently has a supplementary question.

Mr. Martel: Will the Minister stop the exploitation of the residents of northern Ontario by the gas companies?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: I hardly think—

Mr. Speaker: Might I ask the member first if he would ascertain if the Minister would accept a supplementary question. When will the Minister move to stop the exploitation of the residents of northern Ontario by the oil companies?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: I do not consider that a supplementary question.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): The Minister is right, it is the basic question.

Mr. Speaker: I think as we proceed with the questions before the orders of the day that I should acknowledge the presence of scholars from quite a long distance—from the Ridgetown agricultural college of technology in Ridgetown, who have now come into our galleries.

Mr. Makarchuk: I have a question for the Minister of Health. Has the Minister rejected a request from the Brant county medical association and the county mental health association for a change in the designated mental hospital for Brant county from St. Thomas to Hamilton, and if so, is the Minister considering the possibility of expanding the psychiatric wing of the Brantford

general hospital to provide more beds for in-patient treatment?

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, no, I have not rejected any such request as I have indicated in our reply to the Brant county medical association and the county mental health association. We are presently in the process of preparing master plans for all our Ontario hospitals. These are aimed at providing support for plans for further development of services throughout all our communities. We advised those two organizations that we are not in a position to alter the catchment area boundaries at the present time, but that their requests would be given consideration in the development of our master plans.

I would point out that the 1965 Brantford general hospital was given approval to establish 50 psychiatric beds. So far, they have only established 36.

Mr. G. Ben (Humber): When this question was first phrased, a copy was supposed to have gone to the Minister of Agriculture and Food and the Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Randall), soon to be the Minister of Trade and Development. Since the Niagara peninsula is world famous for the quality of the wines it produces, will this government institute a programme requiring that Ontario wines be served exclusively at all provincial functions in Canada and abroad to promote these wines?

Also, will this government request all other levels of government in Ontario and elsewhere in Canada to institute the same programme?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, I share the enthusiasm of the hon. member with respect to the quality of the product that comes from this particularly favoured part of the province of Ontario. This is a very relevant question and I am sure one, the answer to which will be read with some interest by the hundreds of grape growers who come from that great and progressive county of Lincoln.

Mr. G. Bukator (Niagara Falls): And Welland county!

Hon. Mr. Welch: There are those in Welland and some in Niagara Falls and some in Welland South.

I do not know how many producers there are in Humber, but we certainly hope there are lots of consumers in Humber.

Now, having said that, I take it that the question is directed here because the operation of the government hospitality fund is under The Department of the Provincial Secretary. For a number of years this department of government, through the hospitality fund, has done everything possible to encourage the use of domestic products such as those to which you make reference. In fact, in the brochure that goes out to all people who receive the benefit of the government hospitality fund, it is set out that whenever possible the menu should reflect the produce of Ontario. Indeed, this is very important and I am going to send over to the member some tangible evidence of the interest of the government in this very important matter—some sample menus which certainly speak louder than any answer that I could give to this very important question.

Insofar as question number 2 in concerned, I would hope that the hon. member would join with me and with all members who represent grape growing areas of this province in continuing to encourage the use of this local product on the part of those who use the beverage.

I suppose all we can do is to encourage those who use the product to exercise a preference. I can assure you that my colleagues and I intend to do everything that is humanly possible to promote the use of domestic products because we realize the necessity of the producers of the grapes having an outlet for the processed product.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Speaker, would the Minister accept a supplementary question? As I indicated, Mr. Speaker, copies of this question were to go to the Minister of Economics and Development and the Minister of Agriculture and Food. But is the Provincial Secretary aware—and I trust that the other two Ministers are listening—that Canadian wines were not served exclusively at Expo at the Ontario functions? Is he aware that the *Canadian Beverage Review* of August, 1967, reported that Canadian wines were not served at Expo, nor are they served exclusively in our offices abroad. And does the Minister think of this as a good policy to be followed by this government when they keep preaching "Buy Canadian"?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, I would not presume to answer the questions for the Minister of Economics and Development, but I can assure the House that with respect to the Expo situation, the Minister of Economics and Development met with the representatives of Ontario grape growers' marketing board in order to insure that the product of Ontario

vineyards was very much publicized and highlighted on the menu.

If the hon. member was at Expo, he would have found on the wine list a great headline setting out the various varieties of Ontario wine which were available. If he had eaten in the outdoor section of the Ontario pavilion he would have found a great emphasis with respect to the availability of that product.

I think that the Minister of Economics and Development and all those connected with him are to be commended on behalf of the Ontario grape growers' marketing board for the emphasis which was placed on domestic wines for the people who came to Expo.

The grape growers of the progressive riding of Lincoln know very well the world reputation of our domestic wines in any international competition. Indeed, if the hon. member wants to be of some help—and I would not dare discuss litigation which is presently before the court—he would join with me and other members who represent grape growers on a little trip to Ottawa to talk about some agreement down there; about appellations of origin, the amendment of which would be of tremendous assistance to us in promoting this very matter in which he has shown such a keen and a real interest.

Mr. Ben: Will the hon. Minister accept a supplementary to the supplementary question?

Mr. Speaker: I think that the matter has been well pursued. Perhaps if the other Ministers at some later time having been here and received the questions from my office have something to add, I am sure they will—

Mr. Ben: If I do not ask him, I will have to ask another Minister, and it will take an hour.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Hamilton Centre has the floor.

Mr. N. Davison (Hamilton Centre): I have a question for the Minister of Economics and Development. What steps will the Ontario housing corporation take to ensure that Mr. Arthur Pollington, his wife and nine children can obtain accommodation in public housing in the Hamilton area?

Hon. S. J. Randall (Minister of Economics and Development): The administration of all family housing in the city of Hamilton—both federal, provincial and Ontario housing is carried out by the Hamilton housing authority on behalf of the Ontario housing corporation. The application of Mr. Arthur Pollington, who is an employee of the city of Hamilton, was brought to the attention of the Ontario housing corporation on Tuesday, February 19, 1968.

The Ontario housing corporation contacted the chairman of the Hamilton housing authority the same day, and yesterday, the Pollington family received a visit from a representative of the housing authority to ascertain the condition and adequacy of their present living accommodation in relation to other applicants on the waiting list. A report of their visit will come before the housing authority on Friday of this week, February 23, 1968, and I am advised that the Pollington family will be notified of the authority's decision the same day. Mr. Pollington and his family presently occupy a semi-detached, six-room dwelling in the Hamilton north end urban renewal area.

When inspected by the professional staff of the city of Hamilton, this dwelling was rated as being in fair condition. At the present time, the house is privately owned, but will become the property of the city of Hamilton by the end of this month. It has been acquired by the city as it stands in the path of the proposed perimeter road of the urban renewal area. However, we are advised that possession of the dwelling will not be required until later this year.

Mr. R. H. Knight (Port Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Mines. I wonder if the Minister could tell me, in view of the results of the claim-staking rush in the Elliot Lake area, is his department prepared to foster a similar staking programme in the Dryden area of northwestern Ontario where a rich uranium discovery is reported? And further, does the department propose to repeat the Elliot Lake experiment in any other area of the province?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence (Minister of Mines): First of all, may I say that the only information of any new uranium strike, or rush, at the moment, is one that is currently taking place in the Sioux Lookout area and not in the Dryden area, and I believe that my hon. friend may be referring to that particular spot at the moment.

If he is comparing the Elliot Lake area and the Sioux Lookout area in respect to the staking procedures, I may say that there is simply no such relation between the two situations. At Elliot Lake, there was a large tract of interesting land that had been withdrawn from staking some time previously. In the Sioux Lookout area there has been no such withdrawal and the claims are being staked on lands that are already available for prospecting.

In view of the success at Elliot Lake, it is conceivable that the same procedure might be followed in a similar situation, but it is not a similar situation at Sioux Lookout. It could only be done, of course, if it were found that the province was in possession of a large tract of land that was no longer required and which was of interest to the mining industry.

Mr. Knight: In reply, may I say that my information is—

Mr. Speaker: This is a question period, and the members are restricted to asking questions. If you wish to ask a supplementary question, you will please ask the Minister if he will receive it, and it will only be a question that is asked at this time.

Mr. Knight: By way of clarification then, may I place a question for the hon. Minister? Is the Minister aware that the disclosure that this uranium strike took place in the Dryden area is found in a current publication of the northwestern Ontario development council, which is a body of the department of the provincial government, and which is a source of information for all of us in northwestern Ontario? I refer you to the last publication of the council.

Mr. Speaker, I have a second question, this time for the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests. Is there any reason to fear that his department will have to cut back to any extent its lamprey or alewives control programme in the Great Lakes this season because of a possible lack of funds?

Hon. R. Brunelle (Minister of Lands and Forests): Mr. Speaker, in answer to the hon. member for Port Arthur, the lamprey control programme in the Great Lakes is operated by the international Great Lakes fishery commission with funds supplied by the federal governments of both Canada and the United States. The Canadian agent for the actual carrying out of the programme in our waters is The Department of Fisheries in Ottawa. We, in the province of Ontario are not involved.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Highways. Could the Minister advise when his department will announce the route of the proposed, controlled access highway from Sarnia to London, or linking with the Macdonald-Cartier freeway?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Speaker, I think that I will take this question as notice.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): Mr. Speaker, I rise to ask a question on a matter of personal privilege. The Premier has today tabled a slanderous, untrue report. When will we be given an opportunity to debate this shameful document?

Mr. Speaker: Order! Order! If the member wishes to rise on a matter of personal privilege, he will use language that is proper for this chamber; and deal with matters which are proper to be raised here.

Mr. Shulman: The question is, when will we be given the opportunity to debate this shameful document? And those are proper words for it.

Mr. Speaker: I would advise the member that at the moment that is a question that is not answerable and cannot be answered at least until the members have had the opportunity to peruse the document. Then I would suspect that there would be no hindrance to any member who wishes to speak on that, or any other matter, doing so in the appropriate debates of this House.

The member for Lakeshore has a question.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Mr. Speaker, the question is for the Prime Minister. Does the hon. Prime Minister intend to introduce legislation during this session to safeguard the rights of tenants in respect to unreasonable rent hikes, seizure of security deposits, and so on?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, I am unable at this moment to say that the government intends to introduce such legislation.

Mr. Ben: The hon. Provincial Secretary was answering my question. He sent over to me what he stated were menus containing Ontario products. I would just point out to him that one of them—

Mr. Speaker: Order! The member has not stated any point of order.

Mr. Ben: The point of order is that the hon. Minister unintentionally misled this House in stating that these were menus containing Ontario products when, as I say, one begins with orange and grapefruit supreme, and ends up with Cassata Neapolitani.

Mr. D. M. De Monte (Dovercourt): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Davis) which I will stand down until tomorrow as I see that he is not in his chair.

Mr. H. Worton (Wellington South): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister

of Lands and Forests. Would the Minister please explain to the House why his department has purchased uniforms for park attendants that are made in Japan, while the Ontario trade crusade has been urging the public to buy Canadian?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to reply to the hon. member's question. All the department's uniforms are purchased from reliable Canadian firms, and to the best of our knowledge these are made from Canadian products. If the hon. member has a particular reference, we will be pleased to look into it.

Mr. Paterson: Mr. Speaker, I have a—

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Transport. A copy of the question has been submitted to him. What type of legislation does the government contemplate introducing at this session to regulate the use and safety of snowmobiles?

Hon. I. Haskett (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, the matter of motorized snow vehicles is under very careful consideration by our department at this time. The results of that study will be made known to the House in the fullness of time.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Speaker, may I ask a supplementary question? Will the Minister have legislation introduced before the snow leaves?

Mr. Paterson: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Energy and Resources Management. What steps, if any, were taken by your department to try to control the serious flooding that occurred in the Chatham area earlier this month?

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Mr. Speaker, a river forecast was issued by the conservation authorities branch, Department of Energy and Resources Management, on February 1, indicating concern for high run-off in the rivers of southern Ontario.

Additional river forecasts were issued daily up to and including February 5. When the emergency flood forecast was issued on February 1 to all news media, newspapers, radio and television, the resources managers in all the affected conservation authorities were also advised to maintain river watch in their particular area. The staff of the conservation authorities branch was also advised to be prepared for emergency measures. Continuous flood watch was maintained until February 6.

Emergency measures branch was also alerted on February 1 to the potential flood condition developing in southern Ontario. On the Thames River the district engineer, the conservation authorities branch, and the resources manager, lower Thames conservation authority, together established continuous watch on the river and the operation of the flood control dams at Woodstock, Fanshawe, Stratford, Wildwood and Mitchell.

Direct liaison was also maintained with the engineering works department of the affected municipalitities in the vulnerable flood areas. Personnel from the conservation authorities branch, Toronto, travelled extensively throughout the Thames watershed during the movement of the flood downstream, in order to appraise and co-ordinate activities of the flood warning programme. Prior to the initial flood run-off, the lower Thames valley conservation authority dynamited the mouth of the river to loosen the high peak. On February 2, an ice breaker was ordered from Amherstburg to proceed to the mouth of the Thames River to break up the ice at the mouth and remove ice jams in the river. Two ice breakers answered the call and covered the 48 miles through the ice of Lake St. Clair to reach the mouth of the river by Saturday evening. The ice breakers continued the programme of clearing the ice through to February 7.

The cost of hiring the ice breakers was approximately $25,000 of which some $8,000 was in the emergency fund of the authority. This flood is the third highest in the past 50 years. However, due to the effective reservoir operations and effective warning, damage was limited to property immediately adjacent to the river. The forecast peak level issued at noon, February 3, was 591 feet. The peak level recorded in Chatham occurred on the evening of February 5 and was 591.5 feet.

Mr. Paterson: Would the Minister accept a supplementary question? In view of press statements that I have read in the past day or so, is the conservation branch investigating the allegations that the Fanshawe dam water level was not lowered last fall and this neglect contributed to the flooding in the Chatham and lower Thames area?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Speaker, I am not able to answer that question. This is the first I have heard anything about it. If the member would like to give me another question tomorrow I will be happy to get the answer. I do not have all the answers in my head.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, a question to the hon. Minister of Agriculture and Food which I failed to read yesterday. Would he answer it now please, regarding ARDA?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: The hon. member did not read it yesterday.

Mr. Sargent: Well, I will go through the motion here. How many employees are involved in ARDA operations in the province of Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: There are 51 members on the staff of the ARDA branch of our department, but there are many others in other departments who are carrying out ARDA projects under the direction of the ARDA director.

Mr. Sargent: Would the Minister accept a supplementary on that please? Does he feel that is sufficient to handle the budget which you are going to have from the federal government this year along with your own?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: We will have to wait till the budget, Mr. Speaker, to know how much we have to handle.

Mr. Bukator: That is being evasive, is it not?

Mr. Sargent: A question to the hon. Minister of Economics and Development. Briefly, does the province plan to have exhibits in Hamisfair in San Antonio, Texas, and the world's fair in Tokyo; how much will be budgeted; and to whom will the concessions be let insofar as: (1) The general building contract is concerned; (2) Restaurant and beverage facilities; (3) Will the above be on a tender basis?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Being a man of a few thousand words I will answer this with a short reply today. The answer to the first question is no. The province of Ontario will not exhibit at Hamisfair. Yes, the province will exhibit at the world's fair at Osaka, Japan, in 1970.

Third question: The nature and extent of Ontario's participation at Expo 70 are at a very preliminary stage. No decisions with respect to the form of the contract for the building, or whether or not there will be concessions of any description, have been made at this time.

I might say officials of my department will be meeting with the Expo officials on March 4 and 5 and at that time we will know what the conditions of operation will be and I will be glad to give you further information.

Mr. Sargent: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question to the hon. Premier. Will the Premier advise the House why my question relative to the amount of commission, and who received it, insofar as the insurance of the civil service placed with London Life Insurance Company, was not answered in this House?

Mr. Speaker: If the member will read the proceedings of this House as printed he will find that his question is there and that in due course it will be answered in this House.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, I take objection to this. This is a matter that does not need review, it can be answered very briefly and quickly.

Mr. Speaker: Order! Order!

Mr. Sargent: He knows the answer. Why does he not tell us?

Mr. Speaker: The member surely realizes that the questions which are to be placed before the orders of the day at daily sittings are those of importance and urgency; which do not require a great deal of research. Under all those counts this is not a question which I could accept as one before the orders of the day. The answer will come and I will do my best to insure that it does come in a reasonable time. I trust that the member will then be properly satisfied.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, if I might enter this discussion here, I appreciate your ruling and I abide by it, but I would point out that in the question period in this House we on the government side do our best to answer all questions as fully as we can in order to provide information to the Opposition members who ask these questions. On the other hand, I do think the Opposition would necessarily appreciate it if we were to answer other than the questions that we hear asked. The member asked a question and I answered it. I can refer him to *Hansard*, I can refer him to the question. I can refer him to the answer.

Obviously he was looking for something other than that contained in answer to the question he asked, but I do not consider that he or any one on the Opposition side wants myself or any member of the government to interpret their questions.

In other words, we must answer the question that is asked us even if it does not make any sense, which is sometimes the case.

I know what the hon. member is referring to, but he did not ask it, and the question being asked today refers back to the question asked previously which cannot be altered because it is in the record in the form in which it was asked, and in that form it was answered. I would be delighted to provide the information if I can only find out really what the question is.

While I am on my feet, may I say that while the question period is something which I think is very important in this House, I would like to point out that nobody on this side of the House, at any rate, is being fooled by these supplementary questions. We all realize that the supplementary question is figured out and written down and arranged to be asked at the same time the main question is asked.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I just want to point out to hon. members that they are not fooling anybody on this side of the House. Now, if they want to use the question—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: If they want to ask their questions in this way, we are quite prepared to answer them. But I would point out, as I sit here day after day, and listen to question after question, in many cases the main question and answer is not even listened to. The member is anxious to get to the supplementary question because he thinks that there he might be able to introduce some element of embarrassment.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Now, while I am referring to the procedures in this House—and I think as leader of the government I am entitled so to do—I consider the question period to be a very important part of the function of this Legislature. I would not do anything at any time to limit it in its effectiveness. On the other hand, I do see some areas in which its effectiveness might be imprudent.

May I suggest to the hon. members opposite, embody your supplementary questions in the main question because we all know it is coming anyway. Then I think we may be able to save some time. So far today we have been an hour and thirty-five minutes in the House without reaching the orders of the day. Anything we can do to cut this period of time down without restricting the rights of the hon. members to question the government, I think we should do. And this is one suggestion that I make.

Mr. Lewis: In terms of what the Prime Minister has put to the House, I asked two questions today which could have been answered in the negative by one word in each case, and the House was given 15 minutes of self-congratulatory praise by the Premier's Minister. Now, let it be understood that if there are occasional excesses, they exist on both sides of the House.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the member for Grey-Bruce will make a third try and I will be glad to have the question tomorrow morning. Will the member carry on?

Mr. Sargent: Would the Premier like my supplementary now then?

Interjections by several hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I think this is a matter between the hon. member and myself, to which he is referring. He is referring to a contract of insurance that was negotiated by the civil service association of Ontario and the civil service commission as part of the fringe benefits that apply to the civil service in Ontario. The form of the insurance was undertaken by a consortium of insurance companies. The negotiations were completed and finally approved by the civil service association, and now covers, for medical purposes, the civil servants of the province of Ontario. It has nothing to do with OMSIP.

Now, let us make this very, very clear. It has nothing whatsoever to do with the Ontario medical services insurance plan. If this is what the member is referring to—and I think it is—I have asked for a complete report of those negotiations, a list of the companies who are involved, a schedule of the negotiations as they took place and who was involved.

All this, comes under the jurisdiction actually of the Provincial Treasurer; as the Minister responsible for the civil service commission, he will present to the House in due course. It suddenly occurred to me this morning that perhaps I had some idea of what the member was really trying to get at, so now he has the answer.

Mr. Sargent: Thanks.

A question to the hon. Attorney General. Would he advise if he could recommend a

review of all criminal sentences by the appellate courts to provide judicial power to correct extreme or improper sentences without upsetting the entire conviction and to alleviate the situation in Ontario courts where the sentencing judge may select any sentence he wants for any reason he wants, and need not explain why he has made the choice, the way he did?

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I would not recommend the proposal suggested by the hon. member for Grey-Bruce. I see no point in asking a court of appeal to automatically review the vast number of sentences which are patently proper. In fixing a sentence, the trial judge is required to exercise his discretion, that is within the principles and within the limits established by the statutes and by the common law. If he fails to do so, the court of appeal may review the propriety of the sentence on the application of the convicted person. The implication that a judge may capriciously and without remedy deal with the question of punishment is clearly wrong.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. The American bar association has recommended this, and I think that you should study it here in Ontario.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I think our system of jurisprudence and the administration of justice does not suffer by comparison with that of our great neighbour to the south.

Mr. Speaker, a question was asked yesterday of the Minister of Education. I accepted the question as notice then. The question was asked by the hon. member for York South and read as follows:

> What action does the Minister of Education intend to take on the auditors' report presented to his department, that is education, last fall regarding allegations of Leo Juhani against R. D. Schoales in the architectural department of the London board of education?

The answer, Mr. Speaker, is that the matter was referred to our department where it was given to the London city police and the Crown attorney for Middlesex county, in order that it might be fully investigated. That investigation has been completed, and I am advised there is not sufficient evidence to warrant the laying of any charge. No further proceedings are, therefore, contemplated at this time by the authorities.

Mr. Speaker: It would seem that perhaps my announcement of the illustrious group of students from Ridgetown agricultural, technical and agricultural college, was premature. I believe we probably now have them in the gallery. I should have known a farmer when I saw him.

Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: Resuming the adjourned debate on the motion for an address in reply to the speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor at the opening of the session.

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to have an opportunity to resume my remarks that were interrupted by the closing of the House yesterday. I was most interested to have placed in my hands a few moments ago the report of the Royal commission to investigate allegations relating to coroners' inquests, that was brought about by the allegations made by the former chief coroner of Metropolitan Toronto.

I just had a chance to skim briefly through it, particularly the endings of each chapter wherein Mr. Justice Parker seems to make his views most abundantly known. Without exception, I would say that according to Mr. Justice Parker, "mighty Morty has struck out".

But the debate on this particular report, which has really been brought to your attention a few moments ago by one of the principals concerned, could very well be put on the order paper by the House leader if he so chooses, or, as far as we are concerned in the official Opposition. It could be discussed when the estimates of the Attorney General (Mr. Wishart) are brought before us, because the matter here has, in many respects over the months, degenerated into a squabble between the government and one of the Opposition parties. We, in our position, are the only group in the House who can be objective in this matter, and I know when the time comes, Mr. Speaker, you will be grateful for the views that all of us have, particularly those who have some special training in the law, the views they wish to put before the government, and particularly before the Attorney General concerning this very matter.

It is interesting particularly with regard to the words that were spoken in the House a few days ago, about a former administration, the one from 1919 to 1923. One of the recommendations made by our commissioner in those days—W. D. Gregory in 1920 I understand—was that the jurisdiction of inquests should really be removed from the medical

coroners and put in the hands of Crown attorneys who would have this responsibility to call inquests, and that these would, in fact, be conducted by magistrates. This surely is one of the alternatives that will be open to the government in amending what has become a very confused and inadequate system, not only in Metropolitan Toronto but elsewhere in the province. Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, there will be more detailed occasions upon which we can discuss this matter.

In the past, the Premier (Mr. Robarts) has seen fit to place the reports of Royal commissioners on the order paper as separate items themselves, and they would be called for discussion at some convenient time. But it may well be that he will not see fit to do it under these circumstances, and I would just say, as far as the official Opposition is concerned, we are prepared to debate this important matter, that is the upgrading and reform of the coroners' system whenever it is considered an orderly time to bring it before the House.

Also, yesterday, the provincial auditor made available his findings and, as usual, they were far different from the dramatic exposé that is sometimes used to accompany the provincial auditor's colleague at the federal level. We have not had a chance so far to examine in any detail what the auditor has brought before the House, and as you know, sir, he does report to us rather than the government. But I do get the impression that his report does contain considerable information of a constructive type that could be used in our discussions of the Budget of the province, and particularly the responsibilities of the administration in spending that money.

Specifically, he did indicate that in his view the government was spending too much money on travelling expenses. I was quite interested to see that a spokesman for, I believe the Premier's office, said it was very difficult for the members of the administration—

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): No spokesman from my office.

Mr. Nixon: Some spokesman, let us say, from the administration indicated that it was very difficult for those members of the Cabinet and those delegated by them for special responsibility to get around this province without their own government jet aircraft.

My understanding is that the government does have at its disposal a fairly luxurious aircraft, a Twin Otter and I would say that this is certainly justified in meeting the extending responsibilities of the administration. But surely if this particular vehicle is going to be used very much like the Royal yacht in Great Britain is used, with all sorts of recommendations that in certain events it could be converted into a hospital ship, well then surely the leader of the government should make it very clear what his requirements are. I am sure this House, in its reasonableness, will move towards meeting them.

But I understand that this Twin Otter has been provided with what is known as executive configuration. As a matter of fact, when I was coming back on the normal Air Canada flight from the federal-provincial conference in Ottawa, the take-off procedures of the Vanguard were held up for some few minutes while a special plane from Toronto made a landing. As it went by and we were waiting, it resembled the Twin Otter to which I was referring. I have no doubt that the Premier and his entourage were able to get back from Ottawa in time for official discussions.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. member—

Mr. Nixon: I saw it!

Hon. Mr. Robarts: It was Mr. Pearson's jet bringing him in to a $30 a plate federal Liberal dinner. He took off just about the same time as we did.

Mr. Nixon: I am sure the Premier of Ontario would not object that the Prime Minister of Canada should be suitably conveyed on the business of the nation. But I will tell you what I saw while I was waiting in the enclosed cabin of the Vanguard on the regularly scheduled flight. The Prime Minister of Quebec's private plane, a four engine jet, I believe—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: A twin jet.

Mr. Nixon: —just a twin jet—that I understand had actually been purchased by Prime Minister Johnson's predecessor, Mr. Lesage, was waiting on the tarmac for Mr. Johnson to return to Quebec City.

It indicated in the press story I read that he had generously offered to help the Premier of Ontario if he needed any assistance in moving around the province.

But actually I do not mean to imply, certainly not to say, that we should not be prepared to provide adequate transportation. I hope the Premier, if he has provided this sort of adequate transportation, would be good enough to see that the members of the House are aware that in the appropriations for The Department of Lands and Forests, there

would be an amount of several hundred thousand dollars that would be set aside to provide the transportation to which I have been referring. Surely a Twin Otter is far superior and more acceptable in Ontario than a twin jet, because it has been indicated many times that for the Premier of Ontario to have a jet would enable him, perhaps, to fly from here to London, if the runway were extended, and that may be what he has in mind. But the Twin Otter is famous the world over for its ability not only to land in short spaces and take off in the same, but to carry heavy loads.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I might just reassure the hon. member that we have gone into this matter quite carefully. I believe it was mentioned in the House last year in reply to a question from the hon. member for Essex South (Mr. Paterson), but after due consideration, we do not think a jet aircraft would be a practical type of aircraft to operate within the boundaries of the province of Ontario. We think we are well served with jets to take us outside the boundaries of the province, if that should prove to be necessary.

Mr. Nixon: Perhaps, since the Premier is interested in giving us information in this regard, is it correct that the government has been provided, through the budget of The Department of Lands and Forests, with a Twin Otter in executive configuration that is at the disposal of the leader of the government and his colleagues?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, yes. It is part of the air fleet of The Department of Lands and Forests. It is a Twin Otter. It is properly outfitted. I believe nine people returned in it from the Ottawa conference. This is crowding them in a bit, but it can carry a heavy load and was tried as an experiment. I think it was about a year ago, perhaps a bit longer, that the plane came into service. It has functioned very well for its purposes and the interior fittings can be removed, if you are interested, in about 20 minutes so that it can be—

Mr. Nixon: A little better than the Royal yacht.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: —so that it can be converted for its own purposes.

It was used for these purposes. I believe —was there a railway strike in the last year? —in any event, there was one occasion last year in the north country when it was required. The interior was stripped out and it was used for those purposes.

It is operated on a contract basis, that is the actual operation of it. The pilot and so on are contracted for on an annual basis. And all this information will be available when we reach the estimates of The Department of Lands and Forests, where the money for it was voted last year.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, yesterday I was discussing the need in this province for some means whereby private funds can be funnelled through a public corporation for the development of our natural resources. I felt that this means could be used in order to channel the savings of the citizens of this province and this nation into resource development, so that we could strengthen Canadian ownership and management in this regard.

I feel quite strongly that the citizens of the province should have this sort of opportunity to share in the ownership of our expanding economy. Unfortunately, there are many of our citizens who, in the past, have not had access to the good things of what we like to call, "the second best standard of living in the world," and which, I suppose, in many areas of Canada, is the best in the world—I like to believe that. We have to accept our responsibilities towards our fellow citizens who are less fortunate.

Now there have been many new departures, particularly from the federal administration, in the provision of fair and adequate welfare measures for the people of Canada. We, on this side, have been critical of government programmes which we believe have been very slow to implement the philosophy and the general approach to modern welfare that has been provided by federal largesse and grants.

The statement that was made by the Royal commission, or at least the Smith committee on taxation, I read just at the close of my remarks yesterday. Without reading it again, I would recall it to your attention by saying that in matters of welfare, the commissioners believe that the aspirin treatment is not adequate, surgery is required. I believe it is surgery that this House should examine in relationship with the similar responsibilities that the federal administration has. It would be in the introduction of a programme that might best be called a guaranteed minimum income for the people of this province. It is very easy to misconstrue this phrase as something that would mean, once again, the dilution—

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Our amendment last year.

Mr. Nixon: —it would mean the dilution of the responsibilities of citizens in the expansion of their own initiative, but it is obviously clear that those people on the government benches with their feet firmly entrenched in the cement of the thirties, are not going to move into the requirements of the sixties and the seventies.

It surely is a matter of grave concern that we, in this province, have not been able to provide adequately for the dignity and specific requirements of those among our citizens who have been less fortunate than perhaps we would hope.

The Senate of Canada has taken the lead in careful examination of the principle of this process, and the House of Commons has moved into this particular matter by providing supplementary income beyond the standard old age assistance—that is not what it is called—old age security—without a means test, and really as a means of establishing a minimum income.

But I believe this House should undertake a careful survey of the requirements of a programme of this type. I believe that we can apply, more effectively and efficiently, which is a word that should make the Provincial Treasurer's (Mr. MacNaughton's) ears perk up, our responsibilities in this province so that they will not only meet the needs of our citizens but, in fact, will save money as we see an expanding programme in the next few years.

Associated with this must surely be the continuation of the reform that has been undertaken in a very haphazard way—a half hearted way—by the Minister of this department; the reform that would delegate, on a regional basis, the responsibility for the administration of the programme. Really I feel that the new Minister has been a disappointment in the provision of these particular reforms.

He started out with a strong aura of change when he took over the responsibility some 18 months ago, and a bit more, and I would say that the results so far have been disappointing. In this connection, I would also like to bring to your attention, Mr. Speaker, the illness of the Deputy Minister of this department. I was very sorry to hear that Mr. Band has been in the hospital for some weeks and is ill to the extent that he has not had a direction in the affairs of the department for some time. All of us on this side, and I am sure everywhere in this House, wish him a speedy recovery.

I believe that the guaranteed minimum income's application to modern needs should receive the fullest examination by working groups of laymen and experts concerned with this progressive proposal. There is an area of study here, and an area of implementation, which we really must undertake in the near future.

The Provincial Treasurer is concerned with economies as are we all. He has been making pronouncements and announcements, some of them his own views, and some, specific policy changes on behalf of the government. One of the most interesting ones he made during the election campaign—I did not list that in my speech yesterday—in which he finally decided that the government would undertake a programme of centralized purchasing which, in fact, would save us $10 million.

There are many people who are prepared to claim authorship for the idea. Certainly, it has been put forward on this side on several occasions and we have been treated to the strong objections to such a programme by not only this Provincial Treasurer, but his predecessor, and the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Connell), who were prepared to claim that the method that was used in this government before the centralized purchasing that was recently announced, was as good as it could be and, in fact, that we were the model for many jurisdictions.

I was doing a bit of interesting research just a day or two ago. I was looking at some of the pronouncements made by a former Conservative administration before 1919, in which they embarked on a programme of centralized purchasing at that time as a war measure and as an economy measure. I hope that the resolve that the present Provincial Treasurer has associated with his indication that such a programme is to be undertaken, is better than his predecessor of almost half a century ago.

Mr. Speaker, we know that the business of government is one of great concern, but we believe, on this side, that there is a great area for savings in efficiency in administration, particularly in administration practices and housekeeping methods.

When the Minister—the Provincial Treasurer particularly—announces far reaching cutbacks in proposals and programmes, it has to be carefully examined that he is not reacting as his Conservative predecessors, such as R. B. Bennett and Herbert Hoover reacted in times of financial stress, with a return to the philosophy of retrenchment.

Surely our abilities, and the expert advice that is available to us in economics, will prove to us that unless we maintain a growing economy and particularly, unless we maintain the confidence of our citizens in the efficacy and the strength of our economy, then we are

asking for trouble for which only retrenchment would be the solution.

I would say to you that the prospects for economy in government are somewhat dim when we look at the list of election proposals, totalling at least $100 million, made by the Premier and his supporters in the recent election; the $30 million centennial project in which money is obviously being wasted without very much progress being achieved; and the $1 billion announcement made—I submit to you, sir—following a half-baked thought process by the leader of the government himself. Really, if we are going to have the sort of economical administration here that we need, then the attitudes of the leading two members of the administration will have to be upgraded and improved.

The Premier has responded, Mr. Speaker, to my previously stated concerns in these matters by indicating that a member of the Opposition shall become chairman of the public accounts committee and I am pleased to inform you, sir, that our party will nominate the member for Parkdale (Mr. Trotter) for that responsibility.

I trust, as has been indicated in other speeches in the House just in the last few days, that adequate staff will be provided so that this committee will be something more than a watchdog on what has gone before; that they will be able to inquire into the workings of government so that we can have an assessment by members of the House, with professional assistance, as to the level of efficiency because we have had many assurances from the Provincial Treasurer and his predecessor, and his colleagues, that all is perfect, that all is as good as it can possibly be, and that other administrations are looking to us for guidance in this matter. I just do not believe that it is that good. I would say that I do not accept the Premier's view that the workings of the public accounts committee should be *in camera*. There is no doubt that—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Who said that was my view?

An hon. member: Wrong again!

Mr. Nixon: Oh no, not wrong again at all. When the Premier accepted the provision or the proposal that an Opposition member member should become chairman of the public accounts committee, he was pleased to acceed simply because it was what was done at Westminster, and also at Westminster they have these meetings *in camera*. Surely a parallel construction would lead any reasonable listener to assume that he wanted the same thing done here.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, I will have to check *Hansard*, but I point out that in the United Kingdom, where a leader of the Opposition was a chairman of the public accounts committee—

Mr. Nixon: A member of the Opposition.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: A member of the Opposition, yes. I pointed out that those meetings were held *in camera*, and if my memory serves me correctly, I said I did not think such a procedure would be necessary in this jurisdiction.

I will check *Hansard*—but in the recollection of my remarks, I did not think it necessary and I certainly do not advocate that this committee hold such meetings. I simply pointed out that this was done in other jurisdictions but I am quite certain I said I did not think it would be necessary here, because I do not think it would.

Mr. Nixon: Certainly, I accept the Premier's assurances in that regard and if he chooses to check *Hansard*, fine, but it is not necessary as far as I am concerned because I certainly agree that these meetings should not be held *in camera*, and that, in fact, they can be something of great value to the taxpayers of this province without being construed as any sort of a witch hunt.

This was a phrase the Premier used and I can assure him that it is not our intention to undertake any sort of a witch hunt. We are looking for gremlins in the administration; there are areas of confusion that use up public funds unnecessarily, and in programmes that are not for the public benefit, and it is these that we want out of the works. It is these that we will be looking for in the examination of the public accounts.

We, therefore, make the further proposal that the government should engage a firm of management consultants to undertake a fair examination of government departments, making organizational recommendations which would result in economies. Such an independent over-view would result in horizontal restructuring of the type that the Premier has been advocating in years gone by, and the avoidance of duplication of effort.

It has been a long time since we had an objective examination of the business of government here in Ontario. I believe the last such examination was carried out by Walter Gordon himself, having been hired by the former Premier of Ontario.

Walter Gordon himself was the chairman of this particular committee, and his findings were quite voluminous. But since he undertook them just ten years ago, it is surely time for a review of the business of government here and we on this side do not accept the assurances of the hon. Provincial Treasurer that all is well in his particular Denmark.

We also make an alternative proposal, and that is, that the public accounts committee should recruit an advisory panel of business experts from the business community of Ontario. The members of this committee would be assigned for short terms from their parent companies who in return would receive a tax abatement in respect of salaries paid in this sabbatical role.

These experts would be asked to bring their expertise into play in a general survey of the processes and practices of government in this post-centennial year. It would supplement the regular professional staff of the public accounts committee to which it would report.

The government has shown concern about spending at the federal level. But this concern is not reflected in the attitudes taken by the administration. I see that the Premier has found something in *Hansard* which he may like to read into the record again and this might be an appropriate time to do so.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Well, Mr. Speaker, I would safely say that I have checked *Hansard* as to what I have in fact said, and what I told you several moments ago is correct. It is on page 22.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): The Provincial Treasurer himself can refer to the correct page.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: The member saved me the trouble of finding it so that I could listen to these pearls of wisdom.

Mr. Nixon: Well I am certainly glad that the Premier appreciates the opportunity he has this afternoon, as I appreciate certainly his interjections to keep the record straight.

Now, a major part of government renovation is something more than just this objective view of the business of the administration itself.

The Speech from the Throne has already announced a new department which would be concerned exclusively with revenue. We know the economics aspect of the administration has been transferred from the former department to the jurisdiction of the Provincial Treasurer himself.

Now, I know the Smith report has recommended a department of responsibility for revenue, but it seems to me that one of the main reasons that the Premier decided to move forward in this respect is that in the block of seats set apart for the administration there is one glaring omission. There is one member in that block who has not really received the recognition that, I believe, he feels is due. It could be that the member for London South (Mr. White) is finally going to justify his postion in those two rows in something other than being chief government Whip in the past.

However, I would safely say, that while the provision of a specific department of revenue might be a matter of some concern for efficiency, it could surely be administered by one of the gentlemen presently carrying ministerial responsibilities. If we are going to undertake meaningful and effective reform of the administration, it must be something more than just tacking on a seat for the hon. member for London South or anybody else. It is going to mean the setting up of a department of urban affairs.

Now, it is in a department such as this that we can at least bring into meaningful development, the horizontal associations which the Premier has found so difficult in the last few years and put under one man's jurisdiction—the focus and control, the lines of responsibility for those programmes which are needed to bring about proper and orderly growth of our great urban centres.

The migration of people from the farming and rural areas of the province into the five major centres has been something that has brought about problems that this administration has in the past, not been able to cope with.

Only by a reform of the Cabinet, I believe, can this really be a part of meaningful administration in the future. A department of urban affairs would be something more than a housing czar. It is obvious that the Minister of this department would have great responsibility for housing, taking over Ontario housing corporation from the Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Randall). He would also have to have the responsibility from The Department of Municipal Affairs for the ordering of the community planning branch.

These are matters, of course, which are the responsibility of the Premier himself.

The municipal board has shown itself as losing the position of respect that it has built up for itself since 1934, in dealing with

the growing problems that have been faced by so many of our municipalities.

I notice in Kitchener, the municipal board has, at least under the policy of the government, not had an opportunity to hold additional hearings with the need for the expansion of that great and growing urban centre.

The chairman of the board himself was critical, deeply critical, of the approach by Metropolitan Toronto in the last few days, in what they claim, is an unnecessarily welter of red tape controlling this particular area of government responsibility.

Surely, a new look has to be taken in the ordering of these matters, and I would suggest, with all the strength I can muster, that the Premier undertake a review and reform of this part of his Cabinet.

I would say that the Smith report makes it clear that what it calls the helter skelter of unco-ordinated fiscal transfers from provincial to local government must give place to a sound financial plan for the future based on a reformed taxation pattern.

Extracting two plums—basic shelter exemption grant and local administration of justice costs—to wave before the electorate prior to October 17, the government ignored the much deeper basic reforms the report called for, because I suppose there were no votes attending to them.

What kind of an administration jungle does the Smith report reveal? I have undertaken careful research of the report and I believe that the findings in this report should direct a good deal of the discussions in the House for the next few months; I believe they will.

Some of the extracts that I want to read to you now Mr. Speaker, are those admittedly which are seriously critical of the position that the government has taken in ineffectiveness of its policies in years gone by.

On the administration of provincial grants policies this report says, in section 103, and I quote:

> If nothing else, the unfathomable maze of grant programmes examined in this chapter is testimony to the fact that no co-ordination of provincial fiscal transfers to local government has ever been attempted.

We are told in a further quote:

> Grants are administered by a plethora of departments, with each paying but little attention to what the others are doing, let alone to the fiscal impact on municipalities. During the research phase of our work, we undertook a statistical exercise whose purpose was to discover whether grant payments to municipalities bore any relation to local fiscal conditions. Did provincial grants have a detectable impact on overall local spending? Did they favour, on balance, smaller or larger municipalities, richer or poorer, municipalities, optional or mandatory services? The results of the exercise showed that, taken as a group, grant payments bore little relation to anything.

This is a matter from an objective careful extensive study, which indicates in this quote and about three other shorter ones that I will put before you, Mr. Speaker, the need for the sort of reform that this Legislature must accomplish.

The leadership for this can come from proposals from both Opposition parties, but until the government realizes that we of this side, with all members of the House, are prepared to enter into the studies that will result in an improvement in this situation, then really nothing is going to be done.

The report, if I may continue to quote from section 3 on page 410:

> The situation, with respect to provincial grants to local authorities in Ontario is—

and we choose the word carefully—

> —chaotic. It is not even possible to enumerate the grant programmes currently in force.

On road grants, and I know the Provincial Treasurer would be particularly interested in these, we learn on page 417, section 33 that, and I quote:

> The actual operation of the Ontario road grant system, by ossifying municipal status has, if anything, enhanced the inequities in road finance.

The former Minister of Highways, the present Provincial Treasurer, brought before us a careful survey of these inequities at the county level. He knows how gross the difficuties and unfair approaches have been, and here we have it from unimpeachable, objective authority that changes must be made and are certainly overdue.

On recreation grants—we are advised on page 435, section 83, and I quote:

> We find all existing grants on behalf of recreation and community services gravely deficient.

Again, section 84, commenting on the bulk of grants for recreation and community service, says and I quote:

> We are compelled to pointout that they ran afoul of virtually every principle that

in our opinion should underlie an equitable system of provincial-local fiscal relations.

I have had an opportunity to, as the Premier has said, "cast my pearls before the government" for the last two days. In the interests of getting to the end of my remarks, which I know will interest a good many of you, I would say that I have extracted quotes from that particular report that I will not read to you now. They will have more application under specific votes in the months that lie ahead. They deal with municipal statistics, they deal with the assessment of property, they deal with the poor assessment practices that come under the direct jurisdiction of the smiling Treasurer, and certainly the matter of appeals themselves come under attack from the report. But if the procedure for paying out funds is in such bad shape, Mr. Speaker, that for gathering in funds also merits blows from this report that are almost unbelievable. On page 7 of volume 3, we find this statement: "Vestiges of the arbitrary techniques and attitudes of the monarchs of old have remained the rule in the administration and collection of our revenue.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Nixon: And one of the monarchs of old seems to have been reincarnated today—

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Provincial Treasurer): We are trying to change it all.

Mr. Nixon: —when we see the Provincial Treasurer himself sitting there smiling and saying: "This is the report that we ordered." Yet we find in the Speech from the Throne nothing but the vaguest generalities.

Mr. Speaker, there will be many occasions to deal with this more closely and even to hear the comments from the member for London South who is not yet in the administration.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Nixon: But before I end my remarks, there are at least two matters that I want to deal with. There is—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Nixon: He needs all the help he can get.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): We really need another Cabinet Minister from London.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I want to say something about the housing programme in the province, and I would say at the outset of this part of my remarks, that certainly my comments are by no means exhaustive, although some people may find them exhausting.

I simply want to put before you, sir, the fact that the HOME programme as it was enunciated just a year ago, with all of the fanfare that the Premier's supporters and public relations experts were capable of, has fizzled out over the year. The number of people who have actually been put into homes under this programme has been grossly disappointing and inadequate, and I would say that it is ready for very careful re-examination.

A home is still a dream for the average wage or salary earner in Metropolitan Toronto and elsewhere in Ontario, and over-extends the average budget in the other four major metropolitan areas of Ontario. It is not a plan for the people.

For example, in Metro Toronto, service lots alone cost up to $9,900 apiece; or when leased cost up to $48 a month in rental, even before the foundations go in for the house itself. Add the cost of the home financed by mortgages, add the cost of local property taxes which are inflated by having to bear too great a proportion of the cost of education; total it all up and there you have a place fit for a king and which only a king obviously can afford.

It is small comfort to the Torontonian determined on a ravine lot at $9,900 to know that he can get the same thing in Peterborough where federal-provincial land assembly has been in effect for some years, for only $3,200. As a matter of fact, this probably would be an occasion where HOME's efforts, the Ontario housing corporation's efforts, to assemble land in Peterborough should be discussed. This is surely something that the new member for Peterborough will want to bring to our attention as it is the most appalling story of political chicanery that has come to light in many years. It was saved, I submit, from the courts only by the last-minute withdrawal of the administration itself, from a commitment that would have been simply inexcusable and dishonest in the highest degree.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: The same thing for 25 years!

Mr. Nixon: Now, our studies, Mr. Speaker, show that the HOME programme does not operate evenly throughout the province, nor make any approach to that evenness. Com-

parable figures for lots range—I have a table of them here which I will not read to you at this time—from a low of $1,900 in Kirkland Lake to the high figure that I have already quoted for Metropolitan Toronto.

Obviously the discrepancies are a very serious matter, and there is no member of this House who is not prepared to do the work, and to search out the solutions if they can be found. When costs exceed 27 per cent of total income mortgages are not forthcoming. Thus the HOME plan fails to house the most deserving members of our community, while giving help to those who are in a better position to help themselves. By December 31 of 1967, 199 HOME lots had been bought back because people found that they were in deeper than they could afford—more than the 27 per cent of their income and outclassed by the totally artificial system of land acquisition, assembly and improvement upon which the HOME concept rests.

We would put forward the proposal that the government at this level must surely involve itself in some programme of subsidization of home acquisition. We believe, as Liberals, that a programme of second mortgages should be undertaken. We discussed this programme in the House a year ago and we put it before the people during the election campaign. The fact that we were not returned in sufficient numbers to order the affairs of the province does not in my view constitute the attitude of the people of Ontario that the government must not involve themselves more fully in this particular enterprise.

The subsidy could be applied in some other way, and yet our experience in Ontario has shown that government-subsidized second mortgages is a practical approach; the administrative apparatus is presently in existence, and I would say to you, sir, that this would be a reasonable approach that the government should take.

The servicing of large tracts of land associated with our metropolitan centres and elsewhere, through the good offices and direction of the Ontario water resources commission could lead to a reduction of speculative crushes. When we read about people who are required to move to Toronto because of business changes, we realize that they feel that they are being consigned to Siberia or the salt mines at least because of the difficulty of getting adequate housing for their families, and, once they do get it, in maintaining the payments associated with it.

This is a continuing problem, a problem that my colleagues on the Liberal benches will deal with in more detail. We are deeply concerned that the government has not recognized the valuable, long-range solutions that were provided by the federal-provincial conference on housing four months ago. I believe that the Premiers, and some others who were there observing that particular conference, were too quick to call it abortive and useless.

The federal administration was taking their responsibilities admittedly, too, in the long range. The government might be quick to criticize them for that because we in Ontario are faced with a short-term as well as a long-term crisis in housing. But federal, provincial and municipal co-operation surely contains the key to the problem.

I have one other matter that I want to bring to your attention, sir, and I believe there will be ample time to do that. It has to do with our Centennial project, the museum for science and technology to which I have referred on several other occasions in this House.

We know, of course, that it was started as a $5 million shared-cost Centennial project, but quickly escalated until today it appears that $30 million will not meet the overall costs. This soaring completion figure has, as its cause, poor planning and vacillating policy on the part of the government.

Hansard No. 91 of Tuesday, May 9, 1967, captured the feeling of confusion expressed on the part of the government as my colleague, the hon. member for Downsview, engaged in a kind of mad-hatter arithmetic with the Minister of Public Works in which the responsible Minister had difficulty in answering questions associated with this extremely important project. I believe that it is necessary to recall a few of the details.

We remember that at one time or another three groups of architects had been engaged on the project; that incoherent direction of staff had resulted in top-level resignations; and that men with original ideas had been marking time waiting to put the centre to effective educational use. They are still frustrated because the opening of even the first phase of the project seems further away than it was when the Minister of Tourism and Information (Mr. Auld) announced last year that the first phase would be opened in the Centennial year, a date which is now past.

The contractor, Mr. J. J. Pigott, is not a man to complain without being sure of his facts, particularly under the circumstances. As an executive president of Pigott Construction Ltd., he has experienced the

result of an inadequate and unco-ordinated flow of design information.

He has seen the ground breaking for phase two of the project delayed unnecessarily by nearly 12 months after the contract was awarded. He has seen government drafting delays lead to a hold up in steel work completion until the steel workers' strike enmeshed the project in yet further delay.

There has been a domino effect due in the first instance to government departmental inefficiency. The government's claim that strikes and bankruptcy were pertinent causes was seen to be false it was pointed out by Mr. Pigott himself, since these events were never on the project's critical path if their deadlines had been lived up to.

The Premier has told us that here we have a responsible government, that his Ministers are responsible for these matters, and of course they are. Totally responsible. And yet this surely leaves abundant work in inspection and investigation of these matters by the appropriate committee of the House.

Surely it is much too early to call for a Royal commission, we have enough of those, even a Royal commission on payola that the hon. Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. Stewart) announced today. But there is an adequate procedure for a proper investigation of this matter, including testimony by Mr. Pigott himself, in the standing committee system of the House—if it is properly put to use.

We know that not all of the information has not been forthcoming, even from this responsible administration. I called almost a year ago for the publication of the letters of resignation of those top officials of the museum of science and technology that were sent direct to the Premier more than a year ago, rather than to the responsible Ministers. These letters have never been made available through the Legislature.

I have put on the table today a request for this same information, as well as the tabling of the minutes of the meetings of the board associated with our Centennial project. It is only in this way, where we can bring the facts out into the open, that we can assess the responsibility and where it actually lies in this responsible government.

We of the official Opposition are determined that out of this shambles of inefficient direction, there shall nevertheless arise an enduring memorial to our Centennial worthy of the visionaries who first conceived it. I do not know whether it was the Minister of Education (Mr. Davis) or, as one newspaper article indicated, his assistant. But the idea is an excellent one, and one that we supported from the start with all the provisos and exceptions that have been put before you, Mr. Speaker, and your predecessor.

So, I feel that it is a worthy project. A centre that will be in daily use, thronged with children and adults, and paying rich, if long term dividends to the people of Ontario, whose appetites have already been whetted for this sort of thing by their visits to Expo '67.

We have already moved from a historical to a contemporary museum, from a static display to a teaching centre, from a Centennial project to a more general education project. In other words, the government's position has changed at least three times as to the concept that they themselves have as to what this museum should be.

I would like to propose that there is justification, because of the tremendous elevation of the costs, that better use could be made of the facilities even than those that have already been planned and announced. To this end we propose that two endeavours be brought together; educational television, which is now headquartered in expensive rented premises on Bayview Avenue and which is now using up $10,000 worth of studios per week at the height of its production season; and a Centennial centre with its ever changing variety of artifacts, and its specialized staff. The two can be made to work as one.

The Provincial Treasurer who, as I said, is in a retrenchment mood, is considering a proposal that option land close to the Centennial centre should be built upon for separate educational studios. I use that word in its general sense, not in its special sense.

The government of Ontario is proposing to build near the centre, near the museum of science and technology, a separate television headquarters for the production of all of the requirements of The Department of Education. But I believe significant savings to the public purse would accrue if educational television and the Centennial centre project were to be integrated at least.

We commend this proposal to the Minister of Education as a positive educational step and a practical production suggestion, and to the Provincial Treasurer as a significant economy.

This proposal is made, of course, without prejudice to the philosophical question as to whether The Department of Education should be directly involved in educational television,

but this we will debate at a more appropriate time.

For the present, it is clear that whatever form the administration of educational television assumes, the facilities for the electronic application of the potential of our museum will form a vital addition to the amenities of the province, and will help to bring back talented staff members in the right educational atmosphere. In this way, the appalling story of waste and frustration may yet have a memorable ending.

Mr. Speaker, in the time at my disposal, and I would submit to you that it is, I suppose, unlimited, I have attempted to describe the shortcomings of the work of this government as we, the Opposition, see them. We have come through an election campaign and we have had a chance to discuss this matter. We are here, in our position as official Opposition, with a heavy responsibility, and we are resolved to carry it out.

We will give no particular quarter to the government in the use of the time of this House as we see fit, and under the rules administered under your fair hand.

So it is with this in view that I would say that we look forward to the next four years as years in which reforms can be accomplished and the specific objections that we have raised to the programme of the government can be overcome, and that the work of the people of this province, and the work of this government, can be made more effective.

With this in view, as I say, I move, seconded by Mr. Singer, the following amendment to the reply to the Speech from the Throne:

That this House regrets that this government:

1. Will not participate in the benefits of the federal medical insurance Act.

2. Has failed, in spite of much publicity and fanfare, to evolve a workable urban programme for the province that will meet the needs of our family of average income with regard to housing, recreation and transportation.

3. Has been unable to bolster and equalize our economic development, particularly in northern Ontario so that all our residents can share in prosperity.

4. Has failed to reform educational financing to meet local need, and reduce the level of local taxation.

5. Has failed to provide leadership to lead the farming industry from economic doldrums.

It is for these reasons that the government does not enjoy the confidence of this House.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, on the opening day of the Legislature, there was no opportunity for me to express my congratulation on your election to that high post. I hasten to do so now. The role of the Speaker in the efficient operation of the Legislature is a very key one, and, I would put it this way, in our mutual interest I wish you well.

I would also like to express my congratulations to the mover and seconder, two of the new members of the Legislature. Theirs is rather a rare honour, since there are all too many on the government side from which the powers that be have to choose only two.

I must say that the pattern was rather a familiar one, a deluge of self-congratulations that, apparently, the government's capacity to absorb is completely unlimited and, therefore, we have to suffer along with them.

However, I was rather interested in the undercurrents of criticism that crept through this deluge of self-congratulation. The hon. member for Hamilton Mountain (Mr. J. R. Smith) on education, and the hon. member for York East (Mr. Meen), on housing, started out with paeans of praise with regard to the government's policies, but before they were finished, there were some pretty sharp criticisms of the inadequacies of that policy.

I shall have more to say, particularly about the housing one, later and certainly my colleagues will have a good deal more to say.

Mr. Speaker, while I am dealing with congratulations, I should not forget those who have been the benefactors of still more appointments in the Cabinet. I suppose it is inevitable that there will be changes every year.

The first one, some time ago was, quite frankly, one that I had expected would take place years ago—the hon. member for Stormont (Mr. Guindon), has obvious qualifications for the Cabinet—I am sure he will be making is contribution—not the least of which are his capacities as a chorister. I suspect that in the secrecy of that Cabinet chamber when the tensions get so great that the Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts), who displayed something of a capacity for pouring oil on troubled waters during the Confederation of tomorrow conference, will call upon this new Cabinet Minister from Stormont to break into song—Alouette or something like that—to ease the tension.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): In place of coffee!

Mr. MacDonald: Perhaps in place of a coffee break, yes. That is what you would call the Robarts equivalent of the diplomatic ploy —the coffee break by the diplomat in Ottawa.

The second Cabinet appointment was the hon. member for Chatham-Kent (Mr. McKeough). I trust, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. Minister who does not happen to be with us at the moment—my pearls are not going to be accepted by the man himself—is not going to forget that there was a very heavy NDP assist in opening up that Cabinet appointment to which he has fallen heir.

The government has been traditionally very insensitive to the needs of municipalities. In fact this government has no real grasp of the magnitude of the problems of urban society. And that failure was personalized perhaps to too great an extent unfairly in one man, namely Wilf Spooner.

I happened to pay a visit to northern Ontario last August, and while I was there I predicted Mr. Spooner's defeat in Timmins.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): The member predicted all of them.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: Well Mr. Speaker, some of them took place this time and the rest of them will take place next time. In the fullness of time. Just do not get too anxious.

Interjections by hon. members.

An hon. member: How much was your increase?

Mr. MacDonald: But the comment that he was going to lose in Timmins was greeted with the usual derision from the Tory benches. In fact, I was told by somebody who was at the offices downtown when the election results came in—that the Conservatives, who usually have their ears fairly well to the ground politically, had a list of critical seats to watch in case there might be a loss. Timmins was not on the list. Right to the end they did not realize what was happening.

Hon. T. L. Wells (Minister without Portfolio): What about Fort William?

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I wish the Minister well in his appointment into The Department of Municipal Affairs, because quite frankly he has got a big job on his hands to rescue this government from one of its major areas of failure.

I have some comments also I would like to make with regard to the new Minister of Mines (Mr. A. F. Lawrence). Unfortunately, he too has departed. However, no doubt he will read them with great interest in *Hansard* when he has some time from the staking rush.

I am rather puzzled as to what is the appropriate comment. Perhaps now he might be described as the "miner from Yorkville", and I hasten to say that is spelled m-i-n-e-r since that happens to be his riding. When the Prime Minister announced some couple of months or so ago that the House was going to open on February 14, that traditional day of hearts and flowers, I found my mind going off into flights of fancy as to the significance of this date, the opening of the Legislature on February 14. But I did not realize its full significance until the events that took place the day before.

It was a rare sight to watch the Tory establishment and its chief maverick in a sort of kiss and make up act. But the establishment's effort to absorb its sharpest party critic is going to be something of a traumatic experience, I venture, and we will all watch it with some interest.

At the moment, I am not quite certain who is going to suffer most. I congratulate the member on his appointment to the Cabinet. Obviously he has abilities that can be used in the Cabinet. I am not certain whether I should not congratulate the Prime Minister more for his courage in doing so. We will see the results as the months go on.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): We will all sit around and watch.

Mr. MacDonald: The Prime Minister will sit around and watch?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I said the members will sit around and watch.

Mr. MacDonald: That is right. Mr. Speaker, my initial reaction to the Throne Speech was that the lessons of the election had obviously been lost on this government.

On this side of the House we have periodically been taunted every session with that refrain, "that is why we are here and you are there", a refrain suggesting that the government sits on the Treasury benches because it retains the confidence of the people. But I want to suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that that is not the lesson of this election.

This government's majority, which used to be 47, was cut more than in half to 21. Before hon. members on the other side of

the House begin to take too much satisfaction out of what can happen through narrow majorities, as we have seen in Ottawa in the last two or three days, I give them fair warning—indeed, Mr. Speaker, I remind them that both yesterday and today if the Opposition had chosen to call for the adjournment of the House, the Opposition members would have outnumbered the government side of the House.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): The member votes with them.

Mr. MacDonald: We will get around to that. On the rare occasions when the government is right, we vote for them.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: With some difficulty we try to find those occasions when the Liberals are right, and then we will vote for them.

Mr. Sopha: The member is against the rules committee. The next time he votes for the Liberals, is the member for High Park (Mr. Shulman) going to vote with the member?

Mr. MacDonald: Do not worry about the the member for High Park.

Mr. Sopha: Well, the member should worry about him.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, as I indicated, the government's majority in this House was cut by more than half, from 47 to 21. Their proportion of the popular vote in the province of Ontario dropped to 42 per cent, the lowest at any time since the year 1943. So you on that side of the House, despite your numbers, are the minority and represent the minority in the province of Ontario.

Mr. Speaker, it is a smug minority. The title is a very, very appropriate one, because smug indeed is the appropriate adjective to describe their attitude.

During the election, the Prime Minister was willing almost to sleep his way through the campaign. He did not deign to discuss issues with the people and because we hammered away at issues that were disturbing the people; the real issues—prices, housing, municipal taxes, that is why our vote went up and your vote went down. That is a lesson from the election that should not be forgotten.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. MacDonald: The member's vote went down too and we got what he and his party lost.

When the Prime Minister did speak up he was willing to play politics with a question that is too important to be toyed with in a partisan way. Having refused to discuss the gut issues on which his administration was vulnerable, in the latter stages of the campaign he attempted to inject the question of Confederation. He challenged the Opposition leaders to speak up.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the crisis in Confederation is an important question. It is a desperately important question, but it was not an election issue, precisely because all the parties in the province of Ontario are in general agreement.

One would have thought that the Prime Minister would have welcomed that agreement as strengthening Ontario to play its full role, but the Prime Minister did his utmost to exploit what he believed to be differences.

For years I have spoken in the House, in this Legislature, with regard to the crisis in Confederation. I spoke for years when I could not even provoke this government to give any leadership to comment at all on the Confederation issue.

If you doubt that, I invite you to go back and look at *Hansard* in the years 1964 and 1965. But the Prime Minister was willing to play politics with an issue he normally treats with a commendable non-partisanship.

Well Mr. Speaker, he did not succeed in his overall election appeal.

Admittedly, he exceeded more than this record deserves, but he did not succeed and, despite the Prime Minister's lethargic approach to the whole presentation of issues to the people, he did not fool all of the people.

They turned out in greater numbers than at any time for many elections, and the result is that the Opposition is back here in greater numbers than it has been for years, and we are going to be puncturing that smug refusal of the government to deal effectively with the problems that are facing the people in the province.

Events since the election, Mr. Speaker—I have found, Mr. Speaker, that I cannot swallow ice. I do not know whether you have solved that kind of a problem or not.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): The hon. member has on other occasions.

Mr. MacDonald: Oh, have I?

Mr. Speaker, events since the election indicate that the government has an even greater contempt for the democratic process than even the conduct of the campaign itself suggested. "There were no issues," the Prime Minister said. "Where are the leaders of the Opposition, why are they not raising the issues?"

Certainly there were no issues that this government would deign to discuss with the people. Yet, Mr. Speaker, on November 14, the Prime Minister announced a radical change in educational administration in this province. He did so after little or no consultation with those who are intimately involved. There was no use of the vast resources of the Ontario institute of studies on education, the research body established to deal with the best procedures for policy and administrative changes. It was simply an arbitrary decision, unilaterally announced.

And, Mr. Speaker, the government then added insult to injury, because ten weeks went by after November 14 before the government would divulge the details of their programme, so that those responsible for school administration in the province of Ontario would be able to help in an orderly transition to the new pattern that the government has dictated will take place.

The result is that a very worthy objective has been seriously jeopardized by the government's handling of the question.

As one example of the kind of thing that has gone on, the north provides another good example of this government's attitude.

During the election, two Cabinet Ministers were defeated. When the Prime Minister shuffled his Cabinet, he refused to replace one of his defeated Ministers with another northerner, although I would suggest that there were some worthy appointees within the ranks of the Conservative Party.

When a reporter commented that he seemed to be giving the north the short end of the stick, the Prime Minister is reported in the press to have replied, rather testily, "The north voted itself the short end of the stick."

Now, the Minister of Mines, traditionally from the north, has been chosen from Toronto. There you have a clear reflection of the government's attitude, Mr. Speaker. The north must be taught a lesson for its conduct at the polls. Those who feel that they are divinely appointed to rule must never be challenged by mere mortals, or they are going to have to take the consequences—and the Prime Minister is in the process of administering those consequences.

In agricultural Ontario, traditionally the Tory party's power base, there is a seething ferment today. When rural Ontario was in open revolt some two years ago, the government blamed everybody but themselves. For a time approaching the election, they acted as though they might have learned something of a lesson. There were high hopes that with the appointment of the Minister's committte on the basic problem of agriculture, namely income—it was a good committee, much better than normally gets appointed, quite frankly, to look into these complex problems.

But I must confess that I, for one, have lost much of my original hope that anything effective is going to come of this committee. The government is far too preoccupied with playing off one farm organization against another, of manipulating the course of events within farm organizations behind the scenes.

The specific proposal of the income incentive programme put forward by the federation of agriculture some two years ago, and supported by the farm union, was dismissed at the Kemptville conference last July by the chairman of the Minister's income committee. The chairman dismissed it, as, and I quote, "an administrative nightmare."

Last week, the federation of agriculture presented its annual brief to the government and we in the Opposition have had an opportunity to discuss it with them since then. They warned that if the government was not more sensitive to farm needs, more and more farmers would become persuaded that wielding the big stick is the only way to get results.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, by its own record, this government is shaping up another revolt in the province of Ontario in the rural areas, and I wonder who they are going to blame this time?

Now I could cite—

Mr. N. L. Olde (Middlesex South): How may rural members has his party got?

Mr. MacDonald: Well, that is perhaps unfortunate. But I am reminded of another comment in the federation of agriculture's brief and that is their conclusion that the members rule as a link between the grass roots and the government has been such a complete failure, that they have now got to find alternative ways of influencing government. The fact that so many of those rural members have been Tories may really be the basis of the comments that they made.

Mr. J. H. White (London South): How many rural members has his party got?

Mr. MacDonald: Oh, not enough, I admit.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I have cited one or two examples. This government is slipping and what happened in the election is only the beginning. If any further proof were needed, we got it in the Throne Speech, a document that was dull and vacuous, so much so that it sparked editorial comment from as wide a range of sources as the *Globe and Mail* and the Toronto *Daily Star*.

There was, of course, the odd good tid-bit in it. You cannot have everything bad in a Throne Speech. But the government has nothing, virtually nothing, to offer, except what has already been found wanting.

I am not going to attempt today to cover all the range of the Throne Speech and its inadequacies. I have colleagues who will dissect the government's record as it has never been dissected before. But what I do want to do is to sketch something of an approach and, on the major issues, to present something of a constructive alternative to the inadequacies of government policy at the present time.

In reviewing government action and government policies, Mr. Speaker, the first topic that I want to turn to is that of Prudential Finance.

Since the last meeting of the Legislature, there have been further chapters added to the unhappy story of the Prudential fiasco.

During the last session, and throughout the summer, this government kept the victims of that financial collapse on the string with vague statements designed to suggest that the government might consider some compensation for the noteholders.

In the callous way that this government so often treats the victims of its own sins of omission or commission, it was considered to be good election bait to maintain some glimmer of hope at least while the final report was being completed.

Mr. Speaker, that report was completed on October 12, which happens to be five days before the election took place, but none of its contents was revealed until January 12 when the Minister made excerpts of it available to the public. He issued a press release, the final sentence of which I want to read to you:

> My conclusion is that while we in government will do everything in our power to ensure that creditors receive the maximum payment, it would be quite improper to provide a reimbursement [that is to noteholders] out of public funds.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the government never had any intention of reimbursing the noteholders, even though they attempted to deceive the distraught victims with vague prospects until the election was over. During the debate on this issue last spring, when the government was pretending to consider the matter, I challenged the Minister in this House to accept, in principle, the right to compensation—leaving details for later consideration. In the face of that specific challenge, the Minister sat silent in his seat.

But now that we have something more of the full story, as contained in the final report of the securities commission investigation team, the government's responsibility to provide compensation up to certain limits is even more conclusively documented. I want to outline to the House why, in our view, that is the case.

Let me begin with this quotation from page 101 of the final report:

> The resultant loss to members of the public has been enormous, and the public interest requires that the guilt or innocence of those against whom I will recommend charges be decided by the courts whether the evidence be weak or strong.

Well, Mr. Speaker, so far so good. One area of blame for the Prudential collapse undoubtedly rests with the top officers of the company concerning whose conduct the report tabulates some 27 different offences. Charges have been laid. Culpability in these instances will be resolved in the appropriate place, the courts.

But there is another area of culpability, and this is the failure, in the first instance, of the Ontario securities commission, and later of this government through The Attorney General's Department, to fulfil their responsibility to protect the public from the high-pressured solicitation of funds by a company which was already bankrupt.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order! I would advise those in the galleries that applauding is not permitted in the House, and should there be any more I would have to ask that the galleries be emptied.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, no investigation has been made of this second area of

culpability. This government has with calculated persistence, refused to have this matter referred in the first instance, as the Opposition proposed, to a standing committee of the Legislature, or better still, to be the subject of an independent judicial inquiry.

Mr. Nixon: The Opposition?

Mr. MacDonald: Yes, the Opposition. As a matter of fact, if the hon. member wants to interrupt, it is rather interesting that he should interject because on the question of compensation when this broke a year ago, he was opposed to it; now he is silent and the other members of his party are in favour of it.

Mr. Nixon: The hon. member is playing to the galleries.

Mr. MacDonald: I am not playing to the galleries, the record is there to indicate that a year ago the member was opposed to it and now the members of his party are in favour of it. Where the member stands I do not know.

Mr. Nixon: The hon. member well knows that we were fostering the investigation by the committee that was—

Mr. MacDonald: What I am talking about is compensation; deal with the issue instead of evading it.

Mr. Nixon: Nuts!

Mr. MacDonald: Well, Mr. Speaker, "nuts" is about the equivalent of most of his contribution in this Throne debate.

An hon. member: The hon. member is sharp this afternoon.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, instead this government has tolerated the wholly invidious proposition that the Ontario securities commission should be responsible for investigating a debacle in which it was deeply involved. In short, the Ontario securities commission was asked to investigate itself and the government of which it was an agency—and surely that is a ludicrous proposition.

Now no one should be surprised that the Ontario securities commission found itself blameless and never even attempted to assess the responsibility of its political masters. Instead, the OSC report attempts to focus full blame upon the top officers of Prudential for conspiring to present "a false and misleading" financial statement to the securities commission in 1963.

Here the key question arises: Should the Ontario securities commission have been so easily duped into accepting a false and misleading financial statement?

I suggest that they should not have been so easily duped; that they should have taken whatever steps were necessary to assure themselves that the financial statement was an accurate one; that there was plenty of evidence readily available to alert them that those in control of Prudential were free-wheeling financial operators.

I invite hon. members to review the situation with me. The "false and misleading" financial statement of February 28, 1963, was presented to the Ontario securities commission in the spring of 1963 in order to get approval for the sale of short term notes and debentures. Clarkson, Gordon and Company now confirm that at that time Prudential was, in fact, insolvent.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is not simply being wise in hind-sight to suggest that the Ontario securities commission should have had their suspicions aroused enough to have investigated the situation and found out the truth of the company's financial position.

Just let me submit two reasons why I think that is the case: First, from the early days of Brien's take-over of Prudential, the banks had taken steps to realize on the collateral for existing loans and had cut off further credit. Surely such action was clear warning that something was seriously wrong in the operation of the company. Banks do not cut off a major account unless they have become persuaded either that the solvency of the client is in question, or that its management has ceased to operate in a responsible way. Yet, two years after that action, Mr. Speaker, the Ontario securities commission accepted a financial statement from Prudential without any independent investigation. Now how much warning have you got to have before you wake up?

The very fact that the balance sheet of Prudential Finance on February 28, 1963, disclosed bank borrowings of only $275,000 out of total current liabilities of $10.5 million should have been an automatic red light to the commission.

Incidentally, in its final report the Ontario securities commission states the case against Morris Stein, Prudential's auditor, upon which charges are now pending, in the following terms, and I quote:

> There is evidence that Stein did not function independently as the auditor; that he accepted Brien's explanation as to the

bad debts in the London account, and made no independent investigation to determine the losses in the accounts receivable.

Now, Mr. Speaker, is not this precisely what the Ontario securities commission is guilty of? It accepted Prudential's explanation of its financial position even after it had been alerted to financial troubles within the company, and it made no independent investigation. If Stein is culpable to the point that he is now facing charges in the courts, who is going to assess the culpability of the OSC and the government to which it was answerable? That is the question that remains in the wake of this whole schemozzle. In their persistent refusal to permit any investigation of their own responsibility, while attempting to put the whole blame on the principals of Prudential, the government is in a wholly invidious position.

However, let me return to a second reason why the Ontario securities commission should have been alerted and should not have so readily accepted the Prudential financial statement of February, 1963, without independent investigations that would have revealed that it was false and misleading.

When Prudential was cut off from its normal bank credit, Brien embarked on an aggressive campaign to solicit funds from the public. In doing so, he took advantage of the securities legislation of the day. That legislation did not require any prospectus to be filed with the commission before the sale in Ontario of short-term notes maturing in less than 365 days.

So Prudential issued notes maturing in 360 days. By February 28, 1963, the balance sheet of the company revealed that "short-term notes payable" amounted to $8,492,-525.77 out of total current liabilities of over $10.5 million. Thus it was known that Prudential was already on the financial treadmill; it could meet its current obligations to the public only by selling further unsecured notes or debentures to the public to raise the money. And it exploited the loop-hole in the existing securities legislation by selling notes maturing in less than a year so that it would not have to reveal its financial position to the public whom it was victimizing.

Clearly this was a deliberate move by Prudential, and you do not have to take my word for it. In his statement of December 21, 1966, a few weeks after the bankruptcy was declared, the Attorney General (Mr. Wishart) said:

> This was an obvious and direct attempt to obtain money from the public while avoiding full disclosure.

In making that statement some four years after the event, the Attorney General was not just being wise in hind-sight. At the time, the government recognized what Prudential was up to, so much so that in the 1963 session of the Legislature, it plugged this loop-hole in our securities legislation.

An amendment stipulated that on short-term notes maturing in less than 365 days, as well as more than 365 days, the company was obligated to file a prospectus with the OSC and deliver a copy of it to each purchaser, thereby assuring, so it was believed, full disclosure of the company's financial status.

In spite of all the warnings which the securities commission had with regard to Brien and his operations, they accepted the financial statement which Prudential presented in 1963 without any independent investigation to ascertain the conspiracy involved in its presentation, or the insolvency which then existed. As a result, the securities commission became an accomplice in the publication of a "false and misleading" prospectus which was used by Prudential to publicly raise further monies to hide its already existing bankruptcy.

In short, having been alerted to Brien's inclination to fleece the public, they assisted him to continue doing so by legalizing his selling tactics, and even did it by an amendment to the securities legislation.

Moreover, the securities commission's defence of its own neglect, as set forth in the final report of the investigation, is unwittingly incriminating.

For example, the "false and misleading" financial statement of February 28, 1963, upon which charges have been laid against Prudential's top officers, was based on a reorganization of Prudential's financial affairs.

Appendix B of the excerpts of the final report released by the Minister on January 12, just over a month ago, reveals that that reorganization was made by Prudential on the suggestion of the securities commission.

Here is the sequence of events as set forth in the final report:

> When it became known that legislation was contemplated that would require Prudential Finance to file a prospectus to continue selling short-term notes to the public, Brien sent the company's auditor, Morris Stein, to discuss with members of the commission staff, the company's position.

> In these discussions, it was learned that Prudential Finance lent the money it raised by sale of its notes to its parent company, The Independent Businessmen's Credit Corporation Limited, to invest in subsidiaries.
>
> It was suggested to Stein that Prudential Finance should take over control of the companies acquired with funds provided by it, because if Prudential proposed to go to the public for funds, a great deal of information would be required as to the manner in which its resources had been utilized up to that time.

Having been given the tip-off by the securities commission as to how it must re-organize its affairs, Prudential proceeded to do so in what must be the greatest one-man juggling act in the history of corporate finance.

At the time, Prudential Finance, a company controlled by Brien, had loaned nearly $4 million of publicly-raised funds to its parent company, Independent Businessmen's Credit Corporation, a company wholly owned by Brien, which had used the money to buy up a succession of businesses for Mr. Brien.

The re-organization carried out at the behest of the securities commission was this: The nearly $4 million indebtedness of the Independent Businessmen's Credit Corporation, wholly owned by Brien, to Prudential Finance, controlled by Brien, was wiped out simply by transferring the subsidiaries and its other assets. In other words, Brien sold the subsidiaries and its other assets from the company which he wholly owned to the company which he fully controlled!

Obviously, Mr. Speaker, none of these transactions was carried out at arm's length, so is it surprising that they were sold at inflated values? Those inflated values served the purpose of hiding Prudential's insolvency —which is precisely the game that Brien was up to in order to get a prospectus accepted by the securities commission so that he could pursue his merry round of meeting current indebtedness by raising still more money from the innocent public.

Mr. Brien's juggling act had another deceptive angle to it and this is amusing if it were not so serious: In February of 1963, he incorporated still another company called Triangle Equipment Ltd. It had no independent financial means and was, of course, wholly owned by Brien. Then Independent Businessmen's Credit Corporation, wholly owned by Brien, sold its controlling interest in Prudential Finance, already fully controlled by Brien, to Triangle Equipment Ltd., the new company just set up for the purpose by Brien.

Now, it is true some of the features of this so-called re-organization were not revealed to the securities commission. That, indeed, was deception. But here is the point—the switch of subsidiaries and its other assets from the Brien wholly owned Independent Businessmen's Credit Corporation to the Brien-controlled Prudential Finance was spelled out, subsidiary by subsidiary, in the prospectus and reflected in the financial statements of February 28, 1963. And this is the prospectus which the securities commission accepted as representing full disclosure!

It is inconceivable that any supervising agency like the securities commission should have accepted this one-man corporate juggling act as normal business transactions, conducted at arm's length. Any sophisticated member of the business community would need to be asleep not to twig to the fact that Brien was up to something. Yet the securities commission accepted Prudential's financial statement of February 28, 1963 without any investigation of the values placed on the assets transferred from one Brien pocket to the other, and now cries "deception"!

Let us face the facts, Mr. Speaker, the commission was deceived because it did not do its job. And because it did not do its job, thousands more of the public were deceived out of millions of hard-earned savings by a company that was already bankrupt.

Moreover, the securities commission's defence of its own neglect is so naive as to be beyond belief.

On page 17 of the excerpts released by the Minister on January 12 of this year, it is stated with reference to Prudential's position in 1963:

> Though the staff of the commission recognized that the company's financial position was such that it would have difficulty in continuing in business successfully, the staff also recognized the fact that if the company's prospectus was not accepted, the 8,000 noteholders then tied to the company would suffer financial loss.

In short, what the commission says is that while it was recognized that the company was in trouble, in order to protect existing noteholders from losses, the company was permitted to victimize still more investors in order to postpone the day of reckoning—by which time there would be even more noteholders with even larger losses!

Now that kind of logic, forgive me, escapes me.

That kind of argument is worthy of the unsophistication which the Attorney General attributes to the people who bought Prudential unsecured notes—and yet it comes from the Ontario securities commission which is supposed to protect the public interests in the investment world in the province of Ontario, indeed far beyond it.

But there is more. Continuing from page 17 of the final report:

> In these circumstances, the commission staff were persuaded that the company, if properly managed, might be able to overcome its financial difficulties and thereby avoid severe loss to its existing noteholders. Accordingly, the prospectus was accepted for filing on June 20, 1963.

In comment, may I say that it is highly misleading to create the impression that it was only the commission staff that was persuaded, and, therefore, was responsible for subsequent decisions of the commission. The final persuasion took place at the meeting on June 13, 1963, and it involved such persons as the then chairman of the Ontario securities commission, J. R. Kimber; the chief auditor of the Ontario securities commission, Mr. Brown; the registrar of the Ontario securities commission, Mr. Knox-Leet; the president of Prudential Finance Corporation Limited, Mr. J. B. Brien; the auditor of Prudential Finance Corporation Limited, Mr. Stein; Mr. Eyton of the solicitors for Prudential Finance, Messrs. Tory, Arnold, Deslauriers and Binnington, and Mr. Betts of the law firm of Messrs. Carrothers, Fox, Robarts and Betts. In other words, the top level of the commission was persuaded, not just the staff.

But let me examine the statement further with you. It says: "if the company were properly managed" the commission staff felt that might be able to overcome its financial difficulties.

On what basis, pray tell, could the commission staff, or top level personnel, or anybody else assume that the company would be properly managed? Who persuaded them? They already knew that the company was being so improperly managed that the banks had cut off credit. They already knew that the company had sought to exploit a loophole in the securities legislation to solicit more funds from the public in a penny-stock style of campaign, without full disclosure of the company's shaky financial position, and had blocked sales without disclosure through the 1963 amendment to The Securities Act. On what grounds could any sophisticated observer of corporate operations conclude that this company would be properly managed?

Furthermore, if properly managed Prudential might be able to overcome its financial difficulties. The commission staff were at least aware of the fact that it was only a gamble. What right has the securities commission to permit a company to gamble its way out of bankruptcy by the further victimization of innocent investors? What right have they to do so with so little scrutiny of the company balance sheets that they did not know they too were being victimized by Brien and his colleagues with a false and misleading financial statement to hide their already existing bankruptcy?

But, Mr. Speaker, there is still more evidence, believe it or not, of naivety. The final report continues on page 17 with still greater documentation of the securities commission's naivete:

> During the discussion it is now recalled by the staff members involved that Brien and Stein at all times appear most cooperative and willing to meet at any time and furnish any information required.

Why would not Brien and Stein be co-operative? After all, the commission had already shown itself willing to play along with their game for more than two years, with only minor interference! Why wouldn't they be willing to meet any time and furnish any information required when that information was so readily accepted, and so little scrutinized, in spite of all the warnings, that the commission was duped into accepting a "false and misleading" financial statement?

Now, Mr. Speaker, one might be persuaded to forget the tender solicitude of this government and its agency, the Ontario securities commission, for Prudential back in those distant days of 1963 if the same attitude had not carried right through until bankruptcy was officially declared in November, 1966. But not only did the government's puzzling unwillingness to grapple with the situation continue right through to the bitter end, but it did so in spite of growing evidence that the company was in continuing financial difficulties—even to the point that the government gradually cut them off from further sales to the public.

This is a part of the story with which we were familiar during the last session, because it was spelled out in a 15-page statement by the Attorney General on December 21, 1966, a few weeks after the collapse of Prudential. In light of the fuller story which we now have, let me review just the highlights.

On June 20, 1963, Prudential's prospectus, drawn up on the basis of the "false and misleading" financial statement, was accepted by the Ontario securities commission, and for a year this already bankrupt company was free to sell securities to the unsuspecting public. But apparently the Ontario securities commission was worried. Though it was never able to grapple effectively with the situation, it should at least be given credit for being continually worried.

So much so, that when Prudential's authority for the sale of notes to the general public expired in July, 1964, there was never any application for its renewal and certainly it was never renewed. From this point forward, Prudential was cut off from sales to the general public and was restricted to sales to existing noteholders. For some reason or other, the Ontario securities commission became persuaded that the financial position of the company had continued to deteriorate throughout 1963 and the first half of 1964 to the point where the general public must be protected from their predatory activities, though apparently existing noteholders were still considered fair game for Prudential salesmen.

More than a year later, in December 1965, the Ontario securities commission was apparently still sufficiently worried that it sought an up-to-date financial statement from Prudential. It was two months before they got one, and when it arrived in February, 1966, it was unaudited. The incredible proposition that a company with its record should have the colossal effrontery to present the government with an unaudited statement after delaying two months should have been final and conclusive warning, if any more were needed, that something was up once again.

On the basis of this unaudited statement, the Ontario securities commission held a hearing in March, 1966, as a result of which they issued an order forbidding Prudential to make any further sales, even to existing noteholders, and demanded that Prudential should provide an audited statement.

Believe it or not, they did not produce an audited statement for four more months, until July, 1966. This kind of gullibility, or neglect, on the part of the government defies credibility. The Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs (Mr. Rowntree) told us last year that they made frequent demands of Prudential's auditor during this period, but he always explained that he was having difficulty in finalizing his figures, and on each occasion assured the government that they would be ready "within a few weeks".

Obviously the company was engaged in the familiar game of "cooking the books" which they had got away with since 1963, so the auditor could not finalize the figures. Indeed, in the light of the charges contained in the final report regarding Prudential's auditor, it is highly likely that he was helping the company to prepare another "false and misleading" statement. But the government tolerated this unconscionable delay which amounted to almost open defiance and they tolerated it for four months.

When the audited statement was made available in July, the Attorney General contends that he and his advisors still felt that they had no legal basis for making their own examination of the financial affairs of Prudential for which there is clear authority under section 36 of The Securities Act.

Another point should be noted here. The Attorney General has frequently asserted that the government did not have the power to intervene under the existing legislation, and yet he did nothing about it. This is back in the day when the whole matter was under the Attorney General and before the new department was established. Though the Legislature was in session during all this period, until mid-year 1966, the government never sought the greater powers that, it claims, were needed to take decisive action.

In spite of the fact that, in the Attorney General's own words, the unaudited statement of February 1966 "disclosed the possibility of eventual bankruptcy"; despite the fact that for more than six months, Prudential defiantly delayed in producing an audited statement, the government was strangely willing to accept their powerless position—if indeed, they believed that they lacked legislative authority to intervene.

There is a final area in which this government was inexcusably negligent. Even though Prudential's authority to sell to the general public had lapsed in July 1964, and even though the Ontario securities commission forbade them to sell even to present noteholders, after March 1966, Prudential continued to sell during all this period.

The Attorney General's pathetic excuse is that nobody complained to his department that sales were continuing! The securities commission knew it was dealing with a company whose operations were so questionable that its sales activity had to be periodically restricted, yet the securities commission

never took the trouble to check whether its orders were being obeyed.

Not only were the OSC orders being violated through further sales, but Prudential was engaged in a prestige "con" game of shocking proportions. Because the government, which was the only source of information that could inform the public, failed to do so with regard to the growing financial difficulties of the company, everybody was lulled into a false sense of security with regard to Prudential.

Little people, these "relatively unsophisticated investors" as the Attorney General is wont to describe them, went to the better business bureau where they were told that the bureau had no reason to doubt Prudential's stability. They went to their bank manager, who assured them that Prudential was a good investment—indeed, in some instances even he was so unsophisticated as to accept the unsecured Prudential securities as collateral for a bank loan! It happened right in London.

In short, Prudential salesmen used every trick in the prestige book to lure people into purchase of their securities—in violation of existing OSC orders. The name of Metropolitan Trust as trustee for Prudential was bandied about freely. The name of the secretary, Cecil Carrothers, Q.C., and the fact that he was a member of the Prime Minister's former law firm, was regularly introduced into the sales pitch. The prospective buyers did not know, and, of course, they were not informed, that the Prime Minister had severed his connections with the firm in 1961.

Over a four year period, the Robarts government and its agency, the Ontario securities commission, played the role of a patsy for an unscrupulous operator. They ignored repeated warnings that this company was determined to fleece the public to conceal its bankrupt condition. They revealed a monumental unwillingness to investigate, or call a halt, to the operations of a company which was preying on the public—nothing more or less.

At this stage, the public is entitled to ask: Why? Why? Why was this government so unwilling to grapple with a situation which was obviously going from bad to worse and engulfing more and more innocent investors in the process? Why were they so unwilling to use either the existing powers they had under The Securities Act to discover the true situation, or seek new power from the Legislature if they really believed that existing legislation left them powerless to intervene?

I challenge anybody, on the basis of the record since 1963, to come to any other conclusion than that the government of Ontario shares, in a very critical way, responsibility for the Prudential fiasco, and, therefore, the losses which brought financial disaster to thousands of small investors—they also share responsibility for that.

For that reason, there is an obligation on the government to compensate those who suffered losses, at least up to a certain limit, because the government shares in the responsibility for the conditions which brought about those losses.

If the government refuses to accept any share of responsibility, then there is an obligation on it to get out of the invidious position it sits in at the moment and to establish an independent public inquiry to assess the role of the securities commission in the whole fiasco.

Spokesmen for the Prudential creditors have made representations for such an inquiry to the commission itself. I suggest, in light of the record, it is an eminently fair request. The government should act upon it.

Mr. Speaker, it being six of the clock, I move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we will resume this debate.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 6 o'clock, p.m.

No. 7

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

First Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Friday, February 23, 1968

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1968

5

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Friday, February 23, 1968

Statement re an order in council pursuant to The Securities Act, Mr. Rowntree 175

Statement re the appointment of Mrs. Stuart MacKay to the training schools advisory board, Mr. Grossman 175

Statement re irregularities in the Timmins area, Mr. Gomme 176

Questions to Mr. Robarts re students seeking summer employment, Mr. Ben 176

Question to Mr. McKeough re grants to mining municipalities, Mr. Stokes 177

Question to Mr. Haskett re the safety of regrooved tires, Mr. Deans 178

Question to Mr. Haskett re a new carburettion system, Mr. Deans 178

Question to Mr. MacNaughton re an inquiry at the Ontario Hospital, Whitby, Mr. Shulman 179

Question to Mr. Stewart re agricultural research, Mr. Ruston 181

Question to Mr. Haskett re safety features on trailer-trucks, Mr. Burr 182

Questions to Mr. Brunelle re resident fishing permits, Mr. Burr 182

Question to Mr. Stewart re the sugar processing plant in Chatham, Mr. Makarchuk 182

Questions to Mr. Brunelle re the E. B. Eddy Co., Mr. Jackson 182

Question to Mr. Wishart re traffic alert, Mr. Sargent 183

Questions to Mr. Haskett re dual safety controls, Mr. Shulman 183

Questions to Mr. Wishart re the return of fugitives, Mr. Shulman 184

Statement re Ontario pavilion at Expo '67, Mr. Robarts 184

Introducing Mr. and Mrs. Christopher Chapman, Mr. Robarts 184

Resumption of the debate on the Speech from the Throne, Mr. MacDonald 185

Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. MacDonald, agreed to 200

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to 200

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 23, 1968

The House met at 10.30 o'clock a.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are always pleased to have visitors to the Legislature and today we welcome as guests, students from the following schools:

In the east gallery, the St. Philip Neri separate school, Downsview; in the west gallery, Deer Park junior high school, Toronto; in both the east and west galleries, pupils from Thistletown public school, Rexdale; and at noon, the children from Uxbridge public school in the west gallery.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a statement with respect to an order in council pursuant to The Securities Act which was enacted at Cabinet yesterday morning. Executive council approval has been given to regulations which deal with finance companies, trust indentures and trustees under The Securities Act.

It is proposed that these regulations take effect on July 1, 1968. This will provide sufficient and reasonable time for firms affected to identify themselves as finance companies and develop the necessary changes in their accounting and financial reporting procedures which will be required in order for them to conform to the new regulations.

Bearing in mind the principle of "full, true and plain disclosure", the new financial reporting requirements provide for a uniform method of financial reporting which augments the Canadian sales finance long form report called CANSAF and the Robert Morris Associates questionnaires, which supplement the audited financial statements of finance companies. Collectively these measures will give more detailed and uniform information on the vital areas of financial operations than either American or British law requires.

The intent of the regulations is as follows:

1. To define "finance company" in a manner which (a) allows those companies engaged in normal finance company function a means of self identification; (b) allows the director to designate other border-line companies if it seems desirable to do so.

2. To provide a specific form of prospectus for finance companies.

3. To require regular appropriate detailed annual and half yearly financial and organizational reporting by finance companies.

4. To maintain and enforce the higher standards of financial disclosure proposed by the investment dealers association of Canada and the federated council of sales finance companies with such modification as the unique circumstances of individual companies may require.

5. To provide for minimum standards of rights and obligations, firstly for trustees, and secondly for trust indentures, as a condition precedent to permitting debt securities to be offered in Ontario by a finance company.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day I wish to announce the appointment of Mrs. Stuart MacKay as a member of the training schools advisory board of The Department of Reform Institutions.

Born in Vancouver, Mrs. MacKay graduated from the University of British Columbia with a degree in commerce. A resident of Toronto for the past 19 years, she is chairman of the Ontario committee on children, a member of the Hinck's treatment centre—formerly known as the Toronto mental health clinic—a trustee of the crippled children's centre, and a past president of the junior league of Toronto. Mrs. MacKay is married and has three children.

The training schools advisory board is composed of five members, including the chairman. The board meets once a week and visits the 14 training schools under the department's jurisdiction regularly. At the weekly meetings the board reviews reports on the progress of all wards received from superintendents of training schools, treatment

staff and rehabilitation officers. On the basis of its careful examination of these reports, the board makes recommendations for the transfer of juveniles from one setting to another, the placement of wards in their own homes or in foster homes, for the return to training school of wards who may not be doing well in the community, and for the termination of wardships.

Mrs. MacKay's experience with children and her knowledge of the facilities available for children in the province will make her a valuable addition to the training schools advisory board. She assumes the position left vacant by the retirement of Mrs. C. R. Sanderson, RN, who served on the board for 23 years.

Mrs. Sanderson's background in public health nursing and executive positions in community agencies made her eminently qualified for her participation in this advisory capacity. Over the years she brought an intuitive and sympathetic approach to the many and varied problems presented to the board.

On behalf of The Department of Reform Institutions and the government, I wish to acknowledge Mrs. Sanderson's fine contribution of almost a quarter of a century of devoted service, and to extend best wishes for her continued good health on her retirement.

Hon. G. E. Gomme (Minister of Highways): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day I would like to make a brief statement to the House.

For the past three weeks the internal audit section of The Department of Highways and the Ontario Provincial Police have been investigating what appears to be some local irregularities in connection with the department equipment rental operation in the Timmins area of the New Liskeard district.

Our investigations have advanced to the point where assistance has been requested from the criminal investigation branch of the Ontario Provincial Police. I wish to assure the House that the investigation is being vigorously conducted and that I will keep the House informed as to its progress.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, if I may ask the Minister who just made the comment—am I to understand that the provincial police instituted the investigation and then asked the department to assist?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Speaker, I think if the hon. leader of the Opposition would read the statement which I made, that is incorrect.

Mr. Nixon: That is rather difficult to do. He just made it. He has it in his hand.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: I said very definitely that the internal audit section of The Department of Highways and the Ontario Provincial Police found it by our audit.

Mr. G. Ben (Humber): Mr. Speaker, may I ask a question of the hon. Minister? Will he do the same with the department of roads in Metro Toronto?

Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day I have a question of the hon. Prime Minister, alias the Premier. Peter McGillen, *Telegram* outdoors editor, wrote last week as follows:

> Judging from the number of applications being received by summer resort operators across southern Ontario, there appear to be ten students for every job this year.

In the light of the foregoing, will the hon. Prime Minister inform the House what steps are being taken by his government to ensure that our economy will be able to absorb and find a place for all students seeking summer employment?

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I do not know the accuracy of Mr. McGillen's statement that there are ten times as many applicants as there are jobs, but I would say to the House that this is a problem which is getting greater because of the increased protection of young people in our school system, because of increased enrollment in our post-secondary educational institutions of all kinds. Our responsibility is to ensure across the entire economic life of the province that there are jobs available for the work force we have in the province.

Our efforts through The Department of Economics and Development are devoted to that end. Our trade crusades and all the various methods we use to promote increased industry in the province are really directed to the proposition of providing an increasing number of jobs for not only students, but the young people who are leaving our educational system and taking their places in the work force of the province.

We have no programmes devoted directly to the employment of students, but as the total economy of the province develops there are jobs available for these young people. There may be some increasing problem here, as I pointed out, because the number of young people looking for summer work on a seasonal basis, because they are students, is increasing every year. We must look to the general economy to absorb it.

Mr. Ben: Would the Prime Minister accept a supplementary question?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Yes.

Mr. Ben: In view of the statement made by the hon. Prime Minister, does he not deem it expedient at this time to set the central bureau in his government to take a survey of: (a) the number of jobs that would be required; (b) the number of jobs that would be available and to try to find (c) the difference, and create these jobs?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I would say, Mr. Speaker, that this is being done on a continuous basis in The Department of Labour. The research department there is conducting continuous manpower studies and I would point out to the hon. member that these encompass the entire work force of the province. They are not limited only to students; but the necessity for planning employment for students and the opportunities for part-time seasonal work are part of the total studies which are carried out continuously.

We do not need to set up a new bureau, or a new research centre to deal with this particular problem, because it is being dealt with on a continuous basis. It has for years been work done by The Department of Labour.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Speaker, I have one more supplementary question, if the Prime Minister will accept it.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Is this another one?

Mr. Ben: Yes. In view of the statement just made by the hon. Prime Minister, would he table in the House figures showing the number of job openings available and the number of people seeking those job openings?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, if he wants to put an order on the order paper, I will table any statistical information The Department of Labour may have available. I do not, of my own knowledge, have these figures, but if the member wants to place an order on the order paper, I would be happy to see that it is answered.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

Pending implementation of recommendations made by the Smith committee, can the Minister allay the growing concern in mining municipalities that whatever the government's final decision, grants to mining municipalities will not be reduced?

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate there is concern in the mining municipalities, and indeed, among members of the House from these municipalities. The member for Kenora (Mr. Bernier) and the member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Demers) have both been in touch with me on several occasions about this very matter.

I think the best thing I could do at this point would be to place on the record a copy of a letter which I wrote to the secretary-treasurer of the association of mining municipalities on February 20:

> This is further to my letter of February 12 concerning your correspondence and enclosures of January 26. Subsequent to the receipt of your brief, I have been informed that a copy of your submission has been forwarded to the Treasurer, the Hon. C. S. MacNaughton.
>
> Reference to my letter of January 17, with which I enclosed a copy of extracts from the speech of the Hon. Mr. MacNaughton will indicate that a schedule of target dates for presentation of briefs has been set up. Concerning your request for an appointment to discuss your association's views, I would like to refer you to the timetable which calls for a series of meetings in May to discuss major issues raised by municipal associations. Time does not permit the consideration beforehand of all submissions on an individual basis by the departments concerned. However I can assure you that the brief of your association will be subject to a thorough evaluation by the central committee which is studying recommendations of the report and co-ordinating the views of the various departments of the government of Ontario. I would suggest to you that it would be preferable to wait until consideration is given to consolidating the presentation of all views received before any individual representations are undertaken.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, there is a procedure for receiving briefs relative to the Smith report. These are being received by the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. MacNaughton). Letters and comments are all being forwarded to him and are being co-ordinated by The Treasury Department, leading up to the conference, which presumably will be held in May.

I think I should also tell the House that my department is not contemplating at this time any change in the basis of mining revenue payments during the forthcoming fiscal year.

This will perhaps be more readily apparent during the course of the estimates.

Beyond that, of course, I cannot commit the government, nor can any of us commit the government to what might be the future policy of the government on mining revenue payments. This is one of the reasons that the conference is being called in the spring of this year. We want the views of the municipalities, and after those views have been solicited, the views of the government presumably will be made known through a white paper and through subsequent legislation.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day I would like to point out a rather serious error in *Hansard*. On February 19, page 91, there is published an alphabetical list of the members of the legislative assembly of Ontario and my name as member for High Park is listed as a member of the Liberal Party.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Shulman: Let me say that I do not consider this a libel as I would if I had my name listed as a member of the other party. It is, however, a serious matter and I would request that it be reprinted correctly, sir.

Mr. Speaker: The member's point is well taken and I will be most pleased to insure that action is taken on it.

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): I would suggest the hon. member wait a few weeks.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Transport. Has the department initiated a study into the safety of regrooved tires for use on commercial vehicles?

Hon. I. Haskett (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, tire standards are set by regulation under The Highway Traffic Act. Further new standards are under consideration at this time and they may include standards for regrooved tires.

Mr. Deans: A further question for the hon. Minister of Transport. Will the Minister investigate the new carburettion system developed by Doughboy Industries Incorporated, of New Richmond, Wisconsin, which reduces exhaust contamination below the emission limit set by the United States government? If such an investigation agrees with the claims made by the company, will the Minister make it mandatory for the new carburettion system to be installed in all automobiles built in Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Speaker, emission controls come under The Air Pollution Control Act of The Department of Health.

Mr. Deans: A question for the Minister of Economics and Development. Is it the practice of the Ontario housing corporation to directly assemble land for the HOME programme, or is some or all of the land assembled by private developers or real estate agents?

And subsequent to it—if HOME land is assembled by private developers or real estate agents, who is assembling the land on Saltfleet Mountain for the proposed satellite city?

Hon. S. J. Randall (Minister of Economics and Development): Mr. Speaker, this member's question, and several others, were received in my office just as I was leaving for the Legislature. I will take notice of the question along with the others and I will get the information the first of the week.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): The Minister should come to work earlier.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I was there at six.

Mr. Sargent: That is early enough, I guess.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, could I add a little part to the question and take it under consideration at the same time? Assuming that it is developed partly by outside industry —and if it is not then, of course, this does not apply—is the cost of using these outside agencies determined as a percentage of the purchasing or selling price, or is it a predetermined figure?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the member make this a question and I will give him the information. Place it on the order pad.

Mr. Deans: A question for the Attorney General. Has the Attorney General received requests from any groups to add to the exemptions from the bargaining units of professional firefighters as defined under The Fire Departments Act?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, I received the question just a few moment ago and I would ask the hon. member to be good enough to allow me to take it as notice so that I can inquire and make certain, and then I will give him the answer.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps this might be a good time to suggest to the members of the Opposition parties that if it were possible for the questions for Friday morning to reach

me in my office on the Thursday afternoon, as some of them from the New Democratic Party did this time, we might be able to expedite this matter.

All members will realize that questions which come into my office undoubtedly must have a period of time there to be dealt with. They must go to the Minister's office in the period between 9.30 a.m. and 10.30 a.m. when he appears in the House, and it makes it very difficult.

Mrs. M. Renwick (Scarborough Centre): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Social and Family Services. What was the total cost of the Royal commission inquiry into the Timbrell case?

Hon. J. Yaremko (Minister of Social and Family Services): Mr. Speaker, all of the accounts are not in as yet, so that it is not possible to give a firm figure. I will take the question as notice and answer the question as soon as all the information is available.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Thank you.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if it is possible to redirect the question which had been submitted by myself to the hon. Minister of Economics and Development. There was some doubt in my mind as to which Minister it might go to. I would like to direct it, with your permission, to the Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond).

Mr. Speaker: I am sure there will be no objection whatsoever to you redirecting it in the normal course, on Monday.

The Provincial Treasurer has an answer to a question given last week which I think we would like to hear at this time.

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Provincial Treasurer): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On Wednesday of this week, the hon. member for High Park asked some questions concerning an inquiry at the Ontario Hospital, Whitby, in which the civil service commission participated.

Supplementary questions caused me to suggest that they all be incorporated, and that I be given an opportunity to reply later. I am prepared to do this today even though the inquiry to which reference is made is not yet complete. With some apologies, Mr. Speaker, I propose to go into some detail—although I do not think the answer is too long—to provide the information the hon. member requested.

Last September The Department of Health and the civil service association approached the chairman of the civil service commission to consider what action should be taken in regard to a number of employee complaints, some of which had reached the grievance stage, concerning certain employment conditions and practices.

These complaints were not specific enough to indicate what action was necessary. Executives of the department and the civil service association both felt that an independent study of administrative and personnel practices as well as problems of employee morale and inadequate performance was essential to put many minor complaints into perspective. An initial study of the problem indicated that a more formalized approach than the usual was required.

Accordingly, at the request of the Minister of Health, the Deputy Minister of Health and the chairman of the civil service commission established terms of reference for a study which was approved by the civil service association. In these terms of reference which I shall read, a three-member committee was established independent of the direct management of the hospital and of the local branches of the association—that is branches Nos. 27 and 156. The committee is composed of Mr. H. Copeland, chairman—Mr. Copeland is executive director, The Department of Civil Service; Mr. George Gemmell, who is president of the civil service association of Ontario; and Mr. W. B. Nicholls, executive director of The Department of Health.

The members of the committee appointed in October, 1967, constitute a three-member independent committee to study the problems and to recommend appropriate action. Since that time there have been extensive hearings and several hundred interviews conducted. A report will be presented to the chairman of the civil service commission, who will forward the appropriate recommendations to The Department of Health and to the civil service association for implementation. Terms of reference are as follows:

1. To examine into matters which are presently the subject of complaint by certain employees and to inquire into grievances which are at the first stage of the grievance procedure.

2. To identify problems which are considered by employees, representatives of employees and management personnel, to have arisen to the detriment of good administrative and personnel practices in the hospital.

3. Generally to report upon conditions and terms of employment at the hospital and the administrative practices and procedures associated therewith as it is found they affect the staff and the attitude of the staff to effective work performance and conscientious discharge of their duties.

4. To indicate where, in the opinion of the members of the committee, corrective action is required on the part of The Department of Health and/or the civil service association of Ontario.

Upon receiving the report of the committee, it is understood that The Department of Health and the civil service association of Ontario will take appropriate steps to correct the problems disclosed.

I would like to stress to the members of this House, sir, that the fact that this committee is established to inquire into employee-employer relations and management practices indicates a healthy management and union approach to mutual problems. Both the management of The Department of Health and the management of the civil service association have indicated a willingness to take whatever steps are necessary to resolve problems at the hospital. The committee, in its studies, has had the fullest co-operation of both the local management of the hospital and of the members of the civil service association. I understand that the committee is conducting its final hearings this coming week and will be making its report early in March.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, would the Minister accept a supplementary question?

Mr. Speaker: The member asks if you would accept a supplementary question.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Really, Mr. Speaker, I have given a very comprehensive answer as I am aware of it. We incorporated two supplementary questions already in the statement that I have made. I wonder how many supplementary answers they should need.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps I might suggest that the member await until he has had the opportunity of perusing the answer that will be printed—I am sure the Minister will give him a copy of it—and thereafter direct the question to the Minister.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, actually all I wish to know is if the final report will be tabled for the House.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Speaker, I would not like to suggest that it would. It is an internal departmental report. I think the proper disciplines of whatever is required will be exercised when the report is tabled but I would think that the report would be of an internal character.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, the Minister has not answered the first supplementary question which was given to him on Wednesday.

Mr. Speaker: The member states that he did not receive an answer to the first supplementary given to the Minister Wednesday.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Speaker, there are so many supplementary questions that it is quite possible that I have overlooked one. I have attempted to be as comprehensive in my answer as possible but—

Mr. Speaker: I would suggest to the member, the first course of action which I suggested—that he wait until he has an opportunity of perusing the answer and then if he has further questions I will be most pleased to see that they are directed to the Minister, who, I am sure, will give a most comprehensive answer.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): I would like to address my question to the Minister of Mines. Did a mining inspector visit the coal plant at INCO in Copper Cliff on Monday, December 8, 1967? If so, what were the findings at that time?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence (Minister of Mines): Mr. Speaker, I regret that I received this question just a few minutes before I entered the House and the hon. member will appreciate that we have to do some work to get the answer for him, so I will take this as notice.

Mr. Martel: Mr. Speaker, another question for the Minister of Mines. Will the Minister accept the federal government's offer of financial assistance to conduct a survey to determine the effects on workers of long-term exposure to high concentrations of sulphur dioxide fumes at the International Nickel Company plant in the Sudbury district? Also, with this extra money, would the government consider broadening the present study to include actual medical tests, briefs from, and full consultation with, interested parties?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Again, Mr. Speaker, I just received this question coming into the House, but I think I should really answer it

by saying that this is a matter of government policy and I think government policy will be announced in this House at the proper time, and I do not think this is the proper time.

Mr. Martel: Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs. What is the cost of transportation of a gallon of gas from Britt to Sudbury by rail and from Britt to Sudbury by truck?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: I will take it as notice.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the hon. Minister of Agriculture and Food. With regard to the agricultural policy of the government, what are the basic objectives of its agricultural research? 1. Is it to provide cheap food for consumers? 2. To raise income of farmers?

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): Mr. Speaker, I would say that this is one of those questions that one might compare with "When did you stop beating your wife?" I would say this: If the national agricultural policy is to be one in which the Ontario producers are going to have to compete with unlimited importations of low-cost food products from all over the world, then we have no alternative but to conduct research into ways and means of making our own farms highly competitive.

To do this, we are engaged in a very great many research projects. All of these matters of research projects are caused by this very fact that we are in a very competitive situation as far as importation of food products is concerned. As I mentioned in this House not long ago in reply to another question, 46 cents of every dollar of Canadian agricultural income is derived from agricultural exports; 13 cents of every dollar of agricultural income produced in Ontario and Quebec is derived from agricultural exports, but 80 cents of every dollar of western Canada's agricultural income is derived from exports.

I believe that the hon. member, if he really thinks through those figures, will understand that through GATT and through the Kennedy Round trade agreements that have been discussed and which will likely be implemented before long, the federal government believes it is necessary to lower the barriers of trade in order that Canada can sell wheat and cattle. But I maintain, as I have always maintained, that if this is to be done then it should not be done at the expense of eastern agriculture. This is what has been happening in the past.

We have implemented an enormous programme of agricultural research across this province. As a matter of fact, if my hon. friend wishes to, he would read from the report which I tabled yesterday the purpose and intent of the agricultural research institute of this province, which is directed by not only farmers but members associated with the agricultural industry. He will note what the purposes of the research programme are, that it is first of all designed to improve the quality of economic data available to individual farmers for management decisions, and second, carries out research designed to describe and evaluate resource adjustment possibilities for various types of farms, agricultural businesses and regions.

This is necessary because there are many, many products that no longer fit into the production or the competitive field because of these imports. I would suggest that coming from the area of the province in which the hon. member who has asked this question lives, he is perhaps more aware than anyone else of the damaging effects on our agricultural economy of these imports. We have to be very much aware of where we are going.

The very fact that this government has introduced a $500,000 research study—

Mr. Sargent: Nova Scotia spent $2 million.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: —through the farm income committee designed to improve the income of the Ontario farmers is indicative of our interest in trying to find the answers that are necessary. This was done at the suggestion of the farm organizations themselves. Had the hon. member attended the Vineland conference, or the conference at Kemptville—I know he was not a member at the time but his party was extended an invitation to both of those conferences—and participated in both of them, he would know that the farmers themselves feel that there is need for further research into this matter. They have asked our government to put up this money, which we are doing.

Mr. Sargent: It is a stop gap.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: My hon. friend has to yap away about things, but he does not really know what he is talking about, or he would not be talking.

I would say this, Mr. Speaker, that our consumers are able to buy more food with returns from less labour than consumers anywhere else in the world, with the possible exception of the United States.

But this is not a policy of Ontario; it is not a policy of Canada; it is a policy determined by the availability of food products around

the world. It is indeed a policy of the western hemisphere.

If we are to continue to do business in this competitive food world in which we find ourselves, then we have to make every effort for our farmers and our food producers to be competitive. This is the purpose and the intent of our research programme.

Mr. F. A. Burr (Sandwich-Riverside): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Transport. Is the Minister contemplating legislation to make compulsory for all trailer-trucks such safety features as anti-jackknifing equipment, brakes on axles and back bumpers?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Speaker, safety equipment under our Act can be mandated by regulation. I am not aware that any consideration is being given at this time to any specific anti-jackknifing equipment or brakes on all axles and back bumpers at this time.

Mr. Burr: Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister of Lands and Forests.

Is the proposed $3 fee for fishing permits, now under consideration by the Minister, restricted to the vacation lakes and rivers of Ontario, or would it also apply to Windsorites who often pretend to fish in the open sewer we euphemistically call the Detroit River?

Hon. R. Brunelle (Minister of Lands and Forests): Mr. Speaker, in answer to the hon. member's question, first let me say that the proposed $3 resident's fishing licence is only under consideration. However, the quality of fishing in various waters is variable, which cannot be taken into account in licensing, whether for a resident or non-resident.

As he well knows, a resident of the Windsor area is much more fortunate than those of many parts of the province, because they have Lake St. Clair, which has unexcelled fishing, at their doorsteps. They have also good perch fishing in Lake Erie and, while I realize that the fishing of the Detroit River now is insignificant, compared to what it was once, I would like to remind him that there is still much better fishing in that area than there is in the Toronto waters.

Mr. Burr: Would the Minister permit a supplementary question? Has the Minister weighed the potential revenue from the permits against the administrative cost and the possible adverse effect on the tourist industry?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Speaker, may I say to the hon. member that all these matters are under consideration and that we are weighing the advantages and disadvantages.

Mr. Burr: And a question for the Minister of Highways.

Is the Minister giving favourable consideration to the request of the city of Windsor that provincial subsidies towards the cost of constructing and maintaining pavements be granted for roads with a minimum width of 24 feet where existing and anticipated traffic volumes do not warrant construction of a 28-foot pavement?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Speaker, I may say that I did not receive a copy of this question, and if I could have a copy, I will take it as notice.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): A question to the Minister of Economics and Development.

1. How many Ontario housing corporation geared-to-income units are located at the Lawfield and Barrisfield Heights project at Hamilton?

2. How many of the units are rented to tenants with incomes up to $6,000?

3. How many units are rented to tenants with incomes up to $8,000?

4. How many units are rented to tenants with incomes of over $8,000?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Speaker, as I said before, I will take notice of the question and get the information for the hon. member.

Mr. M. Makarchuk (Brantford): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Agriculture and Food. Has a meeting been held with the federal and provincial authorities regarding the closing of the sugar processing plant in Chatham? And the second part; if so, can the Minister advise the House as to what transpired at the meeting?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, may I refer the hon. member to *Hansard* page 49? I thought I gave a fairly full description of the meeting that was held with the federal authorities on this plan.

Mr. D. Jackson (Timiskaming): Mr. Speaker, I have a two-part question for the Minister of Lands and Forests. Is the Minister's department negotiating with the E. B. Eddy Co. to establish a sawmill or wood processing plant in the Englehart area? Was the establishment of a wood processing plant required as a commitment of the E. B. Eddy Co. before its cutting permit was renewed in 1965?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Speaker, in answer to the hon. member's question, negotiations

on the establishment of a wood processing plant are continuing with the E. B. Eddy Co.

In answer to the second part of his question, the licence issued for a ten-year period commencing in 1963 provides that the licence may not be renewed if a pulp and paper mill has not been erected and in operation by the date of expiry. It further provides that if any other company makes a firm commitment to construct a mill, E. B. Eddy Co. has 60 days within which to undertake commencing structure of a mill within the next 12 months or give up the licence.

Mr. Jackson: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Economics and Development. Did the Ontario delegation to the Los Angeles—

Mr. Speaker: May I interrupt? Perhaps the member would withhold that. The Minister is not in his seat at the moment. If he comes in before the end of the question period I will,—oh, is he here? I do not have my glasses on this morning and I was looking at Financial and Commercial Affairs.

Mr. Jackson: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: You are too quiet, Mr. Minister.

Mr. Jackson: Did the Ontario delegation to the Los Angeles trade conference include a representative from northern Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I will take notice of the question, Mr. Speaker, and get the information at the first of the week.

Mr. Sargent: Before I have my question, I would like to rise on a point of order regarding the modern technique of producing *Hansard*. Here is the latest entry we have of *Hansard*; it is the issue for February 19. By the time we get it, it will be a week late and I think that, although this government is never known for speed, with the Xerox systems we have now, we could have it almost instantly.

We could have *Hansard* in the hands of the House, and I think it is a sad affair we do not have any *Hansards* since last Monday. I think there should be something done about this.

Mr. Speaker: I will be most pleased—

Mr. Sargent: I do not know, what do you do about anything?

Mr. Speaker: I will be most pleased to take the member's suggestion under advisement, and would he please proceed with his question.

Mr. Sargent: Thank you very much, sir.

Mr. Ben: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I think that the hon. member raised a very good point. I know it deals with your office but it is something of concern to the members that they have to wait a week to get *Hansard*.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Humber then can be advised that I will take the question as notice.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Attorney General.

Is he aware of the new procedure in the United States, called traffic alert, which will work towards cutting the time in half that the policemen spend in court? And if he is aware of this, does he plan to institute this in the OPP or across Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, the latter part of the question is a question as to policy and, in any event, having just received the question, I would like to take it as notice from the hon. member and answer it later.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, I submitted two questions yesterday which, in the heat of the moment, were not asked. May I ask them now?

The first question is for the Minister of Transport. Have objections been made to the Minister's department by a large number of driving instructors, in connection with the Minister's institution of the requirement that dual safety controls be disconnected at the time of taking the driver's test?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Speaker, a total of five letters has been received by my department complaining about the requirement for the removal of dual controls while a driving test is being taken.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, will the Minister accept a supplementary question?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Yes.

Mr. Shulman: Is the department considering changing this rule?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Not on the basis of the five letters we have had. I think the decision to require the removal or the disconnection of the dual controls during the pendency of the examination is sound.

Mr. Sargent: Can the Minister not make a decision himself?

Mr. Shulman: Did the Attorney General—I am sorry—did the Ontario government change its policy three months ago by requesting the police of foreign powers for the return of fugitives in situations not covered by an extradition treaty?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, there has been no change in the policy of Ontario in seeking the return of fugitives from other countries.

Where we seek the return of such fugitives, we make inquiries of the local authorities and ascertain whether it is the intention of those authorities to deport the individual in accordance with any local laws that may be applicable to the case. If deportation proceedings will not be taken, we then proceed in accordance with the extradition laws that may exist between that country and Canada.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, will the Minister accept a supplementary question? Was this the policy followed with one Collucci in Panama?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, I have stated the policy which we follow in all cases. Now with this specific name the hon. member brings to my attention, I cannot say anything different than that this is the policy we follow in all cases.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, will the Minister inquire into this particular case?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I will be glad to inquire. The name is Collucci.

Mr. Ruston: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Davis).

Mr. Speaker: The Minister of Education is not in his seat, so can this be taken on Monday?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might, with your permission, elicit some non-controversial information from the leader of the Opposition?

On Wednesday last, in the course of his remarks, he made reference to a visit he had from two constituents, both of whom were about to be going blind, and the treatment they received in respect of some sort of an application. If I were to get the names—I have been trying to locate those files with no success—if I were to get the names, I would be very pleased to have a personal review of the matter.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, the letters with the details are in the mail now. I would have thought that the Minister would have received them. I signed the letters as soon as I got the information last weekend.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Thank you very much.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I would like to inform the House that as a contribution to the success of Mr. Drapeau's endeavour—Man and His World exhibition, which is being organized by the city of Montreal—it is our intention to turn over the Ontario pavilion to the city of Montreal. Certain safeguards have been built into the agreement in order that the building may be used in the exhibition the city of Montreal is planning for next summer.

I would say, for the information of the House, that from our point of view there was a certain amount of salvage in the pavilion. There were certain things which could be used elsewhere by the government. These have been removed. Mr. Drapeau is very anxious to have the pavilion in the shape in which it is presently, and we are quite happy to co-operate with him in this regard.

While mentioning Expo, Mr. Speaker, perhaps the members might be interested in a little information concerning the film shown in our building there.

This film I have got here won an award that was made to The Department of Economics and Development of the government of Ontario—a special award for creative innovation it is called. This has been awarded on the basis of that movie. In the House this morning is Christopher Chapman who produced that film. Mr. Chapman, perhaps you would—

Mrs. Chapman is with Mr. Chapman. Mrs. Chapman, I would like you to stand too, because I would like to tell the members that the small boy who walks across the film, in the last scene—and which to me really is the embodiment of so much of what our province really is—that small boy with the big grin just as the film ends, is Mr. and Mrs. Chapman's son.

Now, if I may just beg your indulgence for one moment, I would point out to you that we estimate about 2.5 million people saw that film at Expo. It has been shown since in the theatres throughout Ontario where another 500,000 people have seen it. It is in the process now of being arranged for distribution throughout the world, and it is rather difficult to estimate, really, how many people

eventually will get some impression of Ontario from that movie.

As was announced in the Speech from the Throne, we propose to participate in Expo 70 in Japan and Mr. Chapman has agreed to produce another movie for us which will be part of our pavilion there. The hon. member for Grey-Bruce asked what our plans would be. This probably is the only firm decision that has been made yet in regard to our participation, other than that we will be participating, but Mr. Chapman has undertaken to produce another film for us which will be used at Expo 70 in Japan.

You might also like to know that that film has received two nominations for academy awards—I think the proper title is Motion Picture Academy in Hollywood. Now these awards have not yet been made, but to even be nominated for an award is really quite an honour. It has been nominated for an award as a documentary short subject and as a live action short subject, and I would hope that in due course, I will be able to stand in my place here and inform the House that this film has been successful in winning one of these awards.

It is a decision that has not yet been made, but we are in the running and I am happy to have this opportunity to just say "thank you" to Mr. Chapman for the really wonderful creative work he did in producing this film.

Mr. T. Reid (Scarborough East): Mr. Speaker, would it be proper to ask the Premier an item of information? Is this wonderful movie, this very artistically done movie, now being shown in the classrooms of Ontario schools through the educational television branch of The Department of Education to reach more people?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I would have to inquire and give you the details but I would be able to tell you that it has been reduced to a 16-millimetre film—it was made originally as a 70-millimetre film—which in itself is a very large technical achievement; with that technical achievement having been made, it would now be available in schools, most of which are equipped with 16-millimetre projectors. As to how it is being dealt with in regard to educational television I really am not in a position to answer. I am quite sure the Minister of Education could give any member that information if he were to direct his question to him.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, would the Prime Minister—

Hon. Mr. Randall: Would the Speaker hold the question from the hon. member for a moment? If the film, as the Premier says, has been reduced to 16-millimetre, if you have a colour television set you get the full effect; if you have black and white I do not think you will appreciate it as much as you would if it were in colour. However, the 16-millimetre has been made available to all boards of education. I think up to now we have sold about 300 of the films, and we anticipate that perhaps we will dispose of 2,000 before the next few months are out.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, at the risk of being very unpopular again, would the Prime Minister advise the Minister that we are going a bit too far in this business? You cannot get a home run every time and "Gone with the Wind" has been shown repeatedly over the years. Where does the government get the right to spend this amount of money continuously without the—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sargent: I think it is a point we have to make; we have to draw a line some place as to how much money we are going to spend on PR.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Do not argue with success.

Mr. Speaker: The member will have full opportunity to deal with this when the estimates of the department concerned come before this House and I am sure he will do that then.

Mr. Ben: I do not think my hon. colleague is disputing the amount. What he is wondering is whether it is possible for Mr. Chapman to come up with two such brilliant productions.

Mr. Speaker: Order! Order!

Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: First order, resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the motion for an address in reply to the speech of the Honourable, the Lieutenant-Governor at the opening of the session.

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, in resuming the debate this morning I would like to begin with a few brief comments on the Parker commission report that

the Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) tabled yesterday. I do not intend to discuss the controversial contents of that report. The hon. member for High Park (Mr. Shulman) is well able to defend himself and if the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Nixon) thinks that "mighty Mort has struck out", it just shows how little the leader of the Opposition knows about the ball game which is just beginning.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): If the member had listened to my comments he would know that I said that the Royal commission struck Mort out.

Mr. MacDonald: Exactly it. My comments, Mr. Speaker, are in specific reference to this report but even more broadly on Royal commission reports in general. The Prime Minister gets very wrathy when reports prepared by the government on issues that are of a controversial nature, rather than an investigative or an academic nature, are described as whitewash and I suspect he is going to get wrathy again in this case. But this is the granddaddy of whitewashes, and before he gets wrathy I think it is time that this House got this whole proposition of investigating controversial issues into perspective.

About six or eight years ago there was held on the Canadian broadcasting corporation radio a panel discussion chaired by Allan Anderson—I think it was one of his regular series "Let's Discuss It". On that panel were two people: John Saywell, then with the department of history at the University of Toronto and now dean of arts at York, and Malcolm Robb, a well-known Toronto lawyer. In the course of this panel discussion—a full transcript of which I have here for any member who is interested in looking at it; and I would be glad to lend it to him—they sorted out two kinds of Royal commissions: one which looks into policy issues and they contended that some useful role could be played there; and second, the kind of Royal commission that is set up to look into allegations of fraud or scandal or highly controversial issues. These two men, not talking about any particular Royal commission but really speaking from their assessment of 100 years of Canadian history, as far as Royal commissions are concerned, had these comments; first Dr. Saywell:

> Royal commissions very seldom seem to find out anything that is in sharp contradiction to what the people who have appointed the commission have already decided ought to be found out.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): Then why does the member always ask for Royal commissions?

Mr. MacDonald: I do not always ask for Royal commissions. Secondly, a comment from Mr. Robb—I repeat, a well-known lawyer in Toronto who has, I suspect, as much respect for the judicial process and judges as anybody else. His comment is this:

> When a judge becomes a judge, for all practical purposes he ceases to be a politician, but if you are going to have an impartial commissioner, it becomes an almost certainty that you will never see him appointed on a matter in which a government appointing him is genuinely concerned that something will be brought out in its disfavour.

In other words, judges as Royal commissioners are biased in favour of those who appoint them.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Depending on the decision.

Mr. MacDonald: Depending on which?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Depending on how you like the results.

Mr. MacDonald: However, Mr. Speaker, perhaps a far more important comment with regard to this Royal commission report is that the commissioner simply did not do the job he was given to do—or rather, let me put it more accurately, he did one of the jobs he was given to do and that was to conduct a personal vendetta. He did not do the more important job of resolving the policy issues which were basic to this controversy. Mr. Speaker, I find this absolutely incredible. I have a few questions for the Prime Minister. I am quoting now from *Hansard*, April 14, 1967, and this is a brief debate that took place in the House when the Prime Minister put on record the terms of reference for this Royal commission inquiry. My colleague, the hon. member for Riverdale spoke. It is on page 2197 of *Hansard*:

> *Mr. J. Renwick* (Riverdale): Mr. Speaker, in view of the importance of the matter, I would ask the Prime Minister if he would consider two comments which I will place in the nature of questions to him.
>
> I notice in his terms of reference, and because we want to have a final solution to the problem which occasioned this inquiry, would it be possible that the Prime Minister would consider enlarging the terms of reference to include a consideration by the commissioner of the status historically and at the present time of coroners in the province of Ontario? And would he consider extending the

terms of reference to include, in addition, consideration of the delimitation or the boundary line between the functions of the supervisory coroner in his supervisory and advisory capacities in relation to a chief coroner who has control over the coroners in a city or municipality such as that of Metropolitan Toronto? It would appear to me, Mr. Speaker, that these two areas are so important that we should have them finally settled for the benefit of the people of the province so that we will not have a recurrence of this problem.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I would say, Mr. Speaker, that both the matters that were mentioned will fall within these terms of reference as they are presently drawn. I have discussed these terms of reference, of course, with the commissioner, because I would not bring them here until I had discussed them with him, and I am quite certain that the points which the member raised will be covered here. I think what the member is speaking about is absolutely basic to the commissioner's approach to the problem that we have asked him to solve; he is going to have a look at these things. I have assured the commissioner that if he finds his activities limited technically because of the terms of reference, I would be quite happy to look at them again, as he goes ahead in performing his duties, but I think the points the member raised are covered and will be dealt with by the commissioner in the commission as it stands.

Mr. Speaker, the commissioner simply did not do his job. The Prime Minister said he talked with the commissioner and his words clearly indicate that the commissioner knew what the terms of reference were, that they included this investigation on the basic issue of the role of a coroner, and the relationship between the chief coroner and the supervising coroner, and he simply did not do his job. He was so preoccupied with trying to get Dr. Shulman, that he did not do the job that was given to him.

In the course of his remarks, the commissioner states that if such and such had been done by Dr. Shulman, or by his counsel at certain stages, a lot of time and money would have been saved.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest a lot of time and money would have been saved if this man had not been appointed, because clearly he was in there to do a political hatchet job and the Prime Minister has accepted the fact that he ignored the basic policy issues that he was appointed to look into.

We will let the contents of the report rest for some subsequent opportunity to debate, Mr. Speaker, but I think those two comments with regard to Royal commissions in general, and this one in particular, should be made at this stage.

If I may proceed, Mr. Speaker, to another topic in the body of my comments, Canada is currently preoccupied with the problems of national unity. One of the cornerstones upon which that unity must be built is the elimination of sharp disparities in regional economic opportunities and standards of living. In this context, there is no more appropriate time to consider the plight of Canada's native Indians—and that I would like to do for a few moments.

Over 40 per cent of our Indian population is unemployed or living on relief. Their unemployment rate is ten times the national average.

About 47 per cent of Indian families earn less than $1,000 a year; some three-quarters earn less than $2,000. The Indian population is growing at twice the rate for the nation as a whole, and the pressure on their limited resources is proportionately greater. There is little prospect of any natural improvement in these basic figures.

About 57 per cent of Indian families live in houses of three rooms or less, compared to a national average of 11 per cent. Only 9 per cent have indoor toilets; only 44 per cent have electricity in a province, incidentally, where we boast that almost 100 per cent of our population has access to this modern convenience.

Medical statistics show that the mortality rate among Indians is eight times the national rate for pre-school children; three times the national rate for children; 2.5 times the national rate for teen-agers; and 3.5 times the national rate for adults.

The number of Indians being educated has increased, with school enrolment up from 611 in 1948 to 4,761 in 1965, and university enrolment up from 9 to 88 for the same period. But these gains are not really enough, and—

Hon. J. Yaremko (Minister of Social and Family Services): I wonder if the hon. member would give the source—just for my information—of these figures?

Mr. MacDonald: The source of these particular figures is the document that was recently released by the Indian-Eskimo association and—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I just happen to have it in my hand right now.

Mr. MacDonald: Very good. I am glad to see one Minister is really on the ball this morning.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): It only came out a few minutes ago.

Mr. MacDonald: I was saying, Mr. Speaker, that some 24 per cent of Canada's Indian population remains "functionally illiterate".

A shockingly disproportionate number of Indians are in conflict with the law. A. E. Bigwin, an Ojibway, recently stated that:

> Over 30 per cent of the men, women and children in jail and training centres throughout Canada are of Indian ancestry, while they make up less than 4 per cent of Canada's population.

Most of their convictions are for vagrancy and drinking. These are much more social problems than criminal offenses, and, therefore, represent further evidence of a people adrift in society, up-rooted from their traditional way of life.

It is a national shame that the original inhabitants of this country should live in such degrading conditions. "For many years," as one observer has aptly put it, "the Indian has been like a beggar—standing outside the walls and looking into a mansion he once owned."

In a rather superior way, Canadians are often prone to be critical of the way European imperial powers frustrated the development of native populations in Africa and Asia, so that the efforts of these people to achieve self-determination have been halting, and often violent.

Yet Canada's own native population lives in economic and social conditions which are a match for those of underdeveloped countries. Here, surely, is a situation which should stir the national conscience.

Furthermore, let us not forget we have lived with this unsolved problem for an inexcusable length of time. We have sometimes talked about the need for a change. But our talk has failed to alter the course of our drift through 100 years of nationhood. And it has offered cold comfort to the Indian.

In 1854, some 13 years before Confederation, the Earl of Elgin, Governor-General of Upper Canada, pleaded for government action in observations that are strikingly appropriate for today. Said he:

> If the civilizing process to which the Indians have been subjected for so many years had been accompanied by success, they have surely by this time arrived at a sufficiently enlighted condition to be emancipated from the state of pupilage in which they have been maintained.

In fact, however, Lord Elgin noted that policies with regard to Indians had been unsuccessful for long enough to "warrant the adoption of some other method . . .", and so he concluded:

> The more intelligent and educated Indians, of which there are a great number, are extremely anxious that the experiment should now be tried of allowing them the control of their own private funds, and express themselves ready and willing to assume the consequent liabilities. This desire seems most natural, and I trust that if it is complied with in the manner proposed, individual enterprise and industry will be developed to an extent which will justify so important an alteration in the administration of Indian affairs.

Today, 114 years later, Lord Elgin's diagnosis remains valid, and his recommended cure appropriate. Our relationship to the native Indian population is much the same, and as fundamentally wrong, as it was in 1854. Experience is proving that it is impossible to work out new policies within the framework of the old system represented by the Indian affairs branch in Ottawa. A sharp break with the past is required.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the reason why I raised this particularly at the beginning of a new session of the Ontario Legislature is that the broad lines of a new approach are emerging, and it is necessary for this Legislature to take note of them, and for the government to move with all possible haste to their development.

This new approach comes from, or has the support of, experts in the field, such as the top officers of the Union of Ontario Indians, which is the Ontario government's chief policy advisory group, and from the Indian-Eskimo association, which is the leading independent organizational link between the Indian community and Canadian society as a whole. Proposals for change from such authoritative sources are worthy of serious consideration.

The broad lines of the new approach are as follows:

1. Negotiate a general federal-provincial fiscal agreement to speed up the transfer of a significant number of functions to the province from the Indian affairs branch. The present reliance on piecemeal arrangements has slowed implementation of this desirable policy to a snail's pace.

2. Establish regional development programmes in Indian areas under Crown corporations. These bodies would receive, in one sum, the present grants and other conditional forms of assistance now flowing from federal and provincial agencies and departments. They would be responsible for co-ordinating the use of these funds in all phases of community development.

3. Entrust the shaping of these development programmes to the Indian community, providing outside assistance wherever necessary.

Implementation of the programmes should proceed with the full involvement of the native population, including adequate representation on the Crown corporation charged with the overall responsibility.

This new approach would result in the department of Indian affairs being relieved of most of its present powers except the important work of safeguarding Indian lands and treaty rights. In conducting its research on "Indians and the Law", the Canadian welfare council found that in all regions of the country, officials of the branch were considered not as friends, but rather as the enemy. Because of its long record of bureaucratic paternalism, the Indian affairs branch is unable to get in close enough touch with the Indian people to make its programme effective.

The latest proof of this, is the way its own community development programmes have bogged down in recent years. The extent of, and the reason for their failure, have been detailed in the January, 1968 study published by the Indian-Eskimo association.

This study was completed by its executive director, E. R. McEwen, after conferences and private discussions with the community development officers across Canada, and investigations into similar community development schemes in a number of central American and Caribbean countries.

The IEA study concludes it is simply unrealistic to hope that a working partnership can be established between the community development workers and the traditional bureaucracy headed by the Indian superintendent. Their objectives are in basic conflict: the superintendent seeks to maintain a paternalistic control over the Indian community, while the development officer must encourage a critical assessment of present conditions as a first step to changing them. In the eyes of the superintendent, therefore, the development officer seems a troublemaker.

The IEA study stresses two other fundamental weaknesses in the community development programmes.

First, community development services are theoretically supposed to tap and use the resources of all government departments. But experience has shown departments are jealous of their prerogatives and do not look with favour on any other agency carving out their work for them. And often, when there is cooperation and agreement on a new programme, the money to implement it somehow is not available in the departmental estimates. The resulting delays are deeply frustrating. The attitude of most departments, the study notes, is that "community development people are building an empire using our resources—becoming heroes at our expense."

It is for this reason that the new approach envisages the establishment of a Crown development corporation, along the lines of the Tennessee valley authority or the BAEQ set-up under ARDA to promote development in eastern Quebec. The corporation would have overall control and direction of monies drawn from any and all departments and agencies for the implementation of a fully coordinated development programme.

Second, most of the resources needed for community development—land, water, hydro power, roads, public health, game, and so on—are now controlled by the province. Therefore, a community development programme initiated and worked out under federal jurisdiction, is cut off from most of the resources it needs for successful operation.

That is why this new approach begins by transferring to the province many of the functions now invested with the Indian affairs branch. Here they can be more readily coordinated with the basic resources needed for community development. Although this would merely be a fulfilment of present stated policy, the fact is, up to now, very little has actually been transferred.

"At the present pace and method," the IEA study points out, "it would take decades to effect a substantial transfer," and for that reason, it gives support to the Hawthorn-Tremblay recommendation that:

> The increased funds the provinces will require as they assume growing responsibilities for providing services to Indians, should be provided as quickly as agreement can be reached within general federal-provincial fiscal arrangement, rather than by an infinity of specific agreements dealing with particular functions.

I would ask the Minister of Social and Family Services, who is chairman of the Cabinet committee charged with co-ordinating this government's policy with regard to Indians: Where does Ontario stand in negotiating this transfer of functions from the Indian affairs branch?

And I would illustrate my point with specific reference to one of the most important functions—education. Development programmes in any community hinge in a very vital way on education; but this is critically so among our Indians. As one observer has put it:

> The worst kind of darkness is that of ignorance, and that is why education is crucial to the Indian. It will allow him to keep his dignity and maintain his honour. Without it, there is no tomorrow, only a weary today.

The overwhelming concensus among objective observers is that the education of Indians, which has been left for the most part to the churches in the past, must become a public responsibility. It must be integrated and coordinated with our regular school system.

For some years now, the Minister of Education (Mr. Davis) has voiced Ontario's willingness to undertake this responsibility. So why have there been such prolonged delays in achieving the transfer of responsibility from the Indian affairs branch?

For the moment, Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to pursue the wide-ranging detail involved in this radically new approach. There will be many other opportunities later in the session. My purpose today is simply to suggest to this Legislature that we cannot tolerate any longer, the national disgrace which is the plight of our Canadian Indians.

Ontario can, and should, take the lead in doing something about it. We have been given the broad outline of a new approach by responsible persons and organizations thoroughly familiar with all the difficulties involved. It is our duty, as members of this Legislature, to give this important question high priority in our considerations. I know that the Minister who chairs the Cabinet committee on Indian policy has been meeting with individuals and organizations which have been taking the lead. What is the government prepared to do?

I ask that the House be given a reply to that question as early as possible in the session, so that we might have a working framework within which meaningful debate can take place.

I would just conclude my comments in this connection with a reminder that a CP newsstory of a seminar on Indian affairs held at Western University in London last week, headlined the advice of Dr. R. R. Roth, a professor of zoology:

> INDIANS TOLD: STOP BEGGING
> START FIGHTING FOR RIGHTS

This was the advice from a white man:

> There are many signs of a growing desperation among our Indian peoples. They have manifested the patience of the gods in submitting to the treatment of the white man. One of these days they are going to follow the example of native peoples across the world, and start fighting. Their self-respect and dignity demands it.
>
> If that happens, it will add further to our shame. My plea is that we move with policy changes before events overtake us.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, I assure the hon. member that much of which he has referred to will be dealt with, I assure him, at the earliest opportunity.

Mr. MacDonald: I thank the Minister—in the fullness of time.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Even sooner than that.

Mr. MacDonald: Since the Legislature last met there have been two historic conferences which in my view have set this nation on the road to a successful reshaping of Confederation.

The first was the Confederation of tomorrow conference held here in Toronto under the sponsorship of the Ontario government. History may well acknowledge it as the first effective effort at halting the drift which has characterized the growing crisis in Canadian Confederation over the past few years.

But as a first step, the Confederation of tomorrow conference may quickly be lost in the sweep of history. We have been assured that there will be many other steps following rather rapidly. While it is relatively fresh in our memory, therefore, there are a number of observations that should be made.

First, it is significant that it was on provincial initiative—that of Ontario—that this conference was called. It is an open secret that the federal government refused to attend, partly out of a sense of pique that protocol had been breached, and partly because the federal Liberals were openly predicting that the conference would be a failure. That the conference was a success only serves to underline Ottawa's failure of leadership in resolving the crisis.

Second, the historic significance of the conference lies in the fact that it revealed the possibility of a concensus among provincial leaders on the basic problems plaguing Canadian Confederation.

As a person who was privileged to observe those proceedings, my most vivid recollection is that so many provincial Premiers seemed to be facing up to the reality of the crisis in French-English relations for the first time. How this could possibly be the case, after all the federal-provincial conferences held in recent years, is difficult to comprehend but

there it was. The important achievement was that, despite their understandable preoccupation with economic problems rooted in regional economic disparities, the Atlantic Premiers recognized the urgency of the crisis in French-English relations. And despite the difficulties which the western Premiers have in comprehending "the Quebec problem" so called, they, too, were willing to face up to it in order to maintain and strengthen Confederation.

In short, a concensus began to emerge: tentative and fragile, but nonetheless hopeful.

Third, it is difficult to assess, but perhaps impossible to overestimate, the fact that through radio and TV, all the Canadian people were able to share in this conference. For the first time, in a meaningful way, Canadians from coast to coast could watch their leaders threshing out highly controversial problems. By and large, the result was a most reassuring one. The cynics who predicted that such an open conference would result in fruitless grand-standing were proven to be wrong. The hot glare of the lights did not inhibit free and frank discussion. Indeed, it may well have been a reminder to the participants that the eyes of the nation were literally upon them; perhaps it engendered a sense of responsibility which did much to shape the consensus.

Finally, that concensus helped to create a public climate for acceptance of the B and B report as a practical programme to remove one of the major sources of tension in Confederation.

All of this led very naturally to the next step in the whole process of re-Confederation —the constitutional conference held in Ottawa earlier this month. Having taken the people of the nation into their confidence through open discussions in November, our political leaders could not fail to do so once again. I hope the lesson will not be lost, even upon the government of Ontario, in terms of making the proceedings of this Legislature available to the public through radio and TV. We have everything to gain in permitting the people to share in the conduct of their own business through the electronic media.

I believe the Ottawa conference further gave substance to the emerging concensus. There are still differences, some of which may at this time appear irreconcilable, but there was a solid commitment to the future of this nation. There was agreement on the problems, and on the establishment of machinery to grapple with them. And there was above everything else a spirit of goodwill and a determination to push on with the task. Men of goodwill, who have accepted a common objective, can achieve tomorrow what appears to be impossible today. For that reason, I think there is every reason for cautious confidence.

However, the future success of the continuing constitutional conference depends to a very great extent on maintaining and strengthening the working partnership which was so delicately built at the Confederation of tomorrow conference. That has now been threatened by the confrontation which Justice Minister Pierre Elliott Trudeau so obviously still seeks with Premier Daniel Johnson of Quebec.

It may be good politics to take on Mr. Johnson in open battle, but I have grave doubts whether it is good nation-building. Without the skilful diplomacy of Mr. Pearson, who rescued his Justice Minister from the inevitable consequences of his tactics, the work of the constitutional conference might well have come to an abrupt end.

The federal government has for the moment accepted the Trudeau position that if bilingual and bicultural rights are assured to French Canadians all across this country, then Quebec can be treated constitutionally as "une province comme les autres".

On the other hand, Premier Johnson passionately argues that if French Canada is to protect its traditions and culture, and be assured of its full economic development, Quebec must have greater powers. So much greater, in fact, that they might endanger the federal government's role on behalf of the nation as a whole. That is the core of the problem.

For members of the Legislature in a province which has a key role to play in reshaping Confederation, the critical question is: which approach is politically possible?

In assessing the relative merits of these positions, there is one paramount fact to be borne in mind. Whatever may be our reactions in English-speaking Canada to the position taken by Daniel Johnson today, we must not forget that his position is the most moderate one put forward by any party in Quebec provincial politics at this moment.

The spectre hanging over Quebec today is that of a united separatist movement under the sophisticated leadership of René Levesque. If that political movement now marshalling behind him wins the day, then Confederation is doomed, and both Quebec and the rest of Canada will face an anguished separation, the difficulties of which

should not be underestimated for one fleeting moment.

But even more important than the separatist threat at the moment is the position of the official Opposition, the Liberal Party in Quebec. As spelled out in the recent constitutional document drafted by Paul Gerin-Lajoie, and now adopted by the provincial caucus, the position of the Liberal Party stands midway between that of Johnson and the separatists.

There is no doubt that Premier Johnson was right when he told the constitutional conference that at one point they should not react to his position as a personal one because if he were to go, there is every prospect that his successor would be making even more extreme demands. These are the political realities of Quebec today; whether we like them or not is irrelevant; we must cope with them if Confederation, including Quebec, is to be saved.

There is a second paramount fact to be borne in mind. There is no reason to doubt, in my view at least, that Daniel Johnson is a federalist determined to negotiate a place for Quebec within a reshaped Confederation. If we have the patience to sweat it out, I for one, at least, am convinced that a new Confederation can be built.

The problems related to bilingualism and biculturalism are now manageable. I want to return to them later. But the really difficult problem lies in the redistribution of powers between the federal government and the provinces, particularly Quebec, so that on the one hand the political realities in Quebec can be satisfied, and on the other hand, the central government can be strong enough to meet the needs of the nation as a whole.

How can this be achieved? As a starting point, my mind goes back to positions which were staked out at the Confederation of tomorrow conference. On this issue, we made no progress at the constitutional conference in Ottawa.

In his opening statement to the November conference, Prime Minister Robarts suggested one possible way to resolve the dilemma of the redivision of powers between Ottawa and the provinces. This was his suggestion that the provinces should agree among themselves what are the minimum inviolable powers a strong central government must have. And incidentally it should be borne in mind that all provinces except Quebec were emphatic in their assertions that there must be a strong central government.

In contrast, Premier Johnson started from the opposite point: he suggested that there should be a great decentralization of powers from the central government to the provinces, so that all might be put on a similar basis. The other nine provinces could then delegate back to Ottawa those powers which they wished the central government to exercise on their behalf.

As we seek to reconcile those two positions, we will reach a point where Quebec will insist on certain powers which the other nine provinces, and the federal government, will want vested in Ottawa.

At that point, the challenge to the fathers of re-Confederation will be to find the constitutional means of achieving that accommodation. How exactly it will be done, I venture to suggest, no one knows at this time. But if all those involved are determined that it shall be achieved to save Canada, a way can be found.

When it has been found—one year, two years, three years from now—then we will have established—dare I use the term—a special status for Quebec within a new Confederation.

And I say that, Mr. Speaker, not because I am in favour of a special status for Quebec as an end in itself, but because in my view it will be necessary to meet the political realities in Quebec if this is to remain a united nation.

How do we reconcile this with the present official position of the federal government, as now formulated by Mr. Trudeau? It will be reconciled, it can be reconciled, in the months, perhaps years, of negotiations that lie ahead if—if—intransigent positions are not taken, and if open confrontations are avoided.

Let me give you an example. Prime Minister Pearson and Manpower Minister Jean Marchand were questioned by newspapermen on a telecast on the Sunday evening before the opening of the Ottawa conference. Ottawa's official line emerged in the discussion: Quebec's position in any revised constitution must be essentially the same as that of all other provinces. Claude Ryan, who was one of the newspapermen questioning, zeroed in with unerring accuracy to the heart of the issue: did this mean, he asked the Prime Minister, that never again would it be possible to accommodate the special needs of Quebec in the implementation of any given programme, as was done in the Canada pension plan? Oh no, Mr. Pearson replied, that would not be ruled out.

Well, if not, apparently there might yet be a special status for Quebec in federal Liberal thinking. If so, this is the sort of flexible approach through which a new constitutional framework can alone be shaped so that all Canada can live and grow.

Let me turn now to the B and B aspects of this constitutional development, and I quote, "If we choose to be hesitant and negative in our attitudes towards the linguistic and cultural question, then we shall play into the hands of those who wish to put the future of our country in jeopardy". So said the Prime Minister of Ontario at the constitutional conference. I agree wholeheartedly.

I agree further when he said "More formal recognition of the two linguistic communities in Canada is a modest—indeed, a minimum—investment which must be made in the new Canada".

Therefore, I welcomed the assurance of the Prime Minister that the government of Ontario endorses the guiding principle and the spirit of the first volume of the B and B report: "that both official languages be recognized wherever the minority is numerous enough to be viable as a group".

We have been assured that the studies for implementing a programme of education in French within the existing secondary school system will be completed by March 15. I look forward to action on this during the current session; in fact we have been assured of that.

Four task forces have been set up—to investigate the feasibility of implementing the B and B recommendations concerning first, the administration of justice; second, the Legislature and the provincial statutes; third, municipal administration; and fourth, the provincial public service. These studies, we are told will be completed by this summer, and meanwhile, the broader question of establishing bilingual districts in appropriate parts of Ontario is being looked into. I assume from this that the government will be prepared to present specific programmes by this fall, or at the latest, a year hence.

Le Premier Ministre a aussi indiqué que le département du service publique et le département de l'instruction publique, établiront des cours de française pour tout fonctionnaire dont les fonctions exigent la connaissance de cette langue.

Permettez-moi de plaider ici une cause de la plus grande importance. Dans le nouveau Canada que nous bâtissons, cette législature a certainement le devoir spécial de donner l'exemple dans la réalisation d'un plus grand degré de bilinguisme.

Notre caucus a déjà déclaré son intention de poursuivre ce but. Mais il faut admettre, qu'étant donné nos heures de travail en qualité de députés, il y a des difficultés a entreprendre des cours de conversation française. Je suis cependant, persuadé qu'il y a des membres dans chaque parti qui désirent apprendre le français, ou tout au moins, le perfectionner.

Puisque c'est l'intention du gouvernement d'entamer certains cours et programmes allant jusqu'a l'etablissement de laboratoires linguistiques pour le service publique, je demanderais ceci: est-ce que le gouvernement serait d'accord d'établir des cours de français pour ceux d'entre les députes qui voudraient en profiter?

Je suis convainçu qu'il serait possible de tirer un comité avec répresentation des trois partis, qui trouverait le meilleur moyen d'ajuster de tels cours à nos devoirs législatifs.

Une telle experience serait peut-être utile dans l'envergure du programme envisagé pour le service publique par ce gouvernement.

J'avance cette proposition avec la plus grande sincerité. Et je souhaitrais une rêponse favorable du Premier Ministre lorsqu'il addressera la Chambre dans ce débat.

Mr. Speaker, since we do not have simultaneous translation here and that was rather an important point I wanted to make to the Prime Minister—

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): I understand what the member says.

Mr. MacDonald: Just in case he missed it, may repeat what I said in English.

The Prime Minister has also said that The Department of the Civil Service and The Department of Education will be establishing language courses for civil servants whose duties require a knowledge of French. Here, I would like to make a special plea. In the new Canada that we are building, I think there is a special obligation on members of the Legislature to lead the way in achieving a greater measure of bilingualism.

In our caucus, we have determined to do so. But I must be frank and say that the mechanical difficulties of establishing such French-language discussion groups, under proper guidance, within the heavy work load of the Legislature, are proving to be difficult ones. I am confident that there are members of all parties in the Legislature who would wish to acquire, or improve, their capacity to speak French. Since the government's intention is to proceed with discussion classes, or

language labs, or whatever is deemed to be the most effective means to develop bilingualism, would the government be willing to experiment this year with bilingual classes for those MPP's who are interested?

I am sure that it would be possible to draw together a committee representative of all three parties which could work out the best possible way of fitting such classes into our legislative work. Such an experiment might prove useful in the broader programme which the government plans for the civil service; and meanwhile, it would be eloquent testimony to our sincerity in seeking a greater bilingualism. I earnestly put this proposal to the Prime Minister, and invite his response when he speaks next in this debate, because if we are going to do it, I suggest we should do it.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: My response is that we would be delighted to work this out with the other two parties.

Mr. MacDonald: You see the spirit of goodwill that is involved in developing a new Confederation.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: For this half hour.

Mr. MacDonald: A final word, for the moment, on the question of bilingualism: the B and B report recommends that two provinces, New Brunswick and Ontario, should formally declare themselves bilingual, giving official status to both French and English. Premier Robichaud of New Brunswick has announced that he intends to implement this recommendation at the current session.

Our Prime Minister's proposal is to advance on a number of fronts, but to stop short of the official declaration that Ontario shall be a bilingual province.

Now, I recognize why the government is hesitant to go the whole way. If French were formally declared an official language today, that immediately would assure French-speaking citizens of language rights, at least within the bilingual districts which are under consideration. The government is understandably hesitant to legalize rights which it is not in a position to guarantee.

But surely New Brunswick will face precisely the same problem. Though nearly 40 per cent of its population is French speaking, public business has, up to now, been carried on in English, and there will be the same extensive changes needed to establish bilingualism. The difference, however, is that New Brunswick will proceed this year without any delay.

I am disturbed lest there should develop even the suspicion that Ontario is only paying lip-service to the objective of achieving bilingualism. This would be unfortunate, not only within Ontario, but because of the leadership role which, I am convinced, our province must play nationally on this question.

Quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, there are grounds for that suspicion already, right here at the political heart of the province, in the Legislature.

In my view, the *Globe and Mail* was dead right in its editorial criticism when it said, sir, that you were technically correct in saying that a question submitted in French must be accompanied with an English translation, but that you were wrong in principle because the old restrictions conflict with the spirit of what we are seeking to achieve.

It should not take "a long time," as you suggested, Mr. Speaker, to achieve bilingualism in this Legisalture. Translators are readily available, if there is the will to seek them out. Simultaneous translation will ultimately be needed; there is no reason why it cannot be provided now.

And if I may just digress from my prepared remarks, Mr. Speaker, I do not agree with the leader of the Opposition when he says we do not need simultaneous translation. It seems to me that if you are going to have genuine bilingualism, here is one case where, in terms of his own suggestion, we have got to avoid doing something that looks like a "hollow gesture"—offering the shadow without the real substance.

And if you are going to have a genuine opportunity for bilingualism, it seems to me that you have got to have a simultaneous translation so that you can understand when somebody is speaking in French. Otherwise, very, very seldom will anybody speak in French. It will not be encouraged. You will have an inhibiting factor in there.

I would think the proposition of having simultaneous translation avaliable here and in all the seats in the gallery, available to the school children who come from parts of the province where there is no French spoken, would be a very illuminating glimpse of the reality of Canada. They would find that here, in this Legislature, they could pick up that little phone, or whatever the mechanical gadget is, and listen to a translation into English or French, of what is going on in the Legislature.

I think that creates the climate. All of this can be done, and I emphasize this, as the

Prime Minister does, Mr. Speaker, all the time.

All of this can be done within the concept set forth by the B and B report, namely, that nobody is going to be forced to speak French —French is not going to be rammed down anybody's throat—but the facilities for the use of the two languages should be readily available to all those who wish to do so. Bilingualism, I remind the House, implies not only the ability to speak in either language, but equally important, to be understood.

The Prime Minister told the constitutional conference:

> Our aim is to establish the means whereby the two linguistic communities in Canada can deal, where practical, with public institutions in their own language.

Surely the Legislature heads the list of those institutions which must symbolize the two linguistic communities. The Prime Minister continued:

> What we are attempting to create is a new climate, a new set of attitudes in Canada, not at any price, but in a way which we believe will appeal to the generous instincts of Canadians and which, we believe, will make a significant and meaningful contribution to the new Canada.

As the Prime Minister said, and the *Globe and Mail* underscored:

> The source of current tension has been—and to a lesser, but too large an extent, remains—our reluctance to commit ourselves to the idea of our two languages and our many cultures, and our hesitancy to accommodate the aspirations of French-speaking Canadians.

The stakes are high, Mr. Speaker. As the Prime Minister put it:

> If we choose to be hesitant and negative in our attitudes toward the linguistic and cultural question, then we shall play into the hands of those who wish to put the future of our country in jeopardy.

Now, Mr. Speaker, you are, of course, quite right that nobody, not even the Prime Minister, can unilaterally change the rules of this Legislature. So let us do so by common consent. I have a suggestion.

The government has indicated that it intends to introduce a resolution concerning the right of any member to speak in French or English during our proceedings. If that resolution were broadened to cover some of the other out-of-date House rules, or if you were empowered to make the procedural changes needed to keep pace with our implementation of bilingualism, then we could proceed without waiting for "the long time" which you envisaged, and which we cannot afford. I put that suggestion forward for the Prime Minister's consideration.

Let me now turn briefly to another of the major items on the agenda of the constitutional conference, that of the charter of human rights, and the proposal that it should be enshrined in our constitution. Frankly, I think this is a good idea.

Obviously, however, there is a rocky road ahead for this proposal. The reaction of the provincial Premiers indicated clearly that there is no prospect of securing unanimity, or even near unanimity, for its enactment in advance of other constitutional change. I would agree that it should be dealt with as part of the whole constitutional package which we are now contemplating.

But I hope Ontario's reservations are restricted to the proposal that the declaration of human rights should be dealt with separately, and in advance of other constitutional revision, rather than to the basic principle of its ultimate acceptance. Surely for a province that has made as much progress as we have in legislative proclamation of human rights, there ought to be no hesitation to enshrine them in a new Canadian constitution. Of all the representations made on behalf of Ontario at the constitutional conference I found that of the Attorney General (Mr. Wishart) most unconvincing. His argument tended to come down in opposition to a constitutional charter of human rights. I am assured by my legal friends that his case was a very questionable one. It had more holes than a sieve, one of them put it. However, I will not get off into a legal discussion of that at the moment. My plea would be that in the continuing work of the constitutional conference and its committees, Ontario should keep an open mind on this issue.

As for the highly novel proposal of the federal government that provinces should be able to opt into a declaration of human rights at any time of their own choosing, I find this a most unsatisfactory and dismaying suggestion. Fundamental human rights are not something that we should play games with —picking and choosing, cafeteria style, when and if we want. Surely this is an offensive proposition—that basic human rights, enshrined in a constitution, should be applicable in one province, but not in another.

On the other hand, I must personally confess to a certain open-mindedness, at least

for the moment, to the proposition that the implementation of linguistic rights might be handled by this highly novel procedure. In a situation in Canada where it is admitted that both the need, and possibility, of such implementation varies from province to province—British Columbia, for example, was completely exempted in the B and B recommendations—this might be the practical way to proceed.

I would like to conclude these observations on these critically-important constitutional developments with a general observation. I think it is now widely accepted that on every occasion possible, these historic deliberations should be open to the public through radio and TV. The electronic media provide us with the means for involving all the Canadian people, and the value of doing that is inestimable.

Fateful deliberations like these are not just the concern of government which, in most instances, represents a minority of the people. They are of vital concern to all parties; and wherever possible, an opportunity should be provided for Opposition leaders, or their representatives, at least to attend these conferences as observers.

Speaking personally, I am profoundly grateful for the privilege of attending the Confederation of tomorrow and the constitutional conference in Ottawa. I would not have missed them for anything. Years hence, I shall personally cherish the experience as much as though it had been my privilege to have attended the Charlottetown and Quebec conferences.

But I would extend this plea for an opportunity for Opposition leaders to benefit, and even participate, in the work of Ontario's advisory committee on Confederation. If our exclusion from even attending some meetings of that committee when certain topics are being discussed stems from a reluctance on the part of the members of that committee to have all parties involved, then all I can say is that it baffles me. If our exclusion is the result of a government decision, then I earnestly request the Prime Minister to reconsider the matter. We have nothing to lose and everything to gain by including all members of the political family in detailed study and deliberation on these essentially family problems.

Constitutional reform is only one route to national unity. Preoccupied as we are now with certain aspects of a Confederation under strain, it is all too easy for us to forget that national unity must also stem from people's feeling that government is on their side, that it is helping to solve their problems, not standing in the way of reform.

People look to government for action and leadership on issues which touch their daily lives. They want it whether they are English or French speaking, whether they live in British Columbia, or Nova Scotia, Quebec or Ontario. They are not interested in hearing one level of government excuse its inaction by blaming another level of government. They are not interested in the fine points of jurisdiction which excite the constitutional lawyers.

Speaking in Montreal last autumn, Dr. Ramsay Cook pointed out that the constitutional debate was consuming more and more energy in Quebec and outside. He went on:

> At the same time, and as a direct result, nearly every other problem of educational reform, economic change, and social planning has been dropped to a level of secondary significance. The constitutional debate has nearly paralyzed the revolution of the early sixties, and it has increasingly become the major preoccupation of our federal politicians.

There have been few developments in Ontario under this government to rival the kind of economic and social reforms which came to Quebec in the early part of this decade. But whatever chances we do have to wring improvement from this "smug minority" on the government benches will be lessened if our proper involvement in the constitutional debate prevents our attention to other pressing matters.

We were elected, Mr. Speaker, to conduct as best we can, on their behalf, the people's business. We need to be reminded that, far from being hung up on constitutional theory, people in Ontario are concerned with more mundane, pressing, personal problems.

People today are concerned with getting a house for their families, making ends meet on a tight family budget, upgrading their incomes, learning new skills, having a clean, pure environment to live in, being near green grass and fresh air where their kids can play, a decent education for their children, the finest in health care without regard to ability to pay, some measure of dignity and comfort in their later years.

Let me begin with the cost of living. In national surveys, and during last fall's election, it has proven to be the chief preoccupation of the average family. And no wonder. In January the consumer price index stood at 152.6. A year ago it was 146.0, and in January, 1964 when the last Legislature opened,

it was 134.2. Hard-earned wage increases are being eaten away by the inexorable rise in living costs, and the family budget is being stretched to the utmost.

Yet at no point in the last year, not even during the campaign, did Ontario consumers receive any assurance this government would speak up for them, or take decisive steps to protect their interests.

And since the Throne Speech contains no reference to the need for government action on this front, we can only conclude the Conservatives prefer that the onus shall still be on the buyer to beware, rather than on the seller to be fair.

The continuing rise in prices over the last few months, with producers and retailers under no pressure to defend their actions, exemplifies the government's indifference.

The area of greatest sensitivity is the food industry. After crying the blues all through last year, Dominion Stores now predicts a profit of $1.75 per share on its 1967-68 operations. That is an increase of 33 per cent over last year's profit of $1.32. Loblaws joined Dominion in moaning about high costs, but their president admitted recently about their 1967 performance, "profitwise, we were not too far short of the previous year's all-time record earnings." The other chains all had similar records last year.

Yet, despite this, the Canadian federation of retail grocers persuaded itself last October that the supermarkets were caught in a profit squeeze, and that prices therefore were entitled to rise.

The highest priority for food stores should be to offer the lowest prices for consumers. Anything unnecessary which leads to higher prices should be cut out, including trading stamps and other gimmickry which in 1967 added from $30 million to $40 million to Ontario's food bill.

The trading stamp industry is aware of its untenable position, even if the government is not. One of its spokesmen recently urged on it:

> A programme of research and education to counteract public hostility about its role and effect on prices.

I only wish the government would spend as much time and effort in defending Ontario consumers, as the trading stamp industry will spend defending its dubious product. If this were the case, we would all be better off.

On another front, Shell Oil recently announced it was raising its price on gasoline and fuel oils. The move was quickly followed by at least one other major oil company, and will likely be taken up by others. This means consumers will pay more for gas for their cars, another $10 a year for home heat fuels and, sooner or later, will result in higher apartment rents.

The usual claim is made: that rising wage, salary and material costs have forced the increase. But Shell's stock rose last year from $22 to $35, and during 1966, their profits increased 27 per cent from $34 to $43 million. Preliminary figures for the first nine months of 1967 indicate a further increase.

In the past year Imperial Oil stock went from $55 to $70 and BA Oil from $31 to $44. The oil companies now face the most favourable demand-supply situation in years, with a 4 to 5 per cent rise in refined product demand in 1968. They have a hidden bonanza in the skyrocketing price for one of their major by-products—sulphur. All in all, these are hardly tales of hardship requiring new price hikes.

In fairness, I must note that Imperial Oil has not raised its price of motoring gasoline. Rather it has, in many parts of northern Ontario, marginally lowered the cost: in New Liskeard the wholesale price to dealers has come down one cent.

May I remind this Legislature our party emphasized throughout last year that there was room for considerable reduction of gas prices in the north. I commend Imperial Oil for its move, and say to the government that if they would deign to take a more lively interest in the well-being of the northern motorist, the process started by Imperial would be picked up by other companies, and extended to greater savings.

Not long ago, the profit levels of the Bell Telephone Company were revealed to exceed the permissible limits set in 1966 by the then board of transport commissioners. In other words, the profit levels of the Bell were unwarranted and illegal, above the regulation fixed for their operation.

As all members know, this is not the first time Bell has been guilty of openly disregarding the public interest. Every year since 1959, it has breached the limits laid down for it by the old board of transport commissioners.

The new Canadian transportation commission this time accepted Bell's explanation as to why the profit levels were exceeded, and agreed with Bell the phone rates should not be lowered.

This is precisely the point where the Ontario government should have stepped in; when the federal regulatory body failed to live up to its own rules. As I pointed out earlier, there is precedent in the 1926 action of the Conservative administration under Premier Ferguson. Now, as a result of this government's failure to intervene, to call for a public enquiry, and itself to speak for Ontario consumers, the public has no spokesman at all to protest Bell's behaviour.

There are *prima facie* grounds for the Ontario government to step into the situation. In doing so, it will be applauded by the consumers, by municipal leaders, and by the majority of the business community, who, I suspect, resent the manner in which Bell is allowed to take advantage of its monopoly position. Surely not even a Tory government can fail to act in such suspicious circumstances.

Well, one of my colleagues says yes they can, and he may be right.

Mr. Lewis: The government never acts.

Mr. MacDonald: Let me give you another example of what is happening, Mr. Speaker.

From 1964 to 1966, Massey-Ferguson increased its profits from $18.1 million to $45.2 million. This amounted to a percentage increase in profits of 150 per cent in three years, at a time when its sales were only going up 56 per cent. Yet when the price of agricultural implements was raised last year, this government took no steps to demand justification for the increase.

As a matter of fact, the Liberal government at Ottawa took some steps and then, like the board of transport commissioners, they accepted the explanation and nothing happened.

In deliberate defiance of assurances given publicly under the U.S.-Canada auto trade agreement, car manufacturers in Canada have consistently raised their retail prices in every year since the agreement was signed. For 1968 cars, for example, the big three raised prices twice: the first time around $100 per car, and again another $26 for standard safety features. In view of the fact that 96 per cent of all Canadian cars are manufactured in this province, and a majority of buyers reside here, the Ontario government has a clear duty to protect the interest of Ontario consumers. But so far there has not been the slightest whisper of action on its part.

Dissatisfaction has been mounting in recent years as a result of the inadequate job being done in the field of car insurance by private agencies, so you have been getting some reflection in the editorials of the *Globe and Mail*. A few months ago it emerged in such editorials as that of *Time* and *Life*, normally the bastions of the business world, so finally the struggle is seeping through and the voices are getting louder for some change.

Faced with climbing insurance rates, motorists are unhappy with a situation where only 68 cents of their premium dollar is available to pay claims, the remainder being eaten up by commission costs, cumbersome administration, and profits. They do not like the fact that, last year, Canada's 300 automobile insurance companies earned an estimated $700 million in premiums, 10 per cent more than in 1966, but paid out in claims only $480 million.

That is why there has been growing public response to proposals for a public car insurance plan, operated at cost and allocating a minimum of 85 cents on the premium dollar to payment of claims without regard to fault.

By ploughing back investment earnings, removing the need to earn a profit, eliminating competitive selling, and streamlining administration, a public programme could save the average motorist a minimum of 20 cents on each of his premium dollars.

At the same time, it could provide wider coverage, including income maintenance up to $100 a week for a maximum period of a year.

The growing public support for this kind of programme is such that I invite the government to give it serious consideration in the course of this session.

These examples that I have given in many fields affecting people all across the province —and there are many more—provide ample evidence of the need for the government to use its influence on behalf of the consumer. The steps it can take have been outlined by me many times, and I shall only summarize them now.

First, and most important, set up a price review board to investigate any increases which seem excessive and unwarranted by the prevailing economic situation. I feel that just as trade unionists must go through a lengthy public process of justifying their demands for a wage increase, so should producers, manufacturers and retailers justify before the public inordinate increases in prices. I am satisfied that in most cases, armed with the facts, the buying public can then cope with the situation satisfactorily. It should not be necessary to go to the lengths of rigid price controls, and we certainly do not advocate them.

The headline in a Toronto paper recently read: "Publicity is Sharp's Last-ditch Device to Beat Inflation." Publicity can do a lot, really, to cut out the serious excesses of today's marketplace. I call on the government to take the necessary steps to start the process operating.

Second, the government should significantly broaden the scope of the present consumers bureau. It needs powers to require "truth in packaging". It also needs powers to outlaw unfair contracts and shady practices connected with repossession and debt collections, used car selling, and mortgage brokering. The right to choose the best bargain is hampered by misleading advertising, retail gimmickry, curious sizes and weights of packages, and lack of comparative data on competing products.

The government should, thirdly, put teeth into legislation against false or misleading advertising claims, encourage standardized sizes and weights, move against trading stamps and other promotional devices in the selling of food, and provide funds to expand consumer product research and publicize its results. When a consumer, through no fault of his own, gets a raw deal in the marketplace, he has a right to be heard. The consumers bureau should contain a special section to hear cases of alleged hardship arising from agreements already made. There might well be a free direct telephone line to this section and its branches. While I do not envisage the section would have power to take legal action, it could hold hearings and publicize its findings. Once again, I am convinced that, if consumers get a fair hearing, the public will take the necessary action against the offenders in most cases.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to turn briefly to a comment on housing. An equally serious indictment of the failure of government policy has been the continuing, worsening housing crisis in our province, especially in the fast-growing metropolitan areas. Despite the many often spectacular announcements the Minister trotted out so sensationally last year—motivated more by a desire to win votes than to build houses, I suspect—no appreciable impact has been made on the problem.

It is a many-sided and complex one, and I shall not go into details at this time; my colleagues will be doing so later in this debate and during the session. But let me offer a few current statistics to underline the gravity of the situation we are all confronted with.

Houses cost too much. According to the Toronto real estate board, the average price of a new, single-family dwelling in Metro Toronto at January 31, 1968, was $34,869. That is an increase of $5,200 in one year. Three years ago the average price was $21,914. We are faced with a cost inflation here of astronomic proportions.

Land costs too much. You cannot acquire a serviced 50-lot lot in Metro Toronto today for less than $11,000; it is more likely to cost $12,000. Land costs in Toronto have increased, according to a survey by *Canadian Homes,* by 500 per cent in ten years, and are now the highest in North America. Across the province the average residential lot has doubled in costs over the last ten years. Yet even the government is in the business of driving these costs up as when, last year, HOME acquired Bramalea lots for $6,800 and immediately marked them up to $9,000 plus.

There are not enough houses. The vacancy rate in Toronto at the end of 1967 was 1.3 per cent. A year ago it was 0.9 per cent. In Hamilton it was 1.4 per cent—no improvement at all in the course of a year. In public housing accommodation it was 0.3 per cent in Toronto and 0.0 per cent in Hamilton. These figures are shocking. Housing experts recommend a vacancy rate of 5.0 per cent to be able to handle population movements.

Ironically, the vacancy rate for office space in Toronto has shot up to 12.8 per cent from 5.2 per cent a year ago. It might not be a bad idea to examine our building priorities more closely!

Last year in Ontario there was an increase in housing starts to 59,769. But completions dropped 11,000 over 1966, only partly offset by a rise of 9,000 in houses under construction. I am not interested to gainsay the marginal improvement we have made. But not even government supporters can argue it is good enough—as the hon. member from York East implied, if he did not state it explicitly. And in fact, for 1968, housing starts have declined over the first month as compared with last year.

It is doubtful if more than a few new houses were built last year under the HOME programme. And yet, the Minister himself has pointed out Ontario must start 90,000 new units in 1968. Since this is a figure 30,000 larger than last year's achievement, this Legislature is entitled to early and specific plans from the government as to how this will be accomplished.

Mortgages are too expensive. In ten years, the NHA interest rate has increased from 5½ to 8⅝ per cent. On an $18,000 mortgage over 25 years, the additional interest alone

will add over $10,000 to the eventual cost of the average home. As the papers told us a couple of days ago, some 77 people who had got HOME lots out in Bramalea a few months ago in the highly publicized effort, have now dropped them because of the mortgage interest rates.

And to obtain that $18,000 mortgage in the first place, an individual must bring home at least $8,400 a year. The result is that where the housing shortage is most acute, only the top fraction of the population earns enough to qualify—incidentally, about 11 per cent.

Imagine, Mr. Speaker, getting to a situation in which the housing policy is meeting the needs of the top 11 per cent and missing the bottom 88 per cent.

As for second mortgages, they can now be obtained at usurious rates of 12 to 15 per cent that write "finish" to a family's dream of owning its own home.

Rents are too high. In Toronto, rents now rise 10 to 15 per cent each year. In this tight accommodation situation, tenants are at the mercy of landlords, too many of whom are only out for a fast buck.

We are going to have trouble on this score if the government does not move. It is beginning to emerge out in York East with very noisy meetings. People are not going to take the kind of rental gouging that is going on without growing protests about it.

Duplexes in various areas of Toronto, which a young couple could rent 10 years ago for $125, now cost as high as $250 a month.

Faced with rents like these, young families are unable to save enough for the down payments needed for their own modest house.

I have used mainly Toronto examples because the problem is most acute here, and more statistics are readily available. But the basic problem prevails across Ontario. Seen against this background, home ownership made easy is a cheap and cynical slogan. For hundreds of thousands of Ontario people, it is totally incapable of achievement.

A corrective programme must, in the view of the New Democratic Party, contain these ingredients:

1. The provincial government must build 20,000 units of housing under public auspices each year.

2. Increasingly we must take development land under community ownership, meantime imposing a special tax on speculative gains from land sales. The prospect that we might have socialism introduced in ownership at the local level, is now getting so close that it was even discussed at the Conservative thinkers' conference at Montmorency last fall. So it must be fairly close.

3. The provincial government must underwrite the provision of first mortgages to prospective homeowners, limiting chargeable interest to 5 per cent and subsidizing the difference between this and the NHA rate.

4. Establish a rental review board and enact a tenant's bill of rights.

5. The province must assume a larger share of education, health and welfare costs so that no municipality need curtail lower cost residential development.

6. Give housing in Ontario the priority it deserves by setting up a Ministry of Housing with a separate—and new—Minister.

7. Develop regional housing authorities representing all levels of government to cut red tape and speed project approvals.

Mr. Speaker, I have two other topics that I want to comment on, so I will move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, on Monday we will resume this debate. And I believe the private members' hour will start on Monday afternoon at five o'clock.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 1:00 o'clock, p.m.

No. 8

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

First Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Monday, February 26, 1968

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1968

5

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Monday, February 26, 1968

Reading and receiving petitions 203

Hours of Work and Vacations with Pay Act, bill to amend, Mr. Jackson, first reading 203

Statement re educational broadcasting, Mr. Davis 204

Statement re the Ontario employees' group insurance plan, Mr. MacNaughton 207

Questions to Mr. Davis re the Ontario College of Art, Mr. Nixon and Mr. MacDonald 208

Question to Mr. Dymond re ambulance transportation to Toronto from Burks Falls hospital, Mr. MacDonald 210

Question to Mr. Davis re county school boards, Mr. Gaunt 211

Question to Mr. Davis re consolidation of school boards, Mr. Stokes 211

Questions to Mr. A. F. Lawrence re the coal plant at INCO in Copper Cliff, Mr. Martel 211

Questions to Mr. Auld re the Ontario board of censors, Mr. Lewis 212

Question to Mr. Randall re the HOME programme, Mr. Deans 212

Question to Mr. Dymond re a new carburettion system, Mr. Deans 212

Question to Mr. Davis re the separate school system, Mr. De Monte 212

Question to Mr. Dymond re air-pollution prevention programme, Mr. Burr 212

Question to Mr. Davis re charges of cheating by university students, Mr. Pitman 212

Question to Mr. Bales re compulsory wearing of safety shoes, Mr. Knight 213

Question to Mr. Davis re press ban from school organization meetings, Mr. Ruston 213

Question to Mr. Dymond re land for senior citizens' housing, Mr. Lawlor 213

Question to Mr. MacNaughton re wholesale gasoline prices, Mr. Martel 213

Questions to Mr. Randall re rental housing, Mr. Gisborn 214

Questions to Mr. Randall re the Los Angeles trade and industry conference, Mr. Jackson 214

Resumption of the debate on the Speech from the Throne, Mr. MacDonald 215

Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Robarts, agreed to 229

On notice of motion No. 17, Mr. J. R. Smith, Mr. Breithaupt, Mr. Pitman, Mr. Carruthers, Mr. T. Reid, Mr. Lewis 230

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to 240

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 26, 1968

The House met at 2.30 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: Today we have with us, in the east gallery, the West preparatory school, Forest Hill village; and in the west gallery, Deer Park junior high school, Toronto.

Presenting petitions.

Clerk of the House: The following petitions have been received:

Of the corporation of the township of Vaughan praying that an Act may pass preserving street lighting areas; and for other purposes.

Of Agnes Roy, Jean Louise MacLellan and James Donald McCormack praying that an Act may pass to incorporate Ewart College.

Of Walter Bick, Bessie E. Hallatt, Theodore I. Sherman and Jack Sydney Midanik praying that an Act may pass reviving Janbi Holdings Limited.

Of Jeanny Bick, Bessie E. Hallatt, Theodore I. Sherman and Jack Sydney Midanik praying that an Act may pass reviving Walbi Holdings Limited.

Mr. Speaker: Presenting reports.

Motions.

Mr. L. M. Reilly moves, seconded by Mr. R. G. Hodgson that Mr. J. Root (Wellington-Dufferin) be substituted for Mr. A. W. Downer (Dufferin-Simcoe) in the standing committee on agriculture and food.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: Introduction of bills.

THE HOURS OF WORK AND VACATIONS WITH PAY ACT

Mr. D. Jackson (Timiskaming) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Hours of Work and Vacations with Pay Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Jackson: Mr. Speaker, this bill reduces the maximum working week from 48 hours to 40 hours; and ensures that the reduction in hours does not affect the wages now earned in a maximum working week.

The industry and labour board is authorized to provide for a gradual transition and provides for time and one half for overtime work.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of personal privilege.

I was outside the House on Wednesday of last week when the member for Grey-Bruce (Mr. Sargent), directed a question to the Attorney General (Mr. Wishart) with respect to a subpoena allegedly naming me, pertaining to an action in the Quebec courts involving Shell Oil and Canadian Oil matters.

I refer to a report of the proceedings in the House contained in the Toronto *Daily Star* of February 22, 1968, and to a *Star* article of October 16, 1967.

The October headline said that I was "To Be Subpoenaed". The headline of February 22 last said, "Rowntree Subpoenaed".

I have never been subpoenaed.

The *Star's* article of October 16 last referred to a lawsuit in which one, Archer Shee had maintained an action against partners of G. H. Rennie and Co., and to Messrs. I. R. Wookey and Philip Anderson. Reference is also made in that article to a Mr. Grafstrom, former president of Shell Investments, and his relationship with Mr. Wookey. Reference is also made to Mr. Arthur Crockett, an officer of the Bank of Nova Scotia.

This information and the names I learned from the article itself.

I have never owned any shares of Shell Oil, Shell Investments, Canadian Oil Company or any other company connected with the Shell group, directly or indirectly, nor has my wife, nor have I ever been offered any shares. Indeed, I know nothing whatever of the takeover of Canadian Oil Company by the Shell group other than what I read in the press at the time.

I have never met Mr. Grafstrom, nor Mr. Wookey, nor Mr. Crockett, and I have no connection, nor have I ever had, with any

of them, nor have I ever had any dealings with G. H. Rennie and Company.

I can only conclude that the subpoena was contemplated with respect to me as Minister of The Department of Financial and Commercial Affairs in which capacity I currently report to the House on behalf of the Ontario securities commission.

Hon. W. G. Davis (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day I would like to give to the House a statement with respect to educational broadcasting.

Most members know that a standing committee of the House of Commons is studying a proposed draft bill on educational broadcasting presented to it by the Secretary of State. The committee, Mr. Speaker, is presently hearing briefs, and witnesses, and examining both. I might say if the present federal situation permits, I shall appear before the House committee tomorrow and I thought it would be only appropriate in that this is a matter that, I think, should be of public interest and where members opposite have expressed views from time to time, they be made aware of the statements and position the province of Ontario will be taking before the parliamentary committee tomorrow morning.

I had hoped, Mr. Speaker, to do this in the Throne debate prior to the committee hearings, but I am unable to do so because of time and I think it is important that the members know, prior to the presentation, the rough situation at least, here in the province.

If there has seemed to be a protracted period before the crystallization of our plans which I outline today, Mr. Speaker, the explanations are such that you will appreciate, I am sure, their validity, and I would hope their merit.

First, there has been the problem so familiar to Canadian politicians since 1867 and very current in these months with the general public. The federal government has traditionally been held to have authority in communications; the provinces are constitutionally responsible for education. It seems trite to say something so obvious, but educational television is really an amalgam of communications and education.

In July of 1966 the federal government published a white paper on broadcasting. Item 9 in the paper set out the federal policy intentions for educational broadcasting, and the relevant words are as follows:

> The government is prepared to give immediate consideration to the creation of a new federal organization licensed to operate public service broadcasting facilities. This organization would be empowered to enter into an agreement with any province to make such facilities available for broadcasting within the province during appropriate periods of the day, programmes designed to meet the needs of the provincial educational system as determined by the responsible provincial authorities.

This is a direct quotation from the white paper.

The Ontario government, Mr. Speaker, indicated its willingness to accept in general principle this practical undertaking as set forth. We had hoped, after the white paper, for rather speedy legislation and sequential construction of facilities by the federal government. For its own reasons, the federal government began to move on the proposal only in very recent months. The committee of the House of Commons is now hearing witnesses and evidence on the subject of educational television and the proposed federal ETV transmission plan. It is before them in the order of a draft federal bill.

In general, Mr. Speaker, we find the bill satisfactory, saving some suggestions we shall make about definitions, particularly as to what constitutes educational television programming. There may be questions in some quarters of the propriety of the federal statute setting limits in an area of responsibility which constitutionally is within the jurisdiction of each province. In any event, whatever the judgment in this regard may be, our initial reaction is that the definition of educational programming may be too confining for the needs which the provincial educational authorities may have to meet.

In addition, we shall make the case that in our area, ETV should not be confined to UHF channels and that it should have prior consideration for VHF channels that have not yet been assigned to the CBC or private stations. While VHF channels are scarce in southern Ontario, they are generally available in the north. The UHF signal is not only more difficult to receive, since most existing television receivers would have to be equipped with adapters and connected to special antennae, but it is also more expensive to transmit in the UHF band because of the higher powers required for equivalent coverage.

A second aspect of the delay in federal action relates to our own activities. Despite the frustrations to us of the long months since July, 1966, we have been able to

strengthen the nucleus of an organization for our own province. We have used the intervening time, Mr. Speaker, to acquire engineering skills and a clear appreciation of the experience of other ETV systems throughout the world.

The members know, as well as I do, that the technological and production complexities of television are such that a long look before the leap is especially sensible. I can assure the members that we have a staff which is up to date with every aspect of planning, creating and distributing programmes of quality.

The opinion has been expressed that the ETV branch has undertaken a development of what may possibly become one of the better productive ETV systems. This was the view of the vice-president of the board of broadcast governors who has been charged with the responsibility of studying ETV in depth, and he made these remarks, Mr. Speaker, when presenting a most comprehensive report on ETV to the Commons broadcasting committee. In short, we have progressed and enhanced our potential for good service during the waiting period.

It is almost four years since the Ontario government decided to move into the field of ETV. Our goal was, and still is, the provision of television programming for those citizens who wish to improve themselves in knowledge and skills, from the level of preschool children, to adults who seek to develop themselves as individuals. Thus we plan to bring the best and most modern methods in subject content to the people of Ontario through the medium of television. We believe we must use this most effective of all communication means as a vital complement to the entire instructional system.

As a result of our experience, we will establish an authority for educational broadcasting in Ontario. This authority would be a board responsible to the Minister and through him to the Legislature for the direction and administration of educational broadcasting in the total context of the word in this province. The board's membership will include representation appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor in council from groups such as school boards, our trustees, universities, teachers, adult education, the public, and, of course, associations linking schools to parents and to the home.

The authority will have power as it develops to appoint advisory groups to assist it in developing policy and programmes. The authority would receive funds from any services and programmes used by persons or groups apart from the recognized educational institutions of Ontario. Further, the authority would be able to enter into contracts with individuals, private organizations and public agencies.

The prime obectives in choosing this form for Ontario educational broadcasting, Mr. Speaker, are twofold: First, television is a powerful medium which engenders apprehension about its fair use and control; second, educational broadcasting has a wide range of responsibility beyond the formal school organization. Some of the apprehensions of course can be met directly by anyone who reflects on the experience with television in North America. For example, television is the most public of all media, therefore abuse or misuse of its facilities is so obvious that this very characteristic gives the public protection.

Then, there is a carryover from the early days of television which imagines a captive audience for television, but the opportunities for alternative channel viewing are very extensive today in Ontario and ETV will not have any body of captive viewers among the general public.

In terms of school viewing, anyone who thinks it out will realize, I am sure, that it is an injustice to the integrity and ethics of the teaching profession of Ontario to think that it would bear with programmes which do not meet criteria fair to its pupils and to the public at large.

Mr. Speaker, I feel I should add to the dimensions of your consideration by setting ETV against the whole context of broadcasting in Canada. We expected a federal educational broadcasting agency and that we, as users, would have a place within what the federal government is pleased to call the single system of broadcasting. Under the new federal Broadcasting Act, the Canadian radio television commission has been given general responsibility for licensing, regulating, monitoring and guaranteeing the integrity of the single system.

We are not apprehensive of any conflict between our proposed authority and either the CRTC or the planned ETV transmission agency. However, members should remember the existence of the CRTC and, in addition, our responsibility in Ontario for education as one considers the structure and the place of authority in the whole scheme of Canadian broadcasting.

It is our intention to carry on the liaison and rapport with the on-going school system

and personnel already functioning. This guarantees the integrity of educational broadcasting in terms of teaching and curriculum standards. The programming, the techniques and the philosophy of Ontario ETV have captured the interest of educators in other jurisdictions.

The branch has planned, produced and distributed to date, over 450 programmes, ranging the entire curriculum from grades 1 to 13, and these programmes, Mr. Speaker, have been received and evaluated in over 2,600 Ontario schools despite the severe limits the branch has worked within, due to the brief air time available.

The branch has hired the skills and transmission engineering, light, sound and camera techniques as well as developed directors, producers and writers—people for the whole gamut of programme productions. It has drawn from the reservoir of experienced boadcasting personnel and tied their work in with teachers and administrators throughout Ontario. Therefore, the new authority will not start from scratch.

Few of us can escape from the rapid technological advance of this century. New forms of satellite and terrestial telecommunications are obviously exciting and what seems science fiction today becomes reality tomorrow. I can assure the members that the engineering personnel in the branch know both present day capabilities, and the lines of research now under way.

Our overall engineering plan is of necessity highly technical and unless, during the debates on the estimates of the department, the members wish to do so, I will not involve them in the technical discussions in this House.

We are searching continually for the most efficient and economic means of distribution of ETV programmes into every classroom and home in the province.

The first step, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, and I shall make this point tomorrow morning, is the long awaited channel 19. It will serve regional demands of south central Ontario and provide an originating centre for re-broadcasting units in other parts of the province.

In addition, Ontario's size and diversity in needs requires regional commitments in other stations for northwestern, northern, southeast and southwest sections of Ontario.

Regardless of any scientific developments in the future, it is difficult to imagine that these stations will not be necessary. Our own advice is that it will take two years from the passage of federal and provincial legislation before all five of these stations will be on the air.

The ETV branch has filed a chart with the BBG indicating the location of some 28 re-broadcasting units. It is possible that before construction on these begins, technology will enable us to get the same, or some of the same, coverage by satellite or some other system. If so, we would expect that the federal agency which provides transmission facilities would assist us in taking advantage of the latest technical developments.

Some of you know about the 2,500 megahertz systems, cable systems, and visual recording devices. Our overall plans take such systems into account. They will be used as the basis for tape delay, local distribution systems, and information retrieval. Those of you interested in this specialized aspect of the comprehensive distribution system, are most welcome to discuss it with the personnel of the branch. There is a problem in the making, scheduling and additional use of ETV programmes which I would want to touch upon briefly, and I am doing so tomorrow.

Hon. members know that libraries, archives and museums are the indispensible repositories of printed material. There, through classification cataloguing and systematic storage, the creative record of mankind in print is available for use. Unfortunately, to the best of my knowledge, no one in Canada, or no organization in this country, no one anywhere really, has ever assumed the responsibility for the gathering, indexing, storing, and offering for use, these newer records in the way that the library of Congress, the British museum and our national library have done for prints.

There is an immense quantity of film, sound tape, and video tape material produced in Canada, and elsewhere. Neither the CBC, the national film board, nor any other organization has any comprehensive plan or service. Only last summer, some of the valuable film footage covering some of Canada's past was burned at Beaconsfield, Quebec.

Without assigning blame for our deficiency in this area, one of the greatest national needs in ETV—that it affects much more than ETV—is a computer-linked storage and retrieval centre for visual material and programmes. We plan to do our part in leading developments along these lines. Beyond the inherent value of the material gathered and saved, there is the obvious factor of reductions in production costs, the ability to avoid duplication and to keep adding through the years material which will give our schedules increasing flexibility, and our teachers greater choice.

The kind of co-operative system we envisage will bring together the various areas of Canada, and open up the film and sound resources of the entire jurisdiction. Mr. Speaker, I might say that the government is enthusiastic and optimistic about the potential of ETV in this province. We believe that as our work progresses you will be heartened by the response and encouraged by the penetration and variety that we can achieve with reasonable cost.

TV was launched in Canada in 1950; by the mid-fifties it was on a national network basis.

The statisticians in the field tell us that no people in the world watch more television than Canadians. There is a danger, I think, of losing touch with a generation of young people. They receive so much of their impressions of the world through television as it comes to them at present. There is no need to be pessimistic now that we have a programme in hand and now that we have found the willingness among teachers to innovate, and among the boards of the universities. TV is surely the most important and useful ancillary opened up to teaching since the development of the printed book. All of us can to a degree be satisfied that Ontario has taken the lead in ETV in Canada. I suggest that it means extending educational opportunity to more people and places in our province. This is the position that I intend to present to the House of Commons parliamentary committee, on behalf of the province, tomorrow morning.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, on the Minister's statement, I hope you will permit a brief comment and a question. I can tell you I am relieved that the government has abandoned its former stand that educational television would be administered only through a branch of the department and by the Minister, and that we are in fact to have an educational authority. I wonder, would the Minister comment on whether or not it would be parallel in its scope with the recently announced Radio Quebec which the Prime Minister of that province described in the Quebec Speech from the Throne.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I do not think that it would be proper for me to comment on, or to try to analyze exactly what the Prime Minister of Quebec has stated may be created there with respect to broadcasting. I have stated today as clearly, and I hope as briefly, what I believe our position should be in this province. Whether our position here is the same as in Quebec I would leave to the leader of the Opposition to determine. I think that this provides us with a constitutional and educational solution to this very important—not problem, but opportunity.

Just for the benefit of the leader of the Opposition: If he really was watching or listening or reading my speeches carefully over the last few months he will find reference to the possibility or the probability of—and I did not use the term "authority"—of a commission relating to the overall development of ETV in the province, so that I think this would not come as any great surprise to him here on this occasion.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, if the Minister had been reading my speeches carefully, he would know that we favour the imposition of an authority under these circumstances. Now I do not want to enter into a debate on this matter, but since the Minister is going to Ottawa to meet the committee tomorrow I wonder if, in his brief, he calls attention to the need for not only the very high frequency and ultra high frequency availability, but also the possibility of satellite channels which will surely be of great importance to educational television.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I do not want to prolong the discussion but I do not think that it is a question of satellite channels. I think that it is a question of using satellites as a method of transmission through a channel, whether it be UHF or VHF. I referred in my statement to the use of extra-terrestrial devices or satellites as a means of communication, the possibility of which we are prepared to accept if technology advances rapidly enough in the next two or three years.

Mr. Nixon: Quebec will have one of those, even though the Minister says we are leading in this.

Hon. Mr. Davis: They may, or they may not.

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Provincial Treasurer): Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, February 22, in reference to a question tabled by the hon. member for Grey-Bruce, the Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) indicated that I would provide a statement concerning the employees' group insurance plan provided by the government.

I would now like to place on the record a brief review of the establishment and operation of the plan. The information will amplify, and put in proper context, the

answer I have provided for the question tabled by the hon. member for Grey-Bruce.

Most of these details have been presented in a statement issued at the time of the plan's commencement in August, 1965, and in subsequent business of this House. Nevertheless, in view of continuing misconceptions about the plan, I believe it will be helpful to provide a further summary.

I will present the facts in seven brief points:

1. The plan was established on the basis of an award of the arbitration board on February 27, 1965, following negotiations between the civil service association and the government. Specifications for group life and medical-surgical insurance were agreed upon by both parties and the government called for tenders through advertisements placed in a number of daily newspapers on May 17, 1965.

2. The government received a total of nine bids. Following full consultation with representatives of the association, the contract was awarded to a group of companies, all Canadian-owned, with head offices in this province, and participating in proportion to their shares of insurance in force in Ontario. The tender for the group was submitted by London Life Insurance Company and its bid was judged to be the lowest of the nine submitted, commensurate with the specifications.

3. The group added two other companies who had similar qualifications and agreed to the same conditions of participation as the original members. Ten companies now share the coverage, namely: The Canada Life Assurance Company, Confederation Life Association, the Crown Life Insurance Company, the Excelsior Life Insurance Company, the Imperial Life Assurance Company of Canada, London Life Insurance Company, Manufacturers' Life Insurance Company, the Mutual Life Assurance Company of Canada, North American Life Assurance Company and the Travelers Insurance Company.

4. No brokerage firm was employed to establish the plan and no brokerage commission was paid. The government provided no payment or commission of any kind to any person or company. The sole financial consideration was the cost of insurance and the tender with the lowest quotations was accepted.

5. The government pays 75 per cent of premiums for basic life and accidental death and dismemberment insurance for employees, and an average of 65 per cent of the cost of basic surgical-medical insurance. Supplementary life and major medical insurance is optional to our employees and the government makes no contribution toward premiums for this additional coverage.

6. The plan is an excellent one which is serving our employees well and is administered with an outstanding record for efficiency. I can only recall receiving one formal complaint about any aspect of the service during my tenure of office, which is rather remarkable considering that more than 50,000 employees are insured.

7. The operation of the plan, including any adjustments in premium costs and distribution of earned dividends, remains under continuing consultation between the association and the government. The benefits and premiums, of course, come under the constant scrutiny of our employees, whose personal interests are served.

Considering all these factors, and especially the original and continuing safeguards against special privilege or any form of abuse, I submit there is absolutely no basis for misconception or misinterpretation concerning the plan. The employees' group insurance plan provided by the government of Ontario is an example of an efficient and economical service provided through co-operation among the business community, the public services and the government of this province.

Mr. Nixon: I am not sure, Mr. Speaker, whether the statement just read was in answer to a question or was a ministerial statement. Would the Provincial Treasurer enlighten me on that?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Speaker, at the outset of my remarks I made reference to a statement by the Prime Minister on Thursday, February 22 in which he indicated to the hon. member for Grey-Bruce that a statement would be made by the Provincial Treasurer because he, in fact, speaks for the civil service commission in this House. I also made reference to the fact that the precise answers to the hon. member's question will be tabled in the usual form because the questions now appear on the order paper.

Mr. Nixon: I certainly appreciate the information that has been put at our disposal. I believe some of the difficulties arose from the public statement made by Mr. Colin Brown of London that he was in receipt of some premiums from that programme.

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Education, in two parts. Was the dismissal of Mr. A. Bayefsky and Mr. E. Freifeld from the faculty of the Ontario Col-

lege of Art legal without written notice from the Minister of Education?

Secondly, is the department taking any action with regard to dismissals and the general discontent among students at the Ontario College of Art?

Mr. Speaker: The member for York South has a question on the same problem.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, my question is this: Clause 4 (2b) of the contract of employment between the Ontario College of Art and its instructors, stipulates, "immediate termination of contract is possible by the college with the consent of the Minister of Education". Did the Minister consent to these firings? If so, what action is he now taking to cope with the consequences?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I could deal with these questions just with "yes" and "no" but if the House will permit, I think perhaps there should be one or two general observations made dealing with the specific questions by the leader of the Opposition as to the dismissal of the two gentlemen from the faculty of the college without written notice from the Minister of Education.

The answer to the hon. leader's question would be, "yes," and similarly, to the question from the member for York South, "Did the Minister consent to these firings", the answer is "no"—so the second part of that question does not need answering.

I should point out, Mr. Speaker, that the legislation which was passed here in 1961-1962 set up the Ontario College of Art as, shall we say, an independent institution, and I think if the members opposite will read the statute, they will discover that this is, in fact, the case. Now as to why the question or reference to consent or otherwise on the part of the Minister in the contract forms existed, quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, I have no knowledge whatsoever.

I understand that the more recent forms that have been used do not refer to any consent or otherwise, because as I read the statute and the advice I received, there is just no reason for, and no legal authority for, the Minister to be involved either with hirings or firings.

This is done by the council and administration of the college in a way that is somewhat comparable to the universities.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think that the present debate that is going on, and the discussions that are taking place, should take place in the context of what is a Minister's or this House's responsibility with respect to the internal administration of an institution of higher learning.

And while, Mr. Speaker, one could perhaps put more intelligent parallels or cases before the House, there have been discussions in one or two institutions where the students have been dissatisfied with a particular course, or with the curriculum. There have been suggestions, on occasion, that they will come down and speak to the Minister about it.

I am wondering if the House and the gentlemen who asked the questions really are suggesting that I should, as a Minister, or we should, as a government, become that involved in the internal operation of any institution of higher learning, creating a situation that could, in fact, lead to the dictation, say, of curriculum. We cannot confine our discussions just to the matter of the hiring or firing of personnel. I think, in principle, there is more than this involved.

Mr. Nixon: Yes, but you are involved specifically in the contract. Is not that the case?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I am saying that as a matter of law I doubt very much if I am involved in the contract at all. In fact, our position is that we are not; that if there is a reference in some of the contracts to consent, that reference should not be there.

There is nothing in the statute that requires or gives authority to the Minister to consent or otherwise to the hiring or firing of faculty at the Ontario College of Art. I think reference to this matter is an irrelevant point. I think, Mr. Speaker, that it should be made abundantly clear that the decision was made by the council of the Ontario College of Arts and that it was a decision not only made by them, but implemented by them, and any reference to consent or otherwise is not really relevant because the Minister is not in the position to give consent or otherwise in writing, or in any other form. The council has its own area of responsibility.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I recognize that the firings of these two faculty members have generated a great deal of public interest and discussion—as well they might—and yet I am wondering whether the members opposite really feel this is a matter where the government or the Legislature should become directly involved in what is basically an internal situation within that particular institution.

The members, Mr. Speaker, may argue today, "Yes, you should do so, because you may feel that certain injustice has been done." But if we were to do this as a matter of principle, and extend it into situations where the same principle may not, or may apply, I think we are in real danger of getting into that area of academic autonomy, or academic freedom, that has some relevance.

Mr. Nixon: Certainly reference to the Minister's department should be omitted and taken out of those contracts.

Hon. Mr. Davis: No question. This has been done already. In fact, I am told that the new contracts contain no reference to the Minister or the department, thank heaven.

I think, Mr. Speaker, as we are involved as members of this Legislature in what will be probably an increasing period of change in our institutions of higher learning, we should be very careful before becoming too directly involved in the internal academic nature or autonomy of these institutions.

This is the point that I am endeavouring to make, Mr. Speaker, and I would say at this present moment that while I am prepared to assist in any way to the solution of any problem, I think we should be very careful as a Minister, and as a Legislature, not to become directly involved, or put ourselves in the position, if I can put it this way, of dictating to these institutions what they should, or should not, be doing in those areas of academic autonomy which I think are really quite relevant.

So, Mr. Speaker, that is the position at the present time. There have been suggestions in the press that certain groups, the students and perhaps others, would wish to visit with the Minister. I wish to say to the House, that I shall certainly see them and, as I say, to assist in any way that I can. But I do not want, and I feel this very keenly, to be in the position where the members of this House are suggesting that we should very directly dictate to these institutions. It is not just this one instance. I am sure there may be others in the next number of months or years and I am concerned about any principle that may be established.

Mr. MacDonald: I wonder if the Minister would permit a supplementary question.

I am as sensitive, I trust, as the Minister on the issue of intervening in an unwarranted fashion in the operations of an institution like this. But in view of the fact that seven or eight members of the staff are supporting the students and, therefore, are presumably subject to firing also—one member of the student body, a leader, has been suspended because of his sharing with the protest—and particularly, Mr. Speaker, since two members of the executive of the council which presumably authorized this action knew nothing about it—there had been no meeting, they were not informed, they were not involved—in view of all this, is it not appropriate that somebody, and conceivably the Minister, should intervene before this situation gets much worse?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, Mr. Speaker, of course, one would be prompted to ask in what way the intervention should take place.

I think this is the relevant aspect, and I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that if the two members of council who were not present and were not informed wish to raise this, I see nothing in the legislation—and I am not sure whether there is anything in the bylaws—that would prevent them reopening these discussions. I would hope that this problem can be resolved internally. If I could leave it that way for the present time—

Mr. Speaker: The member for York South has a further question.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, my second question is to the Minister of Health. Were no ambulances available locally to bring students who were victims of an auto accident south of North Bay, from the Burks Falls hospital to Toronto on Saturday, thereby necessitating sending an ambulance all the way from Toronto to Burks Falls?

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, I cannot answer whether or not ambulances were available. I find it difficult to understand why they were not. We feel quite certain that ambulances could have been provided from Huntsville or Bracebridge, or from any one of a number of services much closer than Toronto if the transfer were required urgently as apparently it was. Since the turn around, I am assured, would have been the same whether the vehicle started from Toronto or any other place, it is assumed that the delay in instituting the transfer was either acceptable or desirable. It is difficult for me to understand how this happened because we know that one patient was transferred from Burks Falls to Huntsville by an ambulance from Huntsville.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Education, notice of which has been given. Could the Minister indicate whether or not in respect to the new legislation dealing with the county school boards, all the debenture debts will be assumed as a lump sum by the board and spread equally over the county, or whether they will remain as a debt of the individual municipalities which agreed to the various expenditures in the first instance?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, this matter was just touched upon the other day. I think I should point out that the proposed legislation will contain provisions similar to the provisions in Bill 54 for the determination of assets and liabilities in consolidation of the school sections into township areas.

It is suggested that provision would be made for the adjustment of assets and liabilities between counties where a former jurisdiction included territory in two or more counties and between former boards within the new county division, and if an adjustment is necessary it will take into account the assets and liabilities including the surplus or deficit shown by a board upon entry into the enlarged jurisdiction.

It is contemplated that boards of arbitration—this will be mentioned in the legislation—consisting of arbitrators appropriately appointed—would make the determination of the relative assets and liabilities between the boards that will form part of the new organization. In a situation really comparable to the consolidation of school sections in the township areas, it is quite possible that certain municipalities, for any period of time, whether three or five years depending on what the board determines, will have either a higher or a lower mill rate or cost, because of the consolidation. This was the principle, Mr. Speaker, that was used at the time of the township area consolidation and we intend to extend this. We found that it worked really quite effectively.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Education. Will the Minister delay the effective date of implementation of consolidation of school boards in order that boards, teachers, and other interested parties may have an opportunity to study all aspects of the plan and consult with the Minister's department before it becomes a *fait accompli*?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, it is the intention—in fact we have been doing this for several weeks now, two or three months—in discussing and consulting with the various groups involved. When the legislation is introduced, and I am sure discussed in great detail before the committee on education, I anticipate this will continue, and I believe, Mr. Speaker, there is time for the consolidation to move ahead without a delay as far as the effective date of January 1 is concerned.

But there will be ample opportunity for the discussion and understanding by the trustees and teachers when the legislation becomes available and is discussed not only here in the House, but I am sure in the committee itself and elsewhere in the province.

Mr. Speaker: The Minister of Mines has the reply to a question asked on Friday.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence (Minister of Mines): Mr. Speaker, a question was asked of me in the House on Friday last by the member for Sudbury East: Did the mining inspector visit the coal plant at INCO in Copper Cliff on Monday, December 18, 1967, and if so, what were the findings at that time?

I have now been informed that two engineers of the inspection branch of The Department of Mines made an investigation at the coal plant at INCO in Copper Cliff on December 18, 1967. This investigation was as a result of complaints received by the department and the findings of the engineers were threefold:

1. Fan motors are totally enclosed and are provided with auxiliary force ventilation. The motors cannot be started until the ventilation system is working. They are also provided with temperature switches on the discharge air side of each motor which would trip out the fan motors at a pre-set temperature rise.

2. Vacuum systems and hoses are provided throughout the building to permit cleaning about the electrical equipment without the use of water.

3. A fire in the dust chamber of No. 2 dryer could not cause a coal dust explosion inside the dry coal treatment area.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): Would the Minister accept a supplementary question? How was it that International Nickel, in view of the telegram that I received on December 17, was aware that this inspection was going to take place?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: I hardly think that is a supplementary question. I would like to take that as notice, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Tourism and Information.

Has the Ontario board of censors placed any further restrictions or limitations on subsequent showings of the film "Ulysses" in the province of Ontario?

Hon. J. A. C. Auld (Minister of Tourism and Information): No further restrictions have been imposed on the film "Ulysses". I understand that the owner of the film, or the owners, originally planned to show it in Toronto, Vancouver and Montreal. Whether they may change their plans I do not know.

Mr. Lewis: May I ask a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker? Is the understanding inaccurate, then, that the present showing was confined to four weeks by the Ontario board of censors and that no subsequent showings for extended periods of time were to be allowed?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I really do not know, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Mr. Speaker, two very short questions, the first to the hon. Minister of Economics and Development. Does the government pay any monies to outside agencies for assembling land for use in the HOME programme, and if so, how is the amount calculated?

Hon. S. J. Randall (Minister of Economics and Development): Mr. Speaker, if an outside agency—for example, a real estate broker—is used by the Ontario housing corporation for the purposes of assembling land for the HOME programme, the standard real estate tariff for such services would be paid by us.

Mr. Deans: Thanks. My second question is to the hon. Minister of Health. Will the Minister investigate the new carburettion system developed by the Doughboy Industries Incorporated of New Richmond, Wisconsin, which claims to reduce exhaust contamination below emission limits set by the United States government? If such an investigation agrees with the claims made by the company, will the Minister make it mandatory for the new carburettion system to be installed in all automobiles built in Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, I would ask the right to take that as notice in view of the fact that many proposals are put before us. We have to do some preliminary investigation of all of them before we can determine the merit of further investigation.

Mr. D. M. De Monte (Dovercourt): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the hon. Minister of Education, notice of which has already been given.

Is it the intention of the government to apply the same rules pertaining to the amalgamation of public and secondary schools on the county basis to the separate school system of the province?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, we have had some discussions with representatives from the separate school system. As a matter of policy and principle we are in support of the concept of extending the policy with respect to the public school system to the separate school system. As the hon. member perhaps is aware—if not, he can check this out very carefully—there are certain very real legal complications involved in these discussions, and I think any decision will have to be determined by the results of the studies that are presently under way.

Mr. F. A. Burr (Sandwich-Riverside): Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister of Health. Would the Minister consider a weekly report to members and news media, similar to the one now being sent out by the Ontario water resources commission, indicating which plants have started to install air-pollution prevention equipment, and which plants have completed their programme?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, this is not presently in our planning. I would point out that there are some differences between our programme and that of the OWRC in that the OWRC has been in operation now for some time whereas we just began less than two months ago. Our programme calls for phasing in, before the whole province is covered over a period of five years; it would therefore be necessary to produce such information on a localized basis at the beginning, and I think we are too deeply involved in getting the programme under way before we start thinking of this kind of programme. However, the hon. member's observation has been noted and we will keep it in mind.

Mr. W. G. Pitman (Peterborough): Mr. Speaker, might I direct a question to the Minister of Education as Minister of University Affairs? Would the Minister indicate whether there is any proof of the allegations recently made by officials of The Department of University Affairs that there was widespread cheating by university students

participating in the province of Ontario's student-aid programme?

Hon. W. G. Davis (Minister of University Affairs): Mr. Speaker, perhaps the hon. member is aware that there was a statement issued by the department a day or so after the original story in the press stating that The Department of University Affairs had no evidence to substantiate any such allegations. But to ensure that this was in fact the case, the department undertook to make a study or to inquire of officials at each post-secondary institution as to whether they were aware of any cases where incorrect information had been submitted by the applicants. As the members who were here in other years will know, when we discussed the student-award programme originally it was centred within The Department of University Affairs. After certain discussions, it has now been decentralized to the individual institutions. They are the ones who, in the final analysis, prepare the material and submit it to the department.

So we contacted the various post-secondary institutions, and to date the response from the various universities and colleges supports the position of the department that the vast majority of students are applying for student awards honestly and in accordance with the prescribed regulations.

Mr. R. H. Knight (Port Arthur): I have a question for the hon. Minister of Labour. Has The Department of Labour received complaints from pulp and paper mill unions about the department's ruling, making mandatory, as a condition of employment, the compulsory wearing of safety shoes on a plant wide basis or face a heavy fine or jail sentence? If so, what will the department do about these complaints?

Hon. D. A. Bales (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, in reply to the question from the hon. member for Port Arthur, I would advise that the department through the director of industrial safety has received representation from a group of unions regarding company practices arising out of directions left by factory inspectors that safety boots be worn by employees of the company. The department does not make the wearing of these boots a condition of employment. The industrial safety branch has been looking into this situation and we will be meeting with the company involved shortly to clarify the situation.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the hon. Minister of Education. In the preliminary meetings of the interim school organization committee regarding county school areas, is it intended to continue to ban the press from these meetings, and if so, what is the reason for such a decision?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I think that really the question of whether the press should or should not be at the meetings of the interim school organization committee is something that should be resolved by the participants at the local level. There has been no direction one way or the other as far as the department is concerned, and I think this is a decision that really should be left up to the committee.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Mr. Speaker, on Friday last, I directed a question to the hon. Minister of Economics and Development, which I asked to have redirected to the Minister of Health. The question took this form: Has the hon. Minister given consideration to the needs of senior citizens' housing in the Lakeshore area, and specifically, is he willing to permit a small portion of the grounds of the Ontario Hospital in what was formerly New Toronto, to be used for the purposes of housing our senior citizens in the west end of Toronto and area?

Mr. Speaker: I would advise the member that on Friday when that question was raised, I suggested that he redirect it to the Minister of Health. It has not come into my office so redirected and I presume that the Minister perhaps has not had notice of it?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I have not, Mr. Speaker, but I can answer if the hon. member chooses.

Mr. Speaker: By all means then, the Minister will answer it.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, this matter has been discussed at some length over the past several months. I have been in contact with the authorities of the township of—pardon me, pardon me—the borough of Etobicoke and the Metropolitan Toronto authorities, as well as some interested people. I have indicated to all those that there is no intention on the part of the department to release any of the land now held by us for the operation of Lakeshore psychiatric hospital, since our long-range planning we believe this land will all be needed for health facilities.

Mr. Martel: A question to the Provincial Treasurer. What is the wholesale price of gasoline in Toronto, Sudbury and Timmins?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Speaker, the wholesale price in Toronto—the net dealer wholesale price—is 21.6 cents per imperial gallon; in Sudbury, 24.4 cents per imperial gallon; and in Timmins, sir, 26.9 cents per imperial gallon; the differences in wholesale prices between these centres arise mainly from charges accruing from freight handling and additional storage.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): Mr. Speaker, on Friday last, there were one or two questions directed to the Minister of Economics and Development and I believe the Minister promised to answer them today.

Mr. Speaker: The Minister has already advised me that he has answers to several questions which I would ask him to give when all questions today have been asked, and I believe they are now finished.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Speaker, regarding the questions from the hon. member for Hamilton East, the answer to question 1 is that there will be a total of 84 new geared-to-income dwelling units in the Lawfield and Berrisfield Heights projects. To date, 74 of these have been completed and occupied. A further five are completed and have been allocated, and the families will be moving in almost immediately.

In answer to question 2: Of the 79 units occupied or allocated, 57 are rented to tenants with incomes up to $6,000.

Question 3: Twenty-one units are rented to tenants having incomes from $6,000 to $8,000.

Question 4: One unit is rented to a tenant with an income of over $8,000.

All the tenants having incomes in excess of $6,000 were transferred to these geared-to-income dwelling units from the fixed-rental Roxborough Park and Mohawk Gardens developments where the maximum permissible income for continued occupancy is $5,111. The 41 units which were vacated in Roxborough Park and Mohawk Gardens have been reallocated to families having incomes of less than $5,111.

And then there was a question from the hon. member for Wentworth, I think. He asked it earlier, and I have the answer to that. The answer to question 1: The Ontario housing corporation uses a variety of approaches in assembling land for the HOME plan. Land may be offered to the corporation by private individuals or real estate agents acting on behalf of owners. In addition, the corporation's own property agents locate suitable land and negotiate directly with the owners. In certain instances land has been offered to the corporation, which has already been assembled and partially or wholly planned. In other instances land has been offered on a completed basis, that is, including installations and all municipal services.

And the answer to question 2: The land required for the OHC Saltfleet development was assembled by a private real estate broker and is presently in the ownership of the Ontario housing corporation.

I have a question here, Mr. Speaker, while I am on my feet, from the hon. member for Timiskaming. Since there were two main parts to the Los Angeles trade and industry conference, I would like to reply to the hon. member in two parts:

First, there was sales opportunity mission No. 93 which consisted of ten businessmen representing six different cities in the province —Woodstock, Hamilton, Stratford, Toronto, Kitchener, Lindsay. The ten companies were selected because of their interest in exporting to the United States, as well as having products with sales potential in the Los Angeles area.

Although on this particular sales mission there were no representatives from northern Ontario, this area of the province is never discriminated against, since on several previous sales missions many companies were selected, representing such cities as Kirkland Lake, North Bay, River Valley, Sault Ste. Marie, Sudbury, Dryden, Nipigon and Port Arthur. In the policy of recruiting industries for future sales missions, we will continue to approach companies from northern Ontario as we have in the past.

Second, during our business opportunity mission and economic conference representing the industrial development side of the programme, in which we seek out business opportunities for the province in the area of branch plants, joint ventures and licensing agreements, the government represents all of Ontario. At the economic conferences which were held following my luncheon address to over 450 businessmen, the Equalization of Industrial Opportunity programme was fully described with emphasis on northern and eastern Ontario. When a prospective investor visits the province to seek a branch plant, joint venture or licensing agreement, northern Ontario is always included in any discussions regarding his establishing in Ontario.

In the process of developing trade or industrial interests, I can assure members that northern Ontario or, for that matter, any

other part of the province, is never neglected or omitted.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might direct a supplementary question to the hon. Minister, on the answer to my question?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the member file another question.

Mr. Deans: Well, Mr. Speaker, if I may, what I was going to ask was—

Mr. Speaker: The member will either place it on the order paper by way of a question, or place it in my office by tomorrow morning, at which time it will be answered. The Minister—

Mr. Deans: Well then, Mr. Speaker, if I may, the question I asked was "Who is assembling?" not if it is being assembled by an outsider. Who is the outsider? That was the question.

Mr. Speaker: That would be a suitable and proper question for tomorrow.

Mr. Deans: I asked it yesterday.

Mr. Speaker: And it would be a suitable question for tomorrow.

I would advise the member for Welland South (Mr. Haggerty) that not only has he not a copy of his question, no copy has reached my hands.

I would advise the member for High Park (Mr. Shulman), who last week raised the question of an error in *Hansard* which was an embarrassment to him and the official Opposition, as he stated, that the list of members is published and appended to *Hansard* by the printer; it was not edited by the editors of *Hansard*. The matter, along with two or three other minor errors will be corrected by a new list which will be appended to one of the issues of *Hansard*, and I hope that both the member and the Opposition parties will be satisfied and happy.

Mr. MacDonald: It was a bit of wishful thinking on the part of some Liberal.

Mr. Speaker: The Provincial Treasurer has requested, and I certainly will accede to the request, that he give a supplementary answer to a question, and I think it quite reasonable, since supplementary questions appear to be the order of the day. The Provincial Treasurer has the floor.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes, I probably should have said, Mr. Speaker, in answer to the hon. member for Sudbury East, that under normal circumstances, the information that I provided for him is not available to government or to The Treasury Department, and in this instance, I obtained it from the president of the Imperial Oil Company and also obtained his permission to provide this information to the hon. member and the House.

Now I cannot say beyond that, that these would represent the prices by other companies. It seems only appropriate that that qualifying observation should be made.

Mr. Lewis: That is nice—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Speaker, there was no condescension about it at all, they were very ready and willing to make it available. They have nothing to hide, no condescension at all.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: Resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the motion for an address in reply to the speech of the Honourable, the Lieutenant-Governor at the opening of the session.

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): At adjournment hour on Friday, I had dealt with two issues which are of major concern to the people in the province of Ontario at the present time, namely the cost of living and housing. I want now to turn to a third.

Few questions in my view are disturbing Ontario citizens more than the burden of municipal taxation. The Throne Speech offers no relief other than a couple of recommendations hastily picked from the Smith committee report for election purposes last fall, plus the assurance of fuller implementation of that report at some later date.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if the Smith committee report offered some prospect of resolving the crisis on the municipal front, at least municipal taxpayers could suffer in hope. But while the report is a gold mine of useful historical and background information, in its recommendations it is a profoundly disappointing document.

It condemns the existing grant structure as "chaotic," and that is its word. "By its very nature," it admits, "the property tax can never be truly equitable." After recommending extensive reforms, it defensively adds:

> We readily admit that a fiscal sow's ear has hardly been transformed into a silk purse.

Its indictment mounts in a veritable crescendo until, regarding welfare grants, as the leader of the Opposition has already put on the record, it bluntly asserts that:

> To suggest adjustments in the system would be akin to prescribing aspirin where only surgery will save the patient.

Mr. Speaker, in face of that scathing denunciation, it is inconceivable that a serious report, which was nearly five years in the making, should come up with no alternative. Yet that is precisely what the report failed to do. In its basic solutions, it is bankrupt and this government is content to live with the bankruptcy. At best, the report merely proposes to tinker with the *status quo*.

Provincial takeover of justice administration is long overdue. The report's estimate of $15 million saving has been increased by the Provincial Treasurer to $18.5 million, with his announcement on grants in lieu of non-municipal fines. But it is not unfair to say that this is a mere drop in the bucket of the overall billion dollar municipal tax burden.

As for the $50 average homeowner's saving from the basic shelter exemption, we already have evidence that in Metropolitan Toronto, for example, it will be gobbled up by this year's increase in education taxes alone before the taxpayer ever receives it. I suppose that statement is subject to whatever formula or technique the Minister or the government will use in getting to the taxpayer, and the government is presently deeply preoccupied with that, according to news stories.

During the election campaign, we warned that this is precisely what would happen, that the saving would be gobbled up before it could be passed on.

The Smith report suggests an increase from 45 to 60 per cent, as the provincial share of education costs. Such a limited takeover will not resolve the crisis, but not even this much is indicated in the Throne Speech. Unless the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. MacNaughton) is being coy till Budget time, which is not impossible—he has a capacity for coyness on occasion—we can look forward to no more relief this year.

In short, the government is fiddling while the municipal taxpayer burns. And since it justifies its limited effort by reference to the Smith report, we must go back to the basic inadequacy of the recommendations of that report itself.

The Canadian tax foundation has commissioned many studies since the report was released. Their views represent an authoritative source of commentary. Writing in the foundation's official *Journal*, November, 1967, F. H. Finnis noted the fundamental failure of the committee in the task for which it was appointed:

> It is regrettable that the committee did not carry out research in depth on the burden of taxation on Ontario municipalities.

And Mr. Finnis added:

> If a truly equalized grant system is ever to be introduced, it is essential to establish (1) the relation of equalized mill rates to residential property values and to income, and (2) the cost of providing individual services in different classes of municipalities arranged according to the recommended regional reorganization.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Smith committee did none of this basic work. The report was content to recommend that municipal tax equity could be achieved only through regional government, and on the present intolerable situation, it virtually threw in the towel.

It is patently impossible, the report said, to devise a general grant formula to take rational account of the some 900 totally disparate entities that we now call municipalities in Ontario.

Mr. Speaker, that counsel of despair and defeatism on the fundamental programme that it was appointed to resolve merits two comments. The first is a further quotation from Mr. Finnis in the *Canadian Tax Journal*:

> Having delivered itself of this rather negative thought, the committee proceeded to tidy up the present grant system without making any attempt to provide the framework for an overall plan of provincial aid, which would allow a more uniform tax burden related to the cost of the services received if, as and when the recommended regional units become a reality.

Second, Mr. Speaker, it is nonsense, in my view, to suggest that, "It is patently impossible to devise a general grant formula", to meet the needs of more than 900 different municipalities.

We have already done this for education finances, and we have dealt not just with 900 "disparate entities," to borrow their phraseology, but with more than 1,600 local school boards.

It is beyond belief that the Smith committee should not even have considered the

broader application of the foundation plan model which is operating successfully in the very province which they were studying.

In my view, Mr. Speaker, there is an obligation on Opposition parties, not just to borrow the sharp criticism of the Smith report with regard to the grant structure at the present time, but if the Smith report comes up with no alternative, then there is an obligation for us to come up with this alternative and we, in the New Democratic Party, have accepted that challenge.

In proposing that Ontario should implement a foundation tax plan for general municipal purposes, I am not asking the province to strike boldly into uncharted territory. There is no need to pioneer; Nova Scotia introduced a foundation plan last year and from all reports it is working satisfactorily. A municipal foundation plan is based on the principle that every resident has a moral entitlement to a basic level of services no matter where in the province he lives. Moreover, he should not be expected to pay more for the financing of these services than any other resident in similar circumstances.

Stripped of all the complexities, which any grant structure inevitably involves, following is the proposed formula for a municipal foundation plan:

1. Strike an equalized assessment for each municipality in the province. This could be done on the same basis as is now used for the educational foundation tax plan.

2. Calculate the cost per capita of the services to be covered by the programme. This is known as the standard cost and there could be a separate one for each region or other segment of the overall programme. In each case the standard cost would be arrived at by: (a) totalling the previous year's expenditures for all municipalities in the segment; (b) adding a gross factor to allow for prices and wages increases; (c) dividing this total by the population in the municipality.

3. Assign an initial flat rate grant to each municipality. It would be: (a) a percentage of the standard cost multiplied by the municipal population; or (b) a combination of (a) together with a special additional payment designed to offset the pressure of extraordinary costs which may be borne by fast growth in urban areas.

4. Calculate the mill rate which would have to be charged to make up the difference between this flat rate grant and the overall cost of the services in the municipality or municipalities now having the greatest capacity to carry the financial burden. These top municipalities are the ones which already have the lowest ratio of standard cost to equalized assessment. The mill rate so calculated is known as the "standard mill rate."

5. For each municipality, apply the standard mill rate to be equalized assessment. This determines the amount of money which can equitably be raised locally. Subtract this amount and the flat rate grant from the standard cost of providing the agreed services. Pay each municipality a budget balancing or "equalization" grant to make up the difference, in addition to the flat rate grant.

The basic principle of the municipal foundation tax plan and the manner in which it is implemented can be more simply illustrated by the hypothetical example for A, B and C municipalities with equalized assessment in the ratio of $5,000, $10,000 and $20,000 per capita, assuming that the standard cost for the services covered is $200 per capita and the flat rate grant is 25 per cent. With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit for *Hansard* a brief table (below) to illustrate the working of this formula. I shall not attempt to read it now but I am sure it can readily be understood when it is seen in print. It will take very little space, but it will be very clear and succinct in terms of spelling out the inevitable complexities of a grant formula.

Formula for Municipal Foundation Plan

Municipality	A	B	C
Equalized Assessment (per capita)	$5,000	$10,000	$20,000
Standard Cost (per capita)	$ 200	$ 200	$ 200
25% Flat Grant	$ 50	$ 50	$ 50
Standard Mill Rate	(7.5)	(7.5)	(7.5)
Mill Rate Yield	38	75	150
Equalization Grant	112	75	—
Total	$ 200	$ 200	$ 200
Provincial Share (Flat plus Equalization Grants)	$ 162	$ 125	$ 50

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Will Mrs. Bryden be available to explain it to us?

Mr. MacDonald: As a matter of fact, we would be very glad to make her available. On the question of grant formulas I shall never forget the day when the Minister of Education (Mr. Davis) read into the records the foundation grant formula some three years ago. Mid-way through it, he stopped because it was obvious that he did not know what he was reading. Neither did we know what he was reading; he smiled and said we could read it in *Hansard*. Well I have done my best to make this intelligible though I concede it is a tough proposition.

Mr. J. H. White (London South): Not entirely successful!

Mr. MacDonald: Is that right?

The application of such a plan is straightforward once a decision has been made on the formula for equalizing the assessment and for standard costs. Another basic decision is, of course, what services shall be covered in the plan. In Nova Scotia, for example, in the first year, the standard services programme covers street and fire protection, street lighting and garbage disposal. In other words, to begin with, it is a relatively limited plan.

In Ontario it would probably be wise to select a few of the most vital services for coverage by the plan at first, and gradually add more as experience is gained and the province's capacity to assume more of the municipal burden is developed. The services to be covered can be drawn from a list which the Smith report considers as suitable for regional government jurisdiction as set forth on page 514 of volume 2.

One further item: Capital costs should obviously be included in the foundation tax plan because they are an integral part of supplying general municipal services. Whether they should be covered by the same equalization formula as is applied to operating costs is a matter for further study. It will be recalled that the education foundation tax plan in Ontario uses a different formula for capital costs but it is still based on the principle that grants are in inverse ratio to equalized assessment.

Mr. Speaker, the New Democratic Party believes that a fundamental solution to the municipal crisis can be achieved by a three-pronged attack designed to shift more of the burden off the regressive property tax.

1. This session of the Legislature should adopt, in principle, a foundation plan for general municipal services. This would introduce a basic equity in the standard of services provided and the local cost involved. Details could be worked out in time for a fall session so that it could be implemented for the 1969 tax year.

2. The provincial government's share of education costs should be raised over the next five years from the present 45 per cent to 80 per cent.

3. Health and welfare costs should be fully transferred to the province starting in 1969. Decentralized administration, however, should be retained where units are large enough to support adequate concentration of staffs. Already 80 per cent of welfare payments are covered by the federal and provincial governments, though administration costs are paid by the municipalities. The major health expenditure of the future—pollution control—is now in the process of being taken over by the province. There is no reason why the balance of public health functions, which require action on a regional basis, should not follow. Decentralized administration is still possible under full cost assumption by the province, if local budgets are subject to provincial approval, but some freedom of action can be left with local administrators.

Now comes the key question that undoubtedly the Provincial Treasurer is going to be most interested in: What would such a three-pronged attack cost? Let me set forth the calculations for each of the three components of the programme. First: The cost of the foundation plan will depend on the level of assistance which the province feels that it can give the municipalities immediately in the first year. If the amount is limited to what is now paid out in general municipal grants, and the plan applied strictly, there would be no increase in cost but simply a redistribution in payments among the municipalities, with fiscal need playing a greater role in determining each municipality's share than at present.

However, we do not think any municipality should receive less than it does now under our present mixed bag of grants. We would therefore propose the government assume the additional transitional costs of maintaining a floor on present grant totals at least until the regional government arrangements are worked out. This means that each year as additional funds are made available by the province for the municipalities, they would go out on a

fiscal need basis under the foundation plan. The plan offers considerable flexibility for adjusting the pace, as the amount going to each municipality can be varied simply by changing the standard mill rate or the standard cost or the flat rate grant.

In 1966, the last year for which figures are available, general municipal grants from the province represented 22 per cent of current revenues of municipalities—excluding school board costs—and amounted to $178 million. If we assume that municipal costs are going up 10 per cent each year and the 22 per cent figure is maintained, municipal grants would require $236 million in 1969—and I wonder how close that will be when the Budget comes down.

On these figures, it would require—and here is the key point for the Provincial Treasurer's consideration—$10.7 million additional provincial money for the additional percentage point which the province has assumed under the proposed municipal foundation plan. This would be offset, of course, by a corresponding amount of relief for the local property taxpayer. Presumably this is the objective we are seeking to achieve.

Thus, the scale of costs becomes clear: if the province's share were raised to 25 per cent in 1969 from the present 22 per cent and since we are putting a floor under it, I suggest that is likely to be the point to which it would go, it would cost approximately $32 million more than current grants; if it were raised to 30 per cent, it would cost approximately $86 million more.

Second: In a phased takeover of more of the education costs beyond the 45 per cent borne by the province now, the additional grants would be approximately $10 million for each additional percentage point at current costs. Assuming a takeover of 80 per cent by five years, or some 7 per cent each year over the next five years, that would represent an additional expenditure of $70 million, again with a comparable relief at the local level.

Third: In calculating the cost for a complete takeover of health and welfare costs by the province, the figures published in the municipal statistics book are not very useful, because they do not represent net municipal costs, nor do they include capital costs. The DBS net general expenditure figures give a truer picture of the current and capital costs of the municipalities for providing these services. The latest ones available, for 1963, show that net municipal outlays in Ontario for public health were $11 million, and for welfare, $25 million.

Expenditures for these functions have not been increasing at a very rapid rate in recent years, but if we allow for a five per cent increase per annum, an outlay of approximately $48 million would be needed by the province to assume full costs in 1969. So to sum up, the additional outlay in 1969 for a start in implementing this three-pronged attack would be:

For the foundation plan, assuming the provincial grant share of municipal revenues was increased from 22 per cent to 25 per cent in the first year, some $32 million.

For the phased additional assumption of education costs, some $70 million.

For the complete takeover of health and welfare costs, some $48 million.

That represents a total figure of $150 million in an overall budget that now exceeds $2 billion.

If the province is really determined to meet the crisis on the municipal front, and not to accept the defeatist conclusions of the Smith report in continuing to rely so heavily on the regressive property tax, I suggest to the House that this is a manageable figure, because it may scale up from year to year as our capacity to cope with it is developed.

In any case, I present this programme to the government, and to the members of the Legislature, for their earnest consideration. In working it out, we have had the assistance, as the Minister is apparently aware, of our director of research, who came to us after years of experience with the Canadian tax foundation. There may be arguments—

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Very capable!

Mr. MacDonald: The Minister is right—it is the best money the government is spending. There may be arguments over certain calculations because of the many variables and the fact that we have to work without the detailed information available within the government. But I am confident that the general principles of such a three-pronged attack, including the foundation plan, are sound.

Let me add a final word on an important related matter. How will a foundation plan fit in with regional government? The municipal foundation plan is not a substitute for the development of regional government. We believe that regional government is urgently needed in this province and there should be no delay in its implementation. I agree with

the leader of the Opposition that we have to move to an overall approach to this, and not the piecemeal approach which has characterized the government's conduct in past years, and still today.

However, it is unrealistic to expect it to be achieved overnight, and help for the municipalities in meeting their growing problems of urbanization and the rising costs of services cannot wait.

A foundation plan will be needed to equalize and supplement the resources of regional government. It will be extremely valuable to have gained some experience in the working out of such a programme before it is applied to the new level of government.

Meanwhile, a foundation plan will eliminate some of the mad scramble for industrial assessment or higher priced residential subdivisions. This will be a good thing as it will enable planning for the location of industry and urban growth to be based on factors other than the needs of the municipalities, for assessment. In short, a foundation plan will assist in the orderly development of effective regional government.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I turn to the final topic I want to discuss in this Throne debate. We cannot go through a Throne debate without getting back to that matter of intense preoccupation by the government, and particularly the Provincial Treasurer, and that is the question of medicare.

The fight to win progressive legislation in Ontario has never been an easy one. We have been preoccupied with it ever since we came into being, and we are desperately plagued with the problem of coping with the frustrations that the government puts in the way of its implementation.

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Provincial Treasurer): We think of the people too, all of them.

Mr. MacDonald: As I was saying before I was interrupted, rudely or otherwise, Mr. Speaker, the fight to win progressive social legislation in Ontario has never been an easy one, but surely nothing over the years has been so bitterly resisted by conservative elements—and I have that spelled for the Provincial Treasurer's satisfaction with a small "c". They include certain gentlemen by the name of Sharp and Winters and so on—the small "c" conservative element—in our community.

Already, in this Legislature, the Tory colours have been nailed firmly to the mast. In seconding the address, the member for York East (Mr. Meen) proudly proclaimed his party's position to the principle of universality. He called medicare a socialist measure —horrible, boo!, scare everybody, you know— and implied his party would never countenance its implementation.

I have news for the member. I predict that two years hence, in response to public pressure, his party will have taken Ontario into the national medicare plan and, what is more, his Tory government will be taking credit for the whole idea.

The parallel with hospital insurance is striking. For years the Tories under Leslie Frost fought the proposal of universal public hospital insurance. Socialism. I remember listening to it so often before I got into this House, when I watched from the gallery before I first came into provincial politics. Eventually, however, Mr. Frost came to realize that a modern Ontario could not afford to be without it. At that point, as the Toronto *Daily Star* pointed out on February 16:

> Frost fought more than half his Cabinet to bring in the highly successful Ontario hospital services insurance scheme.

In doing so, Mr. Frost recognized reality more sharply than his colleagues.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): How would anyone know he fought his Cabinet?

Mr. MacDonald: He did not fight them, he dominated the whole thing and said: "You, you, and you, you are all volunteers." I know, but—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, what kind of battle would that be?

Mr. MacDonald: I will tell the hon. Minister. If the hon. Minister has forgotten, there used to be a member for High Park, late and unlamented who stood in this House and fought hospital insurance even after the government had introduced the bill.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That was not "half the Cabinet."

Mr. MacDonald: Well, the people caught up with him.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We always want to make sure that the people can afford it.

Mr. MacDonald: Would the hon. Minister continue while I have a drink? The programme he resisted for so long and finally implemented is one of the proud boasts of the Tory administration. The hon. member for York East may not fully appreciate the

irony in his speech, extolling the government's enactment of Ontario hospital insurance, an irony heightened by the remembrance of his earlier attack on universality and socialism. I have said that this government will two years hence, have implemented medicare. They will do so, one, because it meets an urgent public need and two, because it makes good economic sense and three, because it is something the people want. They will be subject to powerful pressure from the public and they will face continual urging from the New Democrats in the House and, I hope, the official Opposition.

We must recognize, however, that although events will eventually compel the Tories to implement medicare, they are ideologically opposed to it, and they will use any argument against it which seems, in the meantime, to carry weight. They are joined by a powerful triumvirate of special interests: the doctors, the insurance companies, and the large corporations.

The current argument has been badly put by the Provincial Treasurer. Neither Ontario nor Canada, he says, can afford medicare.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: We cannot afford it!

Mr. MacDonald: I recognize the hon. Treasurer's merit, sir. Neither Ontario nor Canada, says he, canafford medicare.

Now, I will examine that argument in some detail today. In my view it is false. It is the product of highly sophisticated propaganda machinery trying to brainwash the Ontario people into accepting what is clearly not the truth.

To start with, what would the per capita cost of medicare be in Ontario? In 1967, the federal Department of National Health and Welfare published a survey of physicians' earnings which showed that in Ontario in 1965 they averaged a little over $33 a person or about $5.50 more than the national average. Allowing for a 20 per cent increase in costs in the intervening three years, it is not unreasonable to estimate the per capita cost for the first year of medicare in this province at $40, and across Canada at $35. These are the figures that I have been using for the last few months in discussing medicare.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: The member's figures are wrong!

Mr. MacDonald: Even taking the hon. Treasurer's calculations into consideration—if the member will bear with me he will see that I have taken them into account. These are the figures that I have been using for the last few months in discussing medicare. They would appear to be borne out by estimating a 10 per cent increase over the per capita figure paid by PSI for 1966 to allow for a fee hike in April, 1967. Such a calculation would indicate a per capita amount of just over $40.

It is also worth noting that medicare in Saskatchewan in 1966 cost $25.22 per head, and doctors there are, on the average, higher paid than anywhere else in Canada.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: There are not many people in Saskatchewan.

Mr. MacDonald: The hon. Minister should not bring in irrelevancies. That is irrelevant, we are talking about per capita costs. That is a typical Tory red herring. They won't face facts when they do not like the facts. The fact is that in Saskatchewan the per capita cost in 1966 was $25.22, and doctors there on the average are higher paid than anywhere in Canada.

Mr. White: The hon. member has neglected to tell us why this must be.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: They would like to get rid of it!

Mr. MacDonald: The Treasurer should not kid himself for one second.

Against the $40 estimate the New Democratic Party has been using, two new figures have been posed. One is being cited by federal Health Minister MacEachen: a gross annual medicare cost of $885 million for all of Canada. He has not told us what the per capita figure or population total he is basing this on, but it works out to $40 per head on a population of 21 million.

The second is the considerably higher figure of $48.50 which the Provincial Treasurer is reported to be using as the cost in this province, along with a comparable national per capita cost of $44. I am bound to say that frankly, on the basis of the evidence before us now, I consider the figure of $48.50 an artificially inflated one, designed to frighten Ontarians away from medicare. Nevertheless, it appears to be the figure being used by the government. For this reason I propose to include it along with our figure of $40 per head, in the subsequent calculations I wish to present in the House.

Now, there is a second question that we have to take a look at. What number of people would be involved? A proper estimate for the first full year of medicare starting

July 1, 1968 should really exclude those who already get medicare elsewhere—armed forces personnel, RCMP, Indians, Eskimos, persons in institutions. Lacking data on the exact number of such persons located in Ontario, we have not made this adjustment, so our estimates are if anything, a little high.

We figure the 1968 average population of Ontario at 7,450,000. This would comprise—

Mr. White: Progress Ontario!

Mr. MacDonald: The hon. member is responsible for the birth increase, is he?

Mr. White: For the population increase, yes!

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Single-handedly?

Mr. MacDonald: This would comprise 1,780,000 families, and 960,000 single persons.

Now, I want to make two cost estimates for Ontario. The first is based on our own figure of $40 per head, the second on the government's higher figure of $48.50.

At $40 per head the cost in 1968 would be $298 million, with another five per cent, or $15 million for administration. The Hall commission used 4 per cent for administration costs, and the 1966 PSI administration cost was 5.2 per cent of expenditures. This makes a total of $313 million. Of this, Ontario would receive back $130 million in federal grants, if the national average was $35 per head, leaving the province to raise $183 million.

But Queen's Park is already paying at least $60 million in respect of OMSIP. So the new net additional funds required would be $123 million.

Now, let us bow to the dictates of the Provincial Treasurer—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: What does the member mean—dictates?

Mr. MacDonald: Using the higher per capita figure of $48.50 for Ontario, and $44 for the Canadian average, this total would be $361 million with an additional $18 million for administrative costs at 5 per cent. The federal grant would be $164 million, the present OMSIP payments, of course, would still be $60 million. Therefore the net additional amount of money needed in Ontario under the Provincial Treasurer's figures would be $155 million.

Now the lower of these two figures based on our calculation, $123 million, could be more than that if Ontario residents were to pay premiums amounting to half the present OMSIP level.

For example, if families paid $72 per year, and single persons $36 per year, Ontario would receive a net premium income of $139 million to cover the $123 million required. And for another $8 a year for families, and $4 for single persons, that is a total of $80 per family, or $40 per single person, the premium income would be high enough to cover the second figure of $155 million, based on the government's much higher per capita estimates.

Let us take a moment to explain how we arrive at these conclusions, just so the Minister, in the quiet of an evening before he goes to sleep at night, will mull these figures through and come to his own conclusion that they are accurate.

At $72 a year premium, 1,780,000 families would raise $128 million, and 960,000 single persons at $36 would produce a further $35 million. For this gross figure of $163 million, we would have to subtract 58,000 families and 162,000 single persons who are currently recipients of social aid, as well as 108,000 families and 176,000 single persons who have no taxable income. These were the numbers receiving free coverage under OMSIP on December 31, 1967. Deducting an amount of $24 million in respect of these persons, we are left with a net premium income of $139 million.

To meet the government's higher estimate, slightly increased premiums of $80 per family and $40 for the single person, would, on the same basis, bring in an income of $153 million. Thus it can be seen, Mr. Speaker, that Ontario's share of medicare, at whatever level of per capita cost is chosen, ours or the government's, can be met by premiums which are roughly half those currently being charged by OMSIP.

Mr. White: The hon. member has neglected to add to the cost of the enormous increase in federal taxes.

Mr. MacDonald: If the member were to sit down and listen, he will find that I have left out nothing that is relevant to the topic.

Mr. White: Again, Mr. Speaker, he has not, I notice, mentioned the experience in Great Britain where costs have become so astronomical that even Prime Minister Wilson is concerned about them.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, time is short enough today that I am not going to be

drawn off by the red herring because a Tory government in Britain looked into the matter and found precisely the opposite was the case.

Mr. White: I know all about that, but they are in a lot of trouble right now because of you socialists, and the member knows it too.

Mr. MacDonald: I am sorry that I exercised these gentlemen on the other side of the House so seriously, Mr. Speaker; their blood pressure begins to worry me. Thus it can be seen, Mr. Speaker, that Ontario's share of medicare, at whatever level of per capita cost you wish to choose, can be met by premiums which are roughly half those of OMSIP. For persons now enrolled in PSI, where family rate is $204, the savings, of course, would be correspondingly greater.

Now, one or two additional comments by way of a footnote; Ontario also collects about $10 million under the Canada assistance plan for the medical expenses of welfare recipients. Since these payments from Ottawa will likely continue under medicare, Ontario will have a further $10 million here to defray its provincial medicare costs. You see I have a little extra in my calculations just to show you—

Mr. White: Mr. Sharp said the cost would be one billion dollars to start.

Mr. MacDonald: Forgive me, just to show that my calculations are conservative in nature.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. White: It is completely misleading and deliberately so.

Mr. MacDonald: We have assumed, Mr. Speaker, that subsidies—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: I am rather enjoying this, but I do not know what has happened to the hon. member from London. When I do not get finished by five o'clock, Mr. Speaker, you will know who to blame.

We have assumed that subsidies to people with some taxable income will no longer be necessary, in view of the substantial reduction in premium levels envisaged under the programme. Now, I think the government itself will concede the logic of these figures—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Not yet.

Mr. MacDonald: Said I, hopefully—because lately they have been concentrating their fire on the alleged burden Ontarians would have to shoulder to help the federal government pay its share of national medicare. You see I had the Provincial Treasurer in mind. I could not forget his deep concern.

An hon. member: Going to solve that too.

Mr. MacDonald: Having failed to pressure Ottawa into reneging once again on its commitment to introduce medicare, the Ontario Tories are now using their influence to bolster sentiment that the province should not participate. They use two arguments.

The first is that Ontarians cannot afford to contribute toward medicare costs in other provinces. That is a sentiment that comes poorly from a government whose leader, only last Christmas, was talking about a billion-dollar Canadian development fund, into which Ontario would make a large contribution. It is a sentiment that runs counter to the whole underpinnings of Confederation. The Premier knows full well that unless Confederation works toward eliminating regional disparaties, our country cannot hold together. That was one of the clear messages coming from the recent top-level conferences on Confederation.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): May I just correct the hon. member? I would not want him to go on his way in misinterpreting what the government says. We firmly believe in the principle of equalization; we have backed it at every provincial and fiscal conference that has been held. What we do say is that we should know what equalization we are paid, and we dislike equalization built into plans of this type.

That is why we have objected, and we will continue to object, to this form of equalization which means that in Newfoundland, for instance, the government will make money on the plan, whereas we, in Ontario, will lose money and between those two extremes fall the various other provinces.

So it is really quite unfair to say that we are destroying the underpinnings of Confederation because we object to this form of equalization built into this, or indeed any other plan of this type.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, Mr. Speaker, the purpose of a social security plan is that everybody should have an equal service, and the cost should be distributed in accordance with ability to pay.

An hon. member: Hear, hear.

Mr. MacDonald: And that means that every social security plan is going to be, in effect, an equalization.

An hon. member: Of course!

Mr. MacDonald: Okay. If the government is opposed to it, it is challenging the underpinnings of Confederation.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: The member misses the point. The point is that you pay the equalization to the provincial government concerned as a flat sum, so that everybody in Ontario knows what they are paying, and then that government, in turn, supports the plan in its own province.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, I repeat, and I will leave it for the moment—we will come back to it on the Prime Minister's estimates if nowhere else, that will be the forum for coming to grips with it—that social security measures are desirably and inevitably, another form of equalization payments.

And as Joey Smallwood and some of the other Premiers would say, "What is the purpose of Confederation if it is not for that?" They said it many times during the conferences.

The second argument that the government is advancing, Mr. Speaker, is that by coming in and collecting the concomitant federal grants, Ontario would, in effect, be financing its medicare scheme with taxes raised in P.E.I. or Manitoba, or other provinces not wishing to join. This is an equally fallacious posture.

As the Toronto *Daily Star* put it:

> If Mr. Robarts meant what he said, he would also refuse most of the federal money available for public housing in Ontario this year—the Premier might also refuse federal subsidies under The Gold Mining Emergency Assistance Act, subsidies which keep some northern Ontario mines and communities alive. After all, some of that money comes from poor provinces which have no gold mines at all.

You see how phony their argument is! It strikes at the basis of the whole underpinnings of Confederation. The *Star* continued:

> These examples are enough to show the absurdity of Mr. Robarts' whole idea.

And it concluded, and in this case I heartily agree with the *Star*:

> Mr. Robarts was not standing on high unselfish principle; he was grabbing at any handy excuse to delay medicare.

Nevertheless, and I get back to my friend from London South again, nevertheless we have been told that medicare will mean high, new taxes at Ottawa. Need this be the case? It need not.

If new taxes come at Ottawa, it will not be because of medicare. It will be, in plain English, because the federal Liberals will not have the guts to implement the Carter commission report recommendations. And here, as on all basic issues affecting people, there is no difference between the Liberals and the Tories.

Using a national per capita cost of $35 for medicare, Ontario's share would be $368 million in the first year if all the provinces came in. Using the higher national figure of $44 per share, the federal costs would be $462 million.

I think I said earlier it was Ontario's share; I meant Ottawa's share would be $368 million on the basis of $35 national average, and $462 million on the basis of $44 per capita.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if the Carter recommendations were fully implemented, these amounts could easily be obtained from the broadened tax base without any increase in tax rates on individuals or corporations.

What would be involved is the removal of tax concessions currently enjoyed by resources industries and insurance industries, and the imposition of a tax on capital gains. At least $150 million could be raised by doing away with special favours to the mining and oil and gas industries, another $75 million from the insurance companies and, at a modest estimate, $300 million from the capital gains tax.

At the present time, however, Mr. Speaker, and you see I am going to take all alternatives in here, realism requires that we recognize that the federal Liberals are unlikely to muster the courage, good sense or the competence to carry out these recommendations. Where then would Ottawa raise its share of medicare?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: How does the member reconcile all these figures when the net total tax revenue that would accrue to the federal government under Carter if all the Carter recommendations were implemented, would be $224 million in revenue?

Mr. MacDonald: Well, I am sorry I do not know offhand what you are referring to.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well, that is the point.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I have the floor.

The figure of $150 million from the mining and the oil industries, $75 million from insurance and $300 million from capital gains

taxes are well known and established figures in the Carter report.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is confusing the House. If he recommends the total implementation of the Carter report on the one hand, and uses these isolated figures on the other, he is obviously misleading the House, because the total—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: I have the floor.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I am not finished with my point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MacDonald: And if the Provincial Treasurer is finally interested in—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: On a point of order.

An hon. member: What is your point of order?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: My point of order is that the figures the hon. member has put to this House are misleading when he says on the one hand—

Mr. MacDonald: That is no point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: —that the federal government—

Mr. MacDonald: The Provincial Treasurer knows that is not a point of order.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I say it is.

Mr. MacDonald: And I invite the Provincial Treasurer—if finally this government is willing to debate the Carter commission in this House, let us do so instead of just interrupting on a speech, because we have had no comment and no debate from the government on the Carter commission.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Please, let us keep the records straight or we will have to do it for him.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. MacDonald: Now, Mr. Speaker, where then, if we are not going to do it by the Carter commission recommendations being implemented, would Ottawa raise its share? Mr. MacNaughton and Mr. Sharp, the fiscal Bobbsey Twins, have both threatened that it would all have to come from increased personal income tax.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Sharp said that.

Mr. MacDonald: These are scare tactics, typical of the small "c" conservative mentality. I say the business community of Canada must pay its full share; corporations benefit from the increased productivity of a healthy work force. During 1960, according to the Hall commission, days lost from work as a result of physical disability were 53 million and a further 34 million days were missed due to non-disabling illness in the work force.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: The member is really reaching out now.

Mr. MacDonald: But, for example, Mr. Speaker, a 3 per cent surcharge on corporation profits would raise $150 million and, combined with a 6 per cent surcharge on personal income tax, it would raise another $225 million. The total federal cost of medicare could be brought in with 3 per cent on corporation, and 6 per cent on personal income.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Six per cent is really the equivalent of 12.5 per cent of income tax. However you add it up, it comes out the same, $12.50 for every $100 of income tax paid by everyone in the province of Ontario.

Mr. MacDonald: We invite the government once again to debate the Carter report that it has skirted around now for a year and a half.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: Finally, perhaps, we have provoked the government into dealing with it publicly instead of behind the scenes.

The figure of 12 per cent income tax surcharge bandied about by Messrs. Sharp and MacNaughton would be necessary only if no increase in corporation tax were imposed, and if the actual per capita medicare cost was at the highest level suggested. Regarding the government's figure, such a discriminating option would only be chosen by a cowardly and corporation-dominated administration, but it does not necessarily say it will not be adopted in Ottawa.

Now Mr. Speaker, when we toss around figures of millions of dollars and percentages of income tax and so on, we tend to lose sight of the human element which is, after all, the underlying foundation of the whole medicare proposal. When you take a look at the benefits which would be enjoyed by the average

Ontario family under medicare, you find it difficult any longer to maintain an argument against it.

If Ottawa would implement the Carter proposals, thus eliminating the need for any further federal taxes at that level, then Ontario families could enjoy a savings upwards of $70 a year in medical costs.

However, Mr. Speaker, we will take all options. If Ottawa will not move on Carter, choosing instead the combination of 3 per cent corporation and 6 per cent personal income surcharges, a family with $5,000 a year income would still save upwards of $65, a family with $7,000 income would save $42, and even at the income level of $10,000, a family would enjoy a marginal saving.

Additionally, when we consider that medicare will provide a more complete range of coverage and services than can now be obtained in any private plan, savings estimates are bound to be on the low side. Even if Ottawa was entirely right on the personal income tax surchage, up at the 12 per cent level a family with $7,000 income would still save more than $20 a year.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: The member does not really believe that.

Mr. MacDonald: I do, because I figured it out and I invite you to do so, and if you cannot figure it out, I will loan you the services of our director of research with a little calculating machine and we will set you right on the figures.

These savings estimates are based on a comparison with current OMSIP rates. PSI family subscribers will pay $204 a year for coverage and would enjoy considerably greater net savinges. In any event Mr. Speaker, we know enough about the economics of medicare to be assured that, under all circumstances, Ontario families will gain from it.

If Ontario were to build equity into its revenues, the savings would be substantial. Medicare means good health and good sense to Ontarians. There is, therefore, no substance to the charge that we cannot afford medicare. For all obfuscations and fulminations in this government—that sounds like an erudite paraphrase of what we used to hear from the former Minister of Mines—which poorly concealed doctrinary dislikes of medicare, the merit of the programme has already been accepted by the Ontario people.

The Ontario people say we cannot afford not to have it.

Now, there are other arguments against medicare which equally will not stand up to close scrutiny. It is said, for example, that most of the population is already covered. The 1966 survey by the Canadian conference in health care showed that 95 per cent of Ontarians are included in some sort of a plan, but most of these plans cover only major costs, and involves deductibles or exclusions.

The 1963 report of medical care in Hamilton noted that a study made of the family medical expenses of 1,000 steelworkers in that city, excluding basic hospitalization, showed the average annual medicare cost expenditure of these families was $237, of which the PSI blue plan paid only 23.5 per cent. The Hamilton report concluded that selectivity did not realistically assess and I quote:

> The proportion of the population that will require such means testing; the magnitude of the sums required for supplemental assistance; the difficulty of establishing equitable criteria on which to assess need; the fluctuation in incomes—

for example, among seasonal workers:

> —and the consequent continuing need for re-testing; the high acquisition and administrative costs of voluntary insurance.

The Hall plan went on to say, and I quote:

> The national hospital insurance programme has proved that a universal—

This is for my friend from York East:

> —that a universal, comprehensive programme is feasible, practicable, economical to administer and immediately effective for the total population.

That commission was headed by a jurist who was appointed originally from the ranks of the Tory party.

As a corollary to this main argument, Tory medicare opponents argue it is too costly to the nation. I remind the House that on the estimates of the federal Minister of Health, national medicare would cost only $80 million more in the first year than what Canadians are now paying for far less adequate health protection. Only $80 million in new money, that is, that will be required, and it will be returned tenfold in greater gross national product when fewer work days are lost because of illness or disability.

We are warned that people will refuse to accept new taxes. If new taxes are presented in the same way as the recent ill-fated Liberal bill in the Commons, and for the same reasons, then perhaps I would agree. But the

Canadian people know that payments out of general revenue for medicare would only be a substitute for money they are already spending, not a new outlay.

They have more brains than the Tory government gives them credit for. In the words of the Hall report, "the device of tax payments to achieve universal coverage is acceptable to the great majority of Canadians."

Now before leaving this subject, Mr. Speaker, I want to note quickly other advantages which would accrue to Ontario citizens under the medicare programme.

Its portability would ensure the same, or a similar plan throughout Canada, and thus provide security of health care wherever in this country we choose to reside or travel in.

Its lower administrative cost, a simple case of economies of scale, would mean more of the premium dollar available to spend on actual medical treatment.

Because it would be non-profit, more money would be available for treatment.

It would provide wider and more comprehensive coverage, eliminate waiting periods, limitations on services, and deductibles. It would be a plan capable of being tied in with public programmes for preventive medicine, and for improving the quality and availability of medical services.

It could, as time and circumstances warranted, be extended to cover drugs, dental and nursing care.

So, Mr. Speaker, I give the government fair warning that the New Democratic Party will fight relentlessly to achieve a final victory for Ontario in medicare. This important social measure has been delayed for 50 years —far too long—by old party procrastination, ever since 1919.

Now Mr. Speaker, I want briefly to turn to the Liberal amendment. Quite frankly, that amendment is as weak and as vacuous as the Throne Speech itself. Like a majority of people in Ontario, we in the New Democratic Party are in favour of God and motherhood and we are against sin, but more particularly—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: Hon. members are not against sin?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: The member has his halo on a lot tighter than the rest of us.

Mr. MacDonald: Oh, okay. More particularly, Mr. Speaker, we are opposed to this government, so in spite of the weaknesses of the amendment, at least its thrust is against that government, and we shall support it.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: Regarding the plea of the leader of the Opposition to present a united front against the government, which now represents only 42 per cent of the people, we are only too willing to do so, when specific proposals are worthy of support.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. MacDonald: I will come to that in a minute. The record of the New Democratic Party in this connection is clear. We support issues whether they are introduced by the Liberals or Conservatives, if we think they are worthy of support.

The Opposition leader made this plea in reference to his regret that we did not support an earlier Liberal motion to have the standing committee on standing orders revise rules of the House. Mr. Speaker, I am not going to take the time of the House, because there is not time today to read the record, but it can be found on page 26 of last Thursday's *Hansard*, on February 15.

We said explicitly and clearly that the objective of that motion was a worthy one, but the vehicle for its implementation was what we had to vote on, and it was inadequate. The standing committee on standing orders is not an appropriate body to consider a review of the rules of the House. It is one of our more routine standing committees.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): It does not need to be.

Mr. MacDonald: It has been appointed for this year and furthermore it has not got the adequate personnel. Moreover, Mr. Speaker, the standing committee sits—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: You should know better than that.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The enemy is over here, fellows.

Mr. MacDonald: I have dealt with you now for about three and a half hours. There is a little problem over here. Just give me a couple of moments.

An hon. member: A little one.

Mr. MacDonald: Yes, Mr. Speaker, let me wrap it up this way. If the Liberal Party is

so bankrupt that they want to try to make capital out of misrepresenting our position on that vote, go ahead. I invite you, go ahead, because you will not make any capital out of it.

An hon. member: There is that halo again.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Tight, is it not?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: Another specific example in the amendment is that the Liberals express "regret that this government will not participate in the benefits of the federal medicare plan." Of course, we share that regret but we have serious misgivings, Mr. Speaker, with regard to the specifics of the Liberal medicare plan.

The Liberal leader has advanced the interesting contention that Ontario already qualifies for entry into federal medicare.

Mr. Nixon: It could be accomplished very easily at this session.

Mr. MacDonald: Because of the fact that 90 per cent of the people are covered by the present plans, including private insurance companies. He then argues that all we have got to do is to pass a law which authorizes these private carriers as non-profit carriers, and presto, we have qualified.

Mr. Nixon: That is incorrect. Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, so that the House will not be misled, it would, of course, be the intent of any statutory changes to put these companies out of the medical insurance business so that they cannot present profit-making medicare plans.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, may I just say to you, in a quiet little personal conversation; the height of political naivety is the proposition that by merely passing a law here, and have private insurance companies operate on a non-profit basis. Who in heaven's name does the hon. leader of the Opposition think he is kidding? Who does he think he is kidding?

Mr. Nixon: It is certainly awfully hard to get through to you, is it not?

Mr. MacDonald: I will tell you what is happening, Mr. Speaker, let us face the fact. The Liberal Party is back to one of the positions of Mr. Wintermeyer, a position of public medicare that involves private insurance companies.

So once again the Liberal Party is in the process of reversing their position. Once, Mr. Speaker, the Liberal leader has been quoted as saying, outside the House, that he had not cleared with Ottawa whether or not his nice little calculation here would be acceptable to Ottawa.

I suggest it is time he quit playing games. I suggest if he is a Liberal, he should talk to Mr. McEachen. I talked to Ottawa this morning and I am told authoritatively, that they do not accept that kind of an approach in Alberta and, therefore, they will not accept it here, unless—and just let me impose a caveat, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Nixon: On a point of order, the leader of the NDP is misleading the House when he says that we would attempt to make it possible for private companies who are engaged in profit-making insurance operations, to come under the sphere of federal medicare. Obviously this is impossible. PSI is non-profit, so are the county medical co-operatives. These could surely be contained within the umbrella to begin with.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, the only thing I can conclude, Mr. Speaker, is that the programme has been changed in the last three weeks, because three weeks ago, when the first announcement of this policy, subject to change without notice, was made—

Mr. Nixon: Oh, nuts!

Mr. MacDonald: Nuts again, eh?

Mr. Nixon: The hon. member has said that. He is misleading the House.

Mr. MacDonald: That is about the level of the member's discussion of important issues.

Mr. Speaker, when this first was made outside the House, it was stated that all private carriers, including private insurance companies—because newspaper men specifically asked the hon. leader of the Opposition about insurance companies—and he said all you would have to do is pass a law saying that they could be non-profit.

Mr. Nixon: No change in our policy at all.

Mr. Lewis: Then 90 per cent would not be covered.

Mr. MacDonald: Now he has changed his policy. Exactly—you do not get 90 per cent. The policy is both subject to change and infinite confusion.

The significant point, Mr. Speaker, when one reads the Liberal amendment, is that they have no real alternatives to this government. Now let me assure you that the New Demo-

cratic Party has, and presents, an alternative to this government. The Liberal Party's differences add up to quibbling over pork barrel politics—they do not like your pork barrel, all they want is their pork barrel.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I do not like either of the member's pork barrels. Does it always have to be pork?

Mr. MacDonald: It may violate some of the Minister's principles, but I do not know anybody on that side who has been in the pork barrel more than you have. It is old party feuding taken to its most futile lengths. The basic problem facing our people, Mr. Speaker, is the cost of living—how to make ends meet.

Take national surveys, talk to any head of a household, talk to any wife who has gone out to purchase the week's groceries—the main problem is—sure they are earning more money than they ever did before—but it is tough to make ends meet as they seek to meet their legitimate needs. That is the problem and there are many things that this government can do.

For example, the government could do something, as I have already pleaded in this Throne debate by exposing the unnecessary increase in prices, through a prices review board; it could do something to cope with the excessive cost of living for people in northern Ontario; it could reduce the high cost of automobile insurance by a government non-profit plan that would take off many dollars each year for each operator; and it could do something about the exorbitant rent of people who are living today in apartment buildings, and have no access to a rental review agency when they have to submit to excessive rent gouging.

It could do something about increasing minimum wages to alleviate pockets of poverty that spread across the whole province of Ontario—hundreds of thousands of people living on one dollar an hour. It should be ashamed of itself—it could do something about it, but it will not.

It could do something to close the gap between the needs and the availability of low cost housing, when everybody concedes that you simply cannot meet the needs of housing today out of a growing proportion of our family budgets. And finally, it could do something about the oppressive burden of property taxes by introducing, I suggest to the Minister of Municipal Affairs, a foundation programme.

Therefore, I move, and I invite the Liberal Opposition—since they solicit with a guilelessness that is really most appealing, that we should join with them against the government. I invite them to support this sub-amendment which presents a real alternative to the government and puts some substance into their amendment.

Mr. Nixon: We support meritorious amendments.

Mr. MacDonald: I move, seconded by Mr. Renwick, that the amendment be further amended by adding thereto—

Hon. Mr. McKeough: That is the best thing the member has said in this speech.

Mr. MacDonald: —that the amendment be further amended by adding thereto—I knew the Minister could not hold his breath any longer than that:

> and this House further regrets the government's continued refusal to assist the Ontario people in coping with soaring costs of living and specifically its failure
>
> 1. to keep exorbitant price increases in check through the public mechanism of a prices review board;
>
> 2. to raise northern family incomes by promoting economic development, and to eliminate gross disparities between those prices charged for consumer products in northern Ontario and those in the rest of the province;
>
> 3. to reduce the high cost, and eliminate the other inequities of automobile insurance through a government operated, non-profit car insurance plan;
>
> 4. to protect tenants from exorbitant rent increases by means of a rental review agency;
>
> 5. to increase the minimum wage to at least $1.75 an hour, thereby augmenting the purchasing power of a majority of Ontario people;
>
> 6. to adopt measures essential to closing the gap between the demand and supply for low-cost housing in Ontario;
>
> 7. to reduce the oppressive burden of the property tax and to introduce equity into Ontario's tax system by means of a foundation tax plan for municipal financing.
>
> And therefore that your government does not enjoy the confidence of this House.

Hon Mr. Robarts moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

NOTICE OF MOTION

Clerk of the House: Notice of motion No. 17 by Mr. J. R. Smith.

Resolved:

That in the opinion of this House, The Department of Education should prepare a course of study dealing with the development and operation of our system of government at the federal, provincial and municipal levels which would stress the privileges and obligations of Canadian citizenship and stimulate in our youth a deep sense of national pride and purpose; and that this course be made obligatory in all publicly supported elementary and secondary schools of this province.

Mr. J. R. Smith (Hamilton Mountain): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Durham (Mr. Carruthers), resolution No. 17, standing in my name, which has just been read.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that this resolution is in keeping with the report of the Ontario Legislature's select committee on youth, who, under the section on government and law, stated pointedly that many students in this province have no idea of the different levels of government or their respective functions.

Thus a good course in civics including the study of laws affecting youth, law enforcement and government at local, provincial and federal levels would seem to be a necessary part of a youth's education. Thus, Mr. Speaker, I heartily endorse their recommendation that the school curriculum should include courses in civics, and should provide opportunities for the student body to gain experience in the democratic process of self-government in as many areas as possible.

As a teacher, I welcome the curriculum division of The Ontario Department of Education's announcement last May that the department was planning to issue an interim revision of social studies programmes from kindergarten to grade 6. This revision indicated that a study of civics or citizenship would be an integral part of the course, as it was felt that an awareness, particularly of local government, would be developed gradually for pupils in these grades.

Mr. Speaker, one of the reasons for this resolution now before the House is that for far too long, teachers and students in this province have had to endure the repetitious story of such people as Christopher Columbus, Cabot, and so on, in grades 4, 5, and 6, while the civics and citizenship side of the curriculum has been neglected.

At present the grade 10 course has been amended for the inclusion of a course in government, which should last for a period of four to six weeks, and which summarizes the growth of government in Canada to its present form, the steps by which Canada assumed the responsibilities of self-government and the operation of government in Canada at the federal, provincial, and municipal levels.

However, Mr. Speaker, I am alarmed by the fact that history, as a subject, is not receiving its due recognition in our secondary curriculum. In Hamilton, students in grades 9 and 10 receive only a yearly average of two and one half periods per week of history, which is only half the emphasis placed on music and art. Undoubtedly, Mr. Speaker, adult cynicism has much to do with the suppression of civics and citizenship in our school curriculum. I find it disturbing that in our nation the word "politics" is often considered to have nasty connotations.

Many adults believe that it does not make much difference who wins the election, that most politicians are corrupt, that voting is at least a choice between degrees of evil and maybe even for some, a complete waste of time—that government is not responsible to popular demand, and that bad government is unavoidable but endurable.

Mr. Speaker, government and its various agencies affect every area of our daily activities. This fact should challenge us to see that the children of this province are made fully aware of the operation, the services and the responsibilities of government.

I feel that many teachers have been rather apprehensive about innovating their own programmes on civics and citizenship, because perhaps they were hesitant to go ahead without guidance since there is no directive presently in existence from The Ontario Department of Education concerning this matter.

Last year the Hamilton and district young Progressive Conservative association wrote a letter to the district heads of all Hamilton district high schools to ask that they give due consideration to the formation of a political club in each of the area high schools where there were enough students so interested. These clubs were to embrace students who had a sincere and genuine interest in political thought and action and which would respect the views of all areas of political viewpoint. Mr. Speaker, the fact that not one of these gentlemen even acknowledged this letter, speaks for itself. I feel that

one of the reasons for the failure of previous civics and citizenship courses has been the reliance on the treatment of the subject as strictly a textbook method. I am convinced that the study of civics as such, should not be an isolated subject, but should be an integral part of the social studies and history courses; a gradual development, as children bring their experiences to bear on particular problems.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the many elementary and secondary teachers of this province who are currently engaged in developing more effective ways of acquainting their pupils with the operation of government at levels that directly affect them. I know that The Department of Education, under its curriculum division, welcomes the ideas and suggestions of teachers across this province on this particular subject. It may well be that teachers are desirous of becoming involved in such programmes in their own classrooms but just do not know where to begin.

Mr. Speaker, I can envisage a course of study dealing with this particular subject, which would contain stimulating suggestions and programmes.

Recent technological advances now afford us an opportunity hitherto unavailable to teachers and students alike. I find it most discouraging that the only film available on Canadian parliamentary procedure is that ghastly national film board production dealing with the House of Commons during the Mackenzie King era. One can well imagine the chuckles when this particular film is projected on to the screens of our school assemblies. It may be that our Department of Education could produce its own colour film dealing with this important subject, as well as placing increased emphasis on educational radio and television broadcasts dealing with current events at the federal, provincial and municipal levels.

I think The Department of Education should be encouraged to issue more frequent periodicals and more visual material dealing with civics and citizenship, such as they now produce for special occasions such as Commonwealth Day. I know from my own personal experience how valuable these printed materials are for classroom teaching and motivation. It may well be that The Ontario Department of Citizenship and The Ontario Department of Education might consider collaboration with regard to the production and distribution of materials dealing with the citizenship aspect as it relates to our young people. Portable visual and audio-visual displays or mobile vans that could circulate throughout our province could do much to foster a greater awareness of the duties and the obligations and above all, the privileges of Canadian citizenship in our youth and adults alike.

Such a course of study could produce many stimulating fields of action for our older students. Debating clubs could be encouraged to have mock parliaments and conduct public opinion polls. They could be encouraged to debate topics of current political interest, while student elections would also do much to stimulate interest in the realm of civics. I feel that our youth has in too many cases been protected from the realities of civic life. Therefore, I believe it is absolutely ridiculous and absurd that in this age of enlightened thinking school political clubs are not allowed to function in Ontario. Surely the time has come to recognize the importance of political science.

I feel that a more intimate collaboration between family, school and outside organizations would lead to a more effective realization of the problems of civic life, and stem the tide of indifference and incomprehension, which are all too frequently observed in our society. School classroom visits by such people as law officers, civic officials and other elected representatives cannot help but develop a liaison between government and our junior citizens.

I think, Mr. Speaker, it is rather unfortunate that the only opportunity many of us have for such a dialogue, at present, seems to be when an election is called. Very often it happens that candidates are invited to engage in debate or speak to school assemblies. Mr. Speaker, any democratic system requires intelligent participation of all its citizens and our children are actually our most important citizens for therein lies our future and the future of this nation. Thus we must plan for participation. We must allow for pupils to learn how citizens are affected by the political process and how they can affect this process. Pupils must know how government is conducted at all levels and how political decisions are made and how they can be changed.

I understand, Mr. Speaker, that last year 35,000 pupils visited this building or this House, and were conducted on a tour of this building by our excellent staff of guides. I know many had the opportunity to listen to this Legislature in an actual session. While not all school children in this province will have the opportunity to visit this chamber,

nevertheless the department, if it outlined a course in civics, could encourage visits to local, municipal and county chambers and our federal Parliament in Ottawa.

We need to open the doors of our classrooms. We need to allow our children the opportunity to see, at first hand, the government in operation. Pupils need to learn the practical limitations on theories and demands advocated by particular groups in the context of the general good of the community. They can only reach that understanding through study and observation of actual cases of local significance.

Our aim must be to face the issue squarely, to inform ourselves as fully as possible on the facts, judge the facts with detachment, and to base our conduct as a people, on conclusions we draw from the facts. In other words, Mr. Speaker, before we set ourselves targets, we have to make a thorough study of ourselves, and what we want. I feel, Mr. Speaker, that we are not doing as much as we could for our students in this regard.

I sincerely hope that eventually the whole matter will be duly recognized by this nation, observing a national flag day on February 15, either under the name of Flag Day or Macdonald-Cartier Day. I know the Hamilton John A. Macdonald society much prefers the latter name. Such a holiday would do much to promote a sense of national pride and purpose.

Mr. Speaker, during the recent federal-provincial constitutional conference, held in Ottawa, the Premier of Nova Scotia mentioned that for some reason or other, Canadians have been unable to develop any real deep feelings of pride in our history as a nation. I was interested to note that he proposed a course of study similar to the one which I have in mind.

Mr. Speaker, we in this province should prepare and adopt a course of study dealing with the development and operation of our system of government which would stress the privileges and obligations of Canadian citizenship, thus stimulating in our youth, a deep sense of national pride and purpose. If we do, I can envisage a convening of a national committee to study this whole area of civics on a national basis. Such a programme could not help but foster Canadian unity from sea to sea.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the most important social process in our school system is that of learning to be a Canadian.

Mr. J. R. Breithaupt (Kitchener): I am pleased to second and approve the comments made by my friend, the hon. member for Hamilton Mountain.

It has been reported that The Department of Education is now making curriculum changes which will lead to greater citizenship education in this province. We are all aware that a great amount of selectivity is needed in such courses if the key issues and facts are to be set out for the students. Surely the goal of our complete primary and secondary educational system should be the provision of good citizens to our society.

No longer can we have our pupils spending time in memorizing dates and studying terms of treaties and in the study of only the mechanics and functions of government. Involvement is needed in the practical aspect of the day-to-day operation of municipal councils, and of such bodies as our Legislature.

A study of civics or citizenship will probably become an integral part of the interim revision of the social studies programme going through grade 6. Surely an awareness of local government can well be instilled in children at this level.

But while the study of all levels of government will be an essential part of grade 8, and while the study of the operations of all three levels of government, and of the administration of justice, will be a part of the grade 10 studies, I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that these steps are not enough.

We have accepted the necessity of informing new Canadians of our history, and we require them to study our ways in order that they may become equipped to be good citizens. Their children in our classrooms do not have this immediate pressure for knowledge on them, and the result may well be, Mr. Speaker, that we are failing to develop, in these children, the depth of loyalty to our own country, and to the interests of good citizenship, that we all wish may be passed on.

We are all aware of the approach of totalitarian states, which mould the student by indoctrination into an automaton, that only mouths the views of its leaders without criticism or question. While we would never wish this result in our own province, we can still acknowledge the importance of the values of citizenship in our own context by looking at the high importance which others place on this study.

The majority of classroom teachers tend to concentrate on knowledge for the sake of knowledge, because there is simply too much of a volume of facts in our world to do otherwise in the time available. We require new

approaches. In addition to knowledge, we need to create attitudes and values for our citizens in a free society.

In this time of doubt and uncertainty, where many other world citizens have values which differ from our own, we find that our traditional views are being openly questioned in many of the areas of thought which we have developed.

It is surely increasingly obvious that the political, social, economic, and national unity problems which face Canada today cannot be permanently resolved by short range solutions.

If our educational system is to be satisfactory, then I submit that we shall have to consider these problems in depth and project solutions to them for one or two generations into the future. As practising politicians, we must surely be aware that there are many of our young people who are bewildered and disenchanted with politics and with politicians.

The aims of our political parties, and of our society as a whole, are simply not being accepted. Such terms as "political party," "party worker," "political activity," and indeed the word "politics" itself, have acquired a connotation of something derogatory, and something which is below the dignity of the average individual to involve himself. If we believe that our own occupations are of value to this province, then we surely must try to develop this opinion by education of others.

Regionalism, provincialism, racial and cultural differences, and a strong southern pull, are all forces which constantly and consistently threaten our existence as a nation. Our Canadian history, unfortunately, is not always presented in a way that will capture the imagination of young persons away from these differences.

The citizens of the 1970s will be those young persons who are being exposed now to our educational system in Ontario. If we fail to instruct them as to why we are Canadians, they will certainly have very little reason to be Canadians on their own. To put it bluntly, Mr. Speaker, we are generally ignorant of one another's problems. Therefore, we must resolve not to bequeath our own ignorance on our younger generation.

If we are to survive as a nation, succeeding generations must learn to think Canadian first. Then, and only then, will our other differences and aspirations become positive forces endowing us with qualities of sophistication, pride and self confidence.

The way to achieve this goal is through education and citizenship. This education must be inspired and co-ordinated across our nation, and I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that Ontario can lead the way in developing in-depth courses of good citizenship in modern settings.

We must present our past in a way which will fill our youth with pride. We must teach our present in the proper context of this exciting age. We must show our future so as to inspire the hearts, and challenge the minds of our young people. The political structure of Canada must receive better treatment in our schools. Youth must be taught that, at the base of this structure, are our political parties and that participation in their activity is a noble occupation—for it is citizenship in action.

In being good citizens, our students will have to do more than have the mere technical knowledge of the government of our nation. We must show our youth that citizenship implies the possession of an ideal, a sense of values, and a theory of what life in Canada may become. It takes in the whole scale of thought, knowledge and behaviour.

Our school system can proudly show that the business of growing up into a good citizen, or of becoming a good citizen upon coming here from another land, is not a matter of learning political science, but it is a matter of taking on maturity. This maturity must be made up of two parts: It must first be healthily independent, and secondly, be what one should be as a social creature.

Our education of youth can show that a good citizen will develop his talents to the maximum benefit of himself and of society. Canada does not seek to standardize men's minds and produce a deadly, low standard of existence. Indeed, we properly seek by co-operation and goodwill to face our future with flexibility, as dictated by an intelligent appraisal of a changing situation. Our schools have the obligation to clearly develop the idea that democracy is something learned, not bestowed, or legalized, or seized. The only protection of the rights of all Canadians is the understanding by education of each of these rights, coupled with a determination to preserve it. A strengthened programme of citizenship education can assist in preserving these rights.

Mr. Speaker, my friend has referred to the select committee study on youth and I suggest to the House that this study has shown the way to what kind of educational development we should have in this province. If I may quote from page 40:

> The school curriculum should include courses in civics and provide opportunities

> for the student body to gain experience in a democratic process of self-government, in as many areas as possible. Some organizations contend that nowhere in our school system are students getting a proper course or proper training in how our government works or who are those responsible for judicial, legislative and executive matters. How these three government functions are related seems to be a logical part of the school curriculum.
>
> The committee has observed that many students have no idea of the different levels of government or of their respective functions also, that many young people are uninformed about basic precepts of the law. Ignorance of the law by young or old has never been held to be an excuse before the law. Thus a good course in civics that would include the study of laws affecting youth, law enforcement and government, at local, provincial and federal levels, would seem to be a necessary part of youth's education.

Mr. Speaker, I call upon the government to implement this resolution and to ensure that our young people are properly trained in all the elements of good citizenship.

Mr. W. G. Pitman (Peterborough): Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this debate, I find myself rather unhappy that I cannot be quite so enthusiastic about this resolution as those who have preceded me. It is the kind of a resolution, Mr. Speaker, which at first glance one believes he can support, but when one looks at it a little more carefully, gives it a second or third glance, first, one is convinced that it is rather pointless; secondly, one is convinced that it is redundant; and finally, one is just a little afraid that it might even be dangerous.

But first, I think it is true that too often we try to solve all our problems by throwing them on the schools, whether this is in the area of automobile accidents or sex, or physical conditioning—anything whatsoever, any problems we seem to have, just start up a course in the schools. I think this is a foolish idea to believe that the schools can do all the things that we in this Legislature believe can be done.

I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that it is redundant because we do have a course in civics. We have a course now in civics in grade 10 that does all the things which are outlined in that particular resolution. It does so at the secondary school level, I realize and not elementary school level, but let us come to that in a moment. I taught this course for some years, Mr. Speaker. In fact, possibly the member for Downsview (Mr. Singer) will remember I invited him down to speak to the students in this particular course; and the member for York South (Mr. MacDonald) as well. And I think that the general level of the course was adequate—I think I could say that it was—I would still say that it was one of the most unpopular courses I taught. It was unpopular because it is largely irrelevant to young people in the way in which it is now being taught and thus the way in which this resolution suggests. Young people just do not think in terms of the dull operation of our system and in the spiritless development of our system, at the federal, provincial and municipal levels. And I am rather horrified to think that this is going to be imposed now upon elementary school children.

One of the things which I came to feel, as I was doing a study for the Hall commission, was that a great deal of what we do in the elementary school is completely irrelevant to students now. We teach them history in grades 4, 5 and 6; and the reason that we send them across the ocean four or five times during these years is that we cannot find anything else for them to do. We have to find something which is romantic; we have to find something they can understand; and so we find something which they can understand and then we call it "history". And we bore them and we confuse them. Then in grade 7, Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you, we turn to Canadian history and we teach them responsible government. They just got off the ship with Columbus and suddenly they are learning about responsible government; and perhaps there are very few historians who know all the implications of that complex topic; I am sure you will agree with that opinion, Mr. Speaker. So, the thing I think that we must recognize is that there are limitations on young people, and not all of them are limitations of the mind. I would suggest that the reason that Canadian history has been crucified in this country has been because it has been given to young people before they are ready to effectively absorb it. And I suggest that imposing a civics course in elementary school—anything which I mean by the term "civics," and I am sure that a number of legislators mean by "civics" —would be completely irrational. I know you can jolly it up—you can have trips to magistrates' courts, have visits to this place, and, of course, you can use television.

Incidentally, in relation to the latter, I think that one of the most important things

that has arisen in this Legislature since we arrived, Mr. Speaker, was the announcement this afternoon by the Minister of Education (Mr. Davis) on the future of educational television in this province. May I hope that we will not be using educational television to provide a course. As McLuhan suggests, educational television is not an adjunct to the textbook as I am afraid some members of his department believe. It is a completely new medium; it demands completely new emphasis and perhaps the most important educational television that we have had over the last two months, I am sure that perhaps the Premier (Mr. Robarts) would agree with me on this matter, was the Confederation of tomorrow conference. Young people learn far more about civics by sitting watching a television programme on real events than they are ever going to learn by taking a course in which they learn that a number of people are in the House of Commons and how old you have to be to be in the Senate, and all of the irrelevancies which now are presented in the civics course being taught in the secondary schools of Ontario.

I think we certainly do not need a course in civics but I think we can encourage—and not make obligatory please, Mr. Speaker—but encourage teachers to engage in the whole area of political discussion. What young people want to know—they do not really care how we formally got here or what we believe we are doing here—what they really want to know is how it works—how it really works. They want to know, sir, how political parties find their themes and how they discover their policies, how policies become laws, and they particularly want to know how political parties come into being and how they are financed. They want to know all of the things which too often we find rather embarrassing to tell them—what happened to election promises and all of this sort of thing. And this is the very thing that does not get discussed in a civics course in Ontario schools, or very often does not get discussed.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): We hardly get it discussed in here.

Mr. Pitman: Well, Mr. Speaker, I will certainly restrain myself from commenting on that. But perhaps most of all I think that the only way to teach democracy is by giving democracy. I think the chairman of the board of education for Toronto, Mr. Barry Lowes, hit at it, hit right at the centre of it when he suggested that student councils in the secondary schools of Ontario have about one decision to make a year, and that is the colour of crepe paper that is going to be used at the annual dance.

Well, if we are going to teach democracy, and we are going to teach our system of government, the only way we can do this is to give a greater participation in democracy, and in that active participation they will come to see what government really means, and what responsibilities are. Students do not learn simply by being told, but only by being a part of a democratic scheme. I am reminded, Mr. Speaker, of a comment made by Professor A. R. M. Lower, of Queen's University, who stated that it is impossible for an Ontario teacher to teach democracy because he has no idea what it is. He has never worked under it himself.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Pitman: I am merely quoting, Mr. Speaker, a comment made in another place. The reorganization of our school system is upon us, Mr. Speaker; I think the fear is that people are going to lose control over their school system, and the fear on the part of teachers that they are not going to have as much to say.

Now, I think that the present Minister of Education has indicated the direction he wishes to go. In the past year or two we have seen the end of the inspectoral system; we have seen the efforts to try and decentralize curriculum—the efforts, in short to free schools.

But I suggest that it is only in this kind of a context that you are going to get any kind of a meaningful discussion of citizenship. Only when there is a chance for young people to know what freedom is, and to know it in the local school system, in which teachers, students and parents have a part to play, will democracy in any way be relevant to the situation in any kind of a course.

Mr. Speaker, one of things which always bothers me in resolutions such as this, is that you can agree with so much, and yet you have to disagree with other aspects. For example, the comment is made that we must teach them the obligations and privileges of Canadian citizenship. I stress that our system of education—and I know that the Minister of Education would agree with me—is not there to teach young people to be citizens. It is there to teach young people to be human beings; exciting human beings, and critical human beings. You have a world in which the whole question of democracy is being questioned, and surely that is what

our school system must be doing, continuing that questioning. Not just "shoring up" and convincing young people that they have privileges and they have obligations alone.

One of their privileges and obligations is to criticize the system, and we would surely want to encourage schools to do that. We want to teach young people to understand themselves and the system in which they live; to see the injustices in our system, to see the squalor in our cities, and ask the question "why, in an affluent society?"

Surely we do not want a citizenship course which is going to teach them how to revere Canadian citizenship. What they want to know is: How do you make a democracy live up to its word? Let us create sensitive, committed, concerned, young people. Then I think that we can stop worrying about whether they will be good citizens. How do you stimulate a "deep sense of national pride" in a person? I return again to my point. You create critical minds, and you stimulate them.

You cannot make this whole business of democracy obligatory. I do not know how you can oblige people to become democratic; I think that the word is wrong, and I think that the concept is wrong, and I think that it is all out of context with the way we have been going with our education system in Ontario for the past number of years.

The whole effect of the Minister's latest efforts, and I would give him full marks for this, has been towards greater freedom. Let us not create more obligatory courses; let us make young people become so concerned and excited about their values that they want to learn something about democracy, because they are a part of that system.

For that reason, although I appreciate, and I commend the member for Hamilton Mountain, and the other gentleman who spoke, I am afraid that I cannot support the recommendation in its present form.

Mr. Carruthers (Durham): Mr. Speaker, rising to take part in this debate, may I say that it is indeed a privilege, and a pleasure for me to second the resolution presented by the hon. member for Hamilton Mountain. I believe that it is most timely that a resolution of this type be presented, and indeed it is significant that it is introduced today at the same session that the hon. Minister of Education has introduced the new programme of educational television in this province.

Indeed a major step in developing intellects, and broadening the vision of our young people is this step taken by the Minister of Education today. It fits in well with the resolution presented by the hon. member for Hamilton Mountain.

Mr. Speaker, anyone who sits in this assembly during a period when we have visitors from schools—during the morning hour, when a talk is given to these children by our very competent guides, when she questions them on various aspects of government, and the leaders and responsibilities of government, it is surprising indeed. I am shocked on many occasions by the lack of knowledge on the part of our young people in civic matters and in matters which pertain to Canada as a whole.

Attempts have been made from time to time to introduce courses on civics into our school programme, and as the hon. member for Peterborough has stated—and I cannot help but agree with him—the course has always been a failure because it has a tendency to be too stiff. In many cases it is above their level of understanding.

I do say though that instead of a particular course in civics, we should have permeating our whole educational system, the theme of national pride, and the meaning of Canadian life, and what it means to be a Canadian.

We have just completed our centennial year, 1967, a year in which our young people, as well as adults, have had an opportunity to look at ourselves in a mirror; to take pride in the great achievements of the past, and also to give great thought to what the future of this great country must be. The future rests on the shoulders of the young people, and unless a foundation has been laid for them, upon which they can build, then this nation will continue to be divided as it has in the past. It will be up to them, with the knowledge that we give them, and the inspiration that we can provide, that will determine whether Canada will be united or disunited.

I am one of those who came up through the old course of study and the old pragmatic system of education, in which we had to learn so many things by rote—the counties, the county towns of Ontario, the provinces of Canada, all the rivers, islands and so on. I wonder, today in our local areas, whether every school child can name the townships of this county. I think that this is important, because I think that the county is a very important part of the education—

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): —and the Gettysburg address.

Mr. Carruthers: Yes, I agree; is the hon. member in favour of that?

Most of our pride in our country was developed through the old readers, one for each grade. When you opened that reader you found inside the front cover a Union Jack, a picture of the Queen, a message from the Governor-General, and perhaps a selection from the book of proverbs. Today that has all disappeared.

Mr. Nixon: Now we have a few words from the Minister of Education!

Mr. Carruthers: Yes, and this may be in order, but I would suggest that it is not out of order that our present national flag and our provincial flag should appear in the front of at least some of our textbooks. I think that a message from the Governor-General, of some inspiring nature to the young people of this province, is in order. But these things are lacking today.

I think that we should, throughout our education programme, endeavour to instill young people with good poetry, the inspirational poetry that the hon. member spoke of, because these are the things that one carries throughout life. I sometimes am very critical of the teaching of English, and teaching particularly memory work today. So often I think that the day after they have learned a few lines, they no longer can recall any of the words they learned the previous day.

I do not wish to prolong this debate but I simply say that I agree fully with the resolution proposed by the hon. member for Hamilton Mountain.

Mr. T. Reid (Scarborough East): Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to talk on the resolution put by the member for Hamilton Mountain.

I am interested in the wording of the resolution that The Department of Education should prepare a course of study dealing with the development and operation of our system of government at all three levels, and that it particularly stressed, "the privileges and obligations of Canadian citizenship." I would like to discuss this particular concept of the course of study, stressing the privileges and obligations of Canadian citizenship.

It seems to me that we cannot, and should not, try to design such a course of study without also stressing the rights of Canadian citizenship. It seems to me further that the concept of "obligations and privileges" is very much—I use the word in its correct term—a conservative concept of the individual in our society. A much more liberal concept for such a course of study would stress the rights of individuals in society. So I would disagree with the wording of the motion in this regard because I believe it is out of balance, that it contains within it the seeds of a particular political philosophy.

I would like, perhaps, to say that if it did include the concepts of the rights of citizenship I would be much more favourably disposed to it. For example, I think too many of our young people are not aware of their rights. They are not aware of the rights of their parents. Therefore we should include, perhaps, in the curriculum outlined for independent people to write, the concept of rights. Perhaps the following would be useful in that regard. I take this from *The United Nations and the Human Person,* which is published this year on human rights. I think we should stress to our young people, particularly in Ontario, that they and their parents have the right generally to life, liberty and security of our persons; the right to have freedom from arbitrary arrest, for example; that we must not be held in slavery or punished in an inhuman or degrading way; that all of us should be equal before the law; that there should not be one law for the rich and another for the poor. We must not be arrested or exiled purely because of someone's whim. In other words, I think that we must stress that there are rights to being a human being as well as obligations to the society in which he lives; that there are rights that are fundamental to the individual as opposed to obligations laid down by society, and particularly by the state.

That is the first point I would like to make on this motion. I found myself in general agreement with it because of the interpretation of the word "democracy" which I believe in and which one finds in standard dictionaries. You know, "democracy" means two things. It means "people" and it means "power". That is what the word itself means and I believe that unless our young people at the elementary school level—and I disagree with the member for Peterborough on this, I think one must start at the elementary school level—that if our young people do not even know what the word "democracy" means, that it does mean people and power —not people, and then something else in between, and power, but people exercising power over the decisions that affect their lives—that unless this is instilled through the family and also, I believe, in the school system, we will continue to have what I consider to be a very imperfect democracy in Canada and in this province, in this metropolitan area of ours and even in Scarborough where I come from.

Somehow, we must drive home the basic point in a formal course of study in our schools at the elementary and secondary level that democracy is something very precious; that democracy is not something to be taken lightly but is vital to our whole way of life; vital to the rights we have as individuals, and vital to the obligations we have to the society of which we are all individual parts.

For example, I think—it is a very personal belief—that if more young people knew how our government worked—and it is imperfect at all levels—they would have a fundamental influence when they grow up to be voters, they would participate even in the simple exercise of democracy in voting. One of the things I found in the recent Ontario campaign, in my own little area of Ontario, was that when all the political candidates did appear in the secondary schools—and even in grade 8 in the primary schools—the children went home and told their parents: "You know, we had three people there; they were from different political parties, but you know, they came and talked to us about politics and why they were involved in politics. You know, it sounded very interesting. Who are you going to vote for?" Then their parents started talking about it.

So, I think that if we can interest young people in politics and government, not only will they vote when they become eligible to vote but they will have a positive influence on their parents—and one would hope that more than 70 per cent or so of the eligible voters in the federal election will vote, that more than 65 per cent or 66 per cent of the eligible voters in Ontario will vote in provincial elections and, of course, more than the 25 per cent or 30 per cent of those who vote in the municipal elections will vote in the future.

I think that if we combine this revitalized course of studies in the operation of our system of government, which would include our political parties, we would find many more young people at the ages of 15 or 16 much more ready to accept the duties and responsibilities of being voters at a much earlier age. I think that hand in hand with the lowering of the voting age to 18 must come a very imaginative programme, a formal course of studies in our schools about the obligations of citizenship, about the rights of the individual. I think that if we combine this two-pronged approach to interesting young people in politics, lowering the voting age to 18, and a formal imaginative course of studies, they will be good voting citizens at the age of 18.

Another aspect of the resolution, Mr. Speaker, has to do with how this course would be taught. I think that one of the ways it could be taught is through a very heavy dependency on educational television. For example, I think it would be very instructive if, as part of the curriculum of this school, there were educational television programmes which emanated from this chamber. I would like to see as part of this programme of study a television camera in this chamber recording what is going on, showing the conflicting points of view that arise from men of different political parties. This programme would be operated by a private television camera, edited by someone other than a government official paid by the government, the selection of the material not done by the government but done by an independent group. Then the programme would be shown in the classrooms across the schools, and would not be a government-produced programme.

Educational television can be a vital part of such a programme of studies in our elementary and secondary schools. I think that the dangers of government-produced programmes, particularly for such a course must be removed by the proper barriers, by the proper safeguards, so that the people producing those programmes are not inhibited in creating a good programme, are not afraid of putting on the air a very dynamic speech by the leader of the other Opposition party because it would be called political interference. I would say that educational television could have a proper function in such a programme of study and I think it must be insulated from any possibility of being government-produced, government-edited before being fed into the classrooms of our schools.

Another point that I think worthwhile mentioning here is the one the member for Peterborough mentioned. I would like to underline the point he made—I believe the member for Peterborough said that if such a new type of course was put into the schools, it should not be made obligatory. I believe that it should not be made obligatory. It seems to me that the concept of making a lot of courses of study obligatory, particularly at the high school level, is out of date. It explains partly the negative feeling among students to many of the courses which are made obligatory. If you leave it up to the teacher to compete for the student, if you leave it up to the teacher to put on a good course, an imaginative course, then he will attract the students to that course. If

you make a course such as this obligatory, I think the challenge will go away from the teacher, I think the course would be much less than it otherwise would be. Such a course on civics and public affairs, if you like, on the functioning of our parliamentary system, of our political parties, can only capture the imagination of our young people, if it is itself an imaginative programme and you cannot make it imaginative if you lock students into it by saying, "you have to go." Leave it up to free enterprise of a sort in the schools, and you will have the teachers responding, and I think you will have the students responding as well. So I would argue about the obligatory nature of the programme, as proposed in the resolution, Mr. Speaker.

Another aspect is, who is to teach this course? Is it going to be someone who failed at teaching English, who is told, "you go and teach the civics course"? Is it going to be a person like this, a residual thing to them; because you are a failure in a profession that does not fire you and a school system that keeps you in and because there is a so-called teacher shortage? Is this going to be the residual catch-all place for the useless teacher? I suggest it is the wrong course to do that, that you will disillusion the young people of our province even more, if you have the failures in our school system teaching. I think this should be a course where you can attract even better people into teaching, that you can say there is such a course in our school system, that it is an imaginative course, using educational television, using active participants in the political process in the course itself, as the member for Peterborough invited the member for Downsview down to discuss with his class. So I think the teachers should be encouraged to be even more involved in the actual teaching of their course.

I would also like to say that the teachers generally, but particularly teachers interested in this course, or interested in the possibilities of teaching this course, should be actively encouraged to participate in the political process itself, so that they will have some of their own involvement in the political process and in the process of government, at the municipal level, school board level, provincial level and so forth. They should receive almost a plus sign for being a campaign manager, for example, for any political party candidate. And in this way, because they are involved in what they are teaching, their students will have a much greater respect for their ability as a person, which is the first prerequisite, I believe, for the learning process to take place.

I would like to say that part of this formal course of study in the elementary and secondary schools are related outside activities.

It would be a learn and work programme, and I can see this working in a very practical way.

There has been quite a bit of discussion about the role of political clubs in our schools. In fact, I know of one primary school in the city where they are thinking of setting up a political club. So it is not just something that is happening in the secondary schools.

We should do everything we can as members of this Legislature to encourage school boards, and perhaps even instruct the Minister of Education to send a directive to the school boards and to the schools, stating that it is worthwhile having a Conservative club, a Liberal club, an NDP club, a Communist club, a Social Credit club, an Independent club, if you like; that there is something worthwhile in having clubs that are called political party clubs, as opposed to some sort of civic mishmash club.

If you actively encourage students to say there is nothing inherently wrong with political controversy; there is no reason why you should all agree together and simply have a discussion group; out of controversy between people with different political philosophies, arises an understanding of what is involved in the political process.

Political clubs as such are very worthwhile, therefore I would argue against the so-called civics club. I would like to see some controversies in our schools; I would like to see some teachers labelled as NDP, others labelled as Liberals and perhaps some, if they can find them, labelled as Conservatives, and the students can ask why these people are attached to certain political clubs.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): The hon. member would sure be an unbiased teacher.

Mr. T. Reid: Right.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to reply to that because one of the basic faults of our school system is that there is a bias against controversy, the teachers try to find the common denominator among the views of their students. I suggest, sir, that this is a boxed-in approach to teaching and learning. There is nothing wrong with controversy in our schools.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I might make a small recommendation, in closing my remarks, that there will have to be a course

outline for this course of studies in our schools.

There will probably have to be a slightly different course outline for the high schools, as opposed to primary schools, and I would suggest, sir, that one of the things that we might do as men and women interested in democracy, interested in good government and interested in controversy as a way of enlightening and sharpening our views, is to offer ourselves, those of us who are interested, perhaps those who have spoken on this resolution, as an advisory committee to the Minister of Education so that we might have a say and might participate in the writing of the course outline which would, of course, be written by an independent author or an independent firm, and hope that we have a number of textbooks.

I would like to suggest in closing that those members of this House who are interested in this—some of us at least—might get together and submit a brief to the Minister of Education to protect him from the charge that he has ridden a politically biased course. Thank you very much.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Mr. Speaker, it now being six of the clock I have three observations on this resolution:

1. First, sir, its irrelevant and innocuous content can only be opposed on the basis of some of its prescriptions. We in this party, of course, noted the use of the word "obligatory" and count again the Conservative tendency to put everything in compulsory and mandatory terms. The basis of the Tory political philosophy has about it a massive element of compulsion, Mr. Speaker, which invades even modest resolutions.

2. If a civics course were preoccupied with the charters and the garters of any given reign, with the procedures of the political system and an analysis of its components, the students in this society would verge between boredom and tedium beyond description. Indeed, if they visited this chamber too often we might not do much good for this political society and therefore, Mr. Speaker, we would be inclined to say that if one wanted to have a course which applied to civics which promoted national pride, purpose and citizenship, then let it be a course which

(a) demonstrated much of the irrelevance of politicians to the political process;

(b) took a look at this society in the class terms which animate it;

(c) looked at nationalism in Canada, if you will, in confrontation between the Trudeaus and the Johnsons, and political styles in the confrontation between the Robartses and the Smallwoods, saw political philosophy in terms of the corporate elite and the war in Viet Nam and student power which would mean effective democratic sense and an understanding of the process.

If that was the kind of course then we would support it. This kind of resolution is of very little substance.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Tomorrow we will proceed with order No. 1—the Throne debate.

Mr. Robarts moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 6:00 o'clock p.m.

No. 9

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

First Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Tuesday, February 27, 1968

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1968

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Tuesday, February 27, 1968

First report, standing committee on private bills, Mr. Carton 243

Presenting reports, Mr. Welch 243

Highway Traffic Act, bill to amend, Mr. Young, first reading 243

Public Utilities Act, bill to amend, Mr. Meen, first reading 243

Question to Mr. Robarts re Ontario Expo pavilion, Mr. Nixon 243

Question to Mr. Randall re York community residence incorporated, Mr. T. Reid 244

Questions to Mr. Haskett re sale of motor vehicles, Mr. T. Reid 244

Questions to Mr. Randall re gasoline and fuel prices, Mr. Sargent 244

Question to Mr. McKeough re assessment notices to tenants, Mr. Sargent 245

Questions to Mr. Dymond re thalidimide, Mr. Sargent 245

Question to Mr. Stewart re the price of livestock feed, Mr. Sargent 246

Questions to Mr. Randall re the HOME plan, Mr. De Monte 246

Questions to Mr. Simonett re federal Bill C-186, Mr. R. S. Smith 246

Question to Mr. MacNaughton re the Royal commission inquiry into coroners' inquests, Mr. Snow 247

Questions to Mr. McKeough re statement to the Canadian club, Toronto, Mr. Young 247

Question to Mr. MacNaughton re the sales tax, Mr. J. R. Smith 248

Question to Mr. MacNaughton re administration of Justice costs, Mr. Ruston 248

Question to Mr. Simonett re Kerr-Addison Mines Ltd., Mr. Jackson 248

Question to Mr. Yaremko re wards of the Waterloo county children's aid society, Mrs. M. Renwick 248

Questions to Mr. Robarts re Asian-British nationals from Kenya, Mr. Lawlor 249

Question to Mr. MacNaughton re the Ontario Hospital at Whitby, Mr. Shulman 249

Question to Mr. Haskett re periodic automobile safety checks, Mr. Shulman 249

Tabling report on the Royal Commission report re coroners' inquests, Mr. Shulman 249

Question to Mr. Dymond re a new carburetion system, Mr. Deans 249

Resumption of the debate on the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Robarts 250

Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Robarts, agreed to 277

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to 277

Revised appendix 279

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 1968

The House met at 2.30 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are always pleased to have visitors to the Legislature, and today we welcome, as guests, students from the following schools: in the east gallery, the 1st Crystal Beach Scouts, from Crystal Beach, and the C. P. Mackie school, Scarborough; and in the west gallery, we have the Lightbourn separate school, of Oakville, and Upper Canada preparatory school, Toronto. I am sure we welcome these young people here this afternoon.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Mr. G. R. Carton (Armourdale) from the standing committee on private bills presented the committee's report which was read as follows and adopted:

Your committee begs to report the following bills without amendment:

Bill Pr10, An Act respecting the town of Smith's Falls.

Bill Pr14, An Act respecting the village of Chalk River.

Your committee would recommend that the following bills be not reported:

Bill Pr2, An Act respecting the town of Thessalon.

Bill Pr4, An Act respecting the Oshawa Young Women's Christian Association.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. R. S. Welch (Provincial Secretary and Minister of Citizenship): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present to the House the following reports—the first is The Department of Labour annual report, 1966-1967; and secondly, the annual report of the Niagara parks commission for the year ending 1967.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Introduction of bills.

THE HIGHWAY TRAFFIC ACT

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Highway Traffic Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Young: The purpose of this bill, Mr. Speaker, is to mandate the setting of standards for head gear for motorcycle riders, and also the mandating that all people riding and driving motorcycles wear such helmets.

THE PUBLIC UTILITIES ACT

Mr. A. K. Meen (York East) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Public Utilities Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: I would like to draw to the attention of members and, of course, visitors to the House that this is an old and historic chamber, and an old and historic building, and fire is always a constant hazard. We have, in the building, a very well organized and detailed fire prevention plan and fire wardens, and I believe this morning there was an evacuation of the building to test the system.

I would ask the co-operation of the members, and of visitors to the House, in ensuring that there is no smoking in the House or the galleries at any time, and that those who do smoke in the environs of the House —the lobbies or the corridors—will take every precaution to ensure that we do not either suffer loss to the chamber, or loss or injury to any person, through carelessness which can be avoided.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I have a question for the Premier. Under Quebec law, does the province of Ontario, or the builders and architects of the Ontario Expo pavilion, have any continuing responsibility for its structural soundness following its acquisition by the city of Montreal?

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I cannot answer the question directly

concerning the provisions of Quebec law but I would say this, that we have an agreement with the mayor of the city of Montreal and I assume through him this will work out to be an agreement with the city itself, and that they will assume all responsibility.

The agreement is presently being reduced to a legal document by The Department of the Attorney General here and such legal people as the city of Montreal may wish to have deal with it. This agreement, when it is completed, will cover exactly the exigencies to which the leader of the Opposition is now referring.

Mr. T. Reid (Scarborough East): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I have a question for the Minister of Economics and Development.

Will the Minister inform the House as to whether mature Atkinson College students with families are being excluded from participation in the York community residence incorporated, segment of the OHA Edgeley project, as a condition of the approval of a 90 per cent mortgage to the student housing group? And if this is so, will the Minister take the necessary steps to ensure that bona fide students, regardless of age or marital status, are given an equal chance to enjoy housing in an atmosphere of intellectual inquiry?

Hon. S. J. Randall (Minister of Economics and Development): Mr. Speaker, I will be glad to give the member the information.

The Ontario housing corporation issued a proposal call for the development of the Edgeley project on February 15, 1968. The Ontario housing corporation and central mortgage and housing corporation jointly own the Edgeley lands, and the proposal call was issued by OHC on behalf of the federal-provincial partnership.

The proposal provides for the development of 579 units of Ontario housing directly for Ontario housing corporation. In addition, it provides for the development of private housing on three parcels of land in the area.

The proposal document defines "private housing" as including multiple rental units, condominiums for sale, and co-operative housing. Thus, York community residence incorporated may submit a proposal for a student residence in the same manner as any other proponent.

Insofar as the private housing portion of the development is concerned, the proposal document clearly specifies that the successful proponent or proponents will be expected to make their own arrangements for financing. This would, of course, apply to York community residence incorporated. As, undoubtedly, York community residence incorporated will look to central mortgage and housing corporation for financing under the provisions of The National Housing Act, it will be their responsibility to meet the requirements of the federal housing agency, CMHC. Insofar as the Ontario housing corporation is concerned, the requirements of its proposal call do not contain the type of restrictions referred to in the hon. member's question.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Transport.

Does garage licence class "A", under the provisions and requirements of The Highway Traffic Act, entitle the licensee to sell motor vehicles?

Hon. I. Haskett (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, section 31 of the Highway Traffic Act and Regulation 226, section 1, subsection 1, provides only for the licensing of the premises of a person dealing in motor vehicles and for the issuance of a certificate therefor when the requirements have been met.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Speaker, would the Minister take a supplementary question?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Yes.

Mr. T. Reid: Does garage licence class "A" under the provisions and requirements of The Highway Traffic Act entitle the licensee to sell motor vehicles?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Speaker, that is not a supplementary question. It was answered fully and completely in my initial answer.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: The Minister has answered the question and it should not take too much effort on the part of the member asking the question to interpret the answer. I find no difficulty in doing so.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Mr. Speaker, a question to the affable and travelling Minister of Economics and Development. Will the Minister advise the House if he is aware of the pending increases of gasoline and fuel oil prices in Ontario—in Canada?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Speaker, I am glad to get the question from the member in dry gulch.

Mr. Sargent: Thank you for telling me.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Speaker, I think that there are a number of questions along

this line addressed to the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs (Mr. Rowntree), but I would suggest to the member that I have not been notified by the corporations that they are going to change gasoline prices. I read it in the paper the same as my hon. friend. This is not a closed society, I do not think the manufacturers have to contact the government and tell them what they are going to do about pricing. I would say, if they break a provincial law, we have legislation to deal with it. If they are combining then the combines legislation in Ottawa will take care of them.

Mr. Sargent: Can the Minister handle a supplementary on this?

Hon. Mr. Randall: What about—dry gulch?

Mr. Sargent: Well, has he ever studied in his department the equalization of gasoline and fuel oil prices across Ontario to give equity and to protect the outlying parts of the province?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I think there have been two or three studies carried out.

Mr. Sargent: No results?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Not yet—dry gulch, kind of like Owen Sound—

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, a question for the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs, J.G.—it means just got his junior grade.

A report from the association of assessing officers of Ontario states that 619 municipalities of Ontario, or 65.8 per cent, did not send assessment notices to tenants, and that many were deprived of voting and school support privileges. Would the Minister advise what is being done about this?

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the statistics quoted are from a speech delivered by my predecessor, the hon. Wilfrid Spooner, to the association of assessing officers' convention in Ottawa in May, 1965, something less than three years ago. Since this speech was delivered, the adoption of the centralized assessment systems—that is to say, county assessment commissioners and district assessors and their adoption of standardized rolls, notices and so on—has reduced the number of municipalities not following this statutory provision to approximately 120, centred in jurisdictions not on the commissioner or district assessor systems.

The department is continuing its efforts to further reduce this figure and I know that the member will be pleased to see the progress which we have made in the last three years.

Mr. Sargent: I think there are still 120 municipalities that do not have the proper assessment.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: That is what I said.

Mr. Sargent: What are you doing about it? It is a sad state of affairs that this can happen. How do you affix your tax for the proper assessment?

Mr. Speaker: Will the member proceed with his questions?

Mr. Sargent: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the distinguished Minister of Health: The manufacturer of thalidomide in Great Britain having announced that it will pay compensation to the families of children born deformed as a result of the use of that drug, will the Minister advise if he will take up with the Canadian manufacturer of this drug the possibility of paying compensation to Ontario families in a similar way?

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, the matter of control and licensing of drugs in Canada comes within the jurisdiction of the federal government, and therefore this matter should be directed toward them. We for our part in Ontario will continue to support these children and the families by every means possible to aid in their rehabilitation.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, would you accept a supplementary on this?

In view of the fact that the government is supporting them now, welfare wise, and all the other ways it can, which I know it is doing, does not it behoove the government to get on the ball and get this money from them which is available to it?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I really think this is a matter for civil litigation, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Sargent: Thank you. A question for the Minister of Economics and Development. Will the Minister advise how many loans were made by the ODC last year? How much money was loaned? How many people—

Mr. Speaker: I would like to advise the member that apparently the line of communications has broken down between his office and mine. That question has been passed to the Clerk of the House for the order paper.

Mr. Sargent: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, thank you.

Mr. Speaker: You have one further question for the Minister of Agriculture and Food?

Mr. Sargent: Yes, sir. To the packers' friend here.

Will the Minister advise the House if the farmers in Ontario will soon know the results of work done by the Canadian livestock feed board and will they benefit from a reduction in the price of feed?

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): Mr. Speaker, first of all might I say that the Canadian livestock feed board is not a creature of this government. It is a national livestock feed board appointed by the government of Canada by an Act passed in the House of Commons in November, 1966. The appointments to the board were made in the summer of 1967.

I find it interesting to note that federal *Hansard* reports that on Friday, February 2, the hon. member for Port Neuf in the House of Commons on that occasion asked this very same question of the hon. Mr. Sauvé, Minister of Forestry and Rural Development, who is answerable to the federal House in regard to the national livestock feed board. Mr. Speaker, I find that I can do no better than to report the answer given by Mr. Sauvé at that time and I quote him as follows:

> I am sure that the eastern Canadian farmers will be delighted with the work of the Canadian livestock feed board.

Mr. D. M. De Monte (Dovercourt): Mr. Speaker, I had a question for the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Bales). I see he is not in his seat so I will stand the question down, but I do have a question for the hon. Minister of Economics and Development.

What are the minimum income requirements land down by his department for the leasing of lots under the home ownership made easy plan?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Speaker, in answer to this member's question, there are no minimum income requirements laid down by the Ontario housing corporation for the leasing of lots under the HOME plan. All applicants for lots are, however, advised that it is their responsibility to obtain mortgage financing on the dwelling that they propose to build on the lot, and that this is a National Housing Act direct or insured loan; it will be necessary for them to meet the income requirements laid down by the federal housing agency, central mortgage and housing corporation.

Mr. De Monte: I have a further question for the Minister of Economics and Development. What will be carrying charges per month, principal, interest, and taxes of a home constructed by an individual under the home ownership made easy plan?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Speaker, I regret that I am not in a position to give the specific amounts in respect to the principal, interest and taxes on a home under this plan because principal payments depend entirely upon the capital cost of the dwelling, which as the hon. member knows, may not exceed $15,000, under the terms of the mortgage.

Interest charges will depend upon the method of financing, and at the present time the maximum interest rate under The National Housing Act insured or direct loans is 8⅝ per cent. However, not all lending institutions are charging the maximum. In addition, an individual may elect to finance his dwelling other than under the terms of the national housing plan, and in such cases there would be a different interest rate again.

Insofar as municipal taxes are concerned, these would depend upon the size of the dwelling and the value of the dwelling, and would vary from municipality to municipality. The hon. member will therefore appreciate why I cannot give him specific figures. I would at this time like to stress however, that the interest rate on which the lot rentals is based has remained unchanged at 7.25 per cent from the inception of the plan, despite the substantial interest rate increases which have taken place under The National Housing Act.

Mr. De Monte: Would the Minister of Economics and Development answer a supplementary question? Can the Minister give me an average cost then of the houses purchased under the home ownership made easy plan, and the houses that are constructed thereon, or what minimum requirements are required?

Hon. Mr. Randall: The nearest that I can come to it is that one of the lowest income lots purchased in Bramalea was $6,600, approximately.

Mr. R. S. Smith (Nipissing): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Energy and Resources Management in two parts. First, what representations have been made by the Ontario Northland Railway commission to the federal government with regard

to Bill C-186, An Act to amend The Industrial Relations and Disputes Investigation Act which is presently before the federal Parliament; secondly, does the Ontario Northland Railway and this government support the contention of the other major railways concerning this proposed amendment, or does it support the intent of the amendment?

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Mr. Speaker, the position of all Canadian railways is one of opposition to the proposed amendment. The Ontario Northland supports this position, as do the labour organizations on this property.

At present there is one bargaining unit for each organized group, and this unit represents all members across Canada belonging to that particular group. It is our understanding that the proposed amendment would change this form of representation, and could result in fragmenting the bargaining units as presently constituted.

This may be serious to the larger railways, and might also prove detrimental to the Ontario Northland Railway.

Mr. R. S. Smith: Would the Minister accept a supplementary question? What part does the Ontario Northland Railway play in the bargaining arrangements with the other two major railways?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Speaker, the Ontario Northland does not directly bargain with the unions. It has been handled by the two major railroads, the CNR and the CPR, and we have met whatever arrangements have been reached by these two major railroads.

Mr. J. W. Snow (Halton East): I have a question for the hon. Provincial Treasurer. Would the Minister advise this House of the total cost to the Ontario taxpayer for the Royal commission inquiry to investigate allegations relating to coroners' inquests?

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Provincial Treasurer): Mr. Speaker, the costs actually paid to date are $41,622. All accounts have not as yet been rendered, but those outstanding are estimated at $7,700.

An hon. member: That was a planted question!

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Actually, the question was not planted.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): What about questions of cost that have not been answered and were tabled on the order paper?

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Young: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

How does the Minister reconcile his statement before the Canadian club of Toronto yesterday with that found in volume two of the Smith report and in the report summary of August 31, 1967?

The Smith report says on page 544—and three words were omitted here:

> We recommend that the provincial government plan and schedule the detailed studies of boundaries, functions and forms of municipal organization needed to establish a comprehensive system of regional government within five years of the publication of this report.

The report summary of August 31, makes these words clear when it says:

> The committee believes that the province could set up regional governments everywhere in Ontario within five years.

And yet the Minister yesterday said this:

> The target date of five years hence to complete a study to rationalize local government in Ontario seems to be reasonable and attainable.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, first of all may I say there is in my mind no basic conflict between the recommendations made in the Smith report, which the hon. member has quoted, and the statements made in my speech to the Canadian club in Toronto yesterday.

In reviewing the statement made to the Canadian club, it perhaps would have been better, more complete, for me to say that the date of five years seems to be reasonable if the government after the May series of conferences were to decide to follow the general course suggested or recommended by Smith.

I think if the member would read the whole statement, and I would be happy to provide —he already has one, good—I think if he read the whole thing he would get the picture that I was trying to paint rather than the small excerpts which he has referred to.

While reference is made to a target date for the preparation of a plan of action for regional government throughout Ontario, there could very well be certain areas of the province where new regional-type governments could be established before that date.

Mr. Young: Then the Minister is not backing away from the possibility of establishing the regions in five years?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The commitment of the government is to take the Smith report, hear the submissions, have a conference in May of this year, and those would be recommendations arising out of the Smith report. Then sometime after May, after we have the submissions formally before us, we would issue a white paper and then presumably move along the road to legislation.

My point was that if the government decided to go down the path of regional government—if—then I think the five-year suggested timetable made by Smith could probably be attained.

Mr. J. R. Smith (Hamilton Mountain): Mr. Speaker, a question to the hon. Provincial Treasurer:

Is consideration being given to amending the retail sales tax to exempt children's clothing on the basis of age, rather than size?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Speaker, the application of retail sales tax to various classes of tangible personal property is under constant review. The present exemptions with respect to children's clothing are as amended effective April 1, 1967, and generally speaking exempt children's clothing on the basis of the styles and sizes designated by the clothing trade itself as being children's styles and sizes.

Serious consideration has been given to other means of classifying exempt clothing for children, but as yet no other method has been found which is as practicable. It must be kept in mind that administration of this particular exemption should be simple enough for the thousands of retail store clerks to understand easily and also be such that departmental officials could make satisfactory checks at a later date to assure proper application of the tax in order to be fair to the general public.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): Mr. Speaker, I have a question I would like to direct to the hon. Provincial Treasurer.

With regard to the provincial government assuming the cost of the administration of justice, is it the intention of the government to assume the outstanding debentures due on county court houses in the year 1968?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Speaker, I gave a statement to the House on February 16 regarding the subject matter of the hon. member's question and for my answer, I do not think that I can improve on it really today. It will be found on pages 47 and 48 of *Hansard* No. 3, dated February 16.

However, for the information of the hon. member, I will read that section of the statement again.

> The third and final phase, that of arrangements for assuming costs of accommodation for administration of justice functions, will require considerable more time to resolve, although we have provided for funds to meet anticipated expenditures which up to this year had been the responsibility of the municipalities and counties. The considerations are complex, involving debt retirement charges, leases, rentals, operational and maintenance costs relating to accommodation for administration of justice. Conditions vary so widely from jurisdiction to jurisdiction that a major survey, now under way, must be finished before arrangements can be completed with the municipalities.

And in that context, Mr. Speaker, I would go back and make reference to "involving debt retirement" charges, which of course relate, I think, specifically to the matter of debentures referred to by the hon. member. The statement went on to say:

> Nevertheless, in preparing their 1968 budgets, municipalities can anticipate reimbursement by the province of all costs outlined above, as from January 1.

Mr. D. Jackson (Timiskaming): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Energy and Resources Management.

Is the Minister aware that the Kerr-Addison Mine is pumping tailings into Larder Lake? And since Larder Lake is a tourist attraction, what steps does the Minister intend to take to stop further pollution of the lake?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Speaker, the answer to the first part is yes.

As to the second part, the method of disposal is one of long standing, as approval was first given to Kerr-Addison Mines Limited to discharge tailings to Larder Lake by a judge of the mining court in 1938 and further approval was given by the mining court in 1951.

The Ontario water resources commission investigated the disposal procedures in late 1966 and a more detailed review of this mining operation is scheduled for this summer.

The acceptability of this method of disposal will be considered further at this time.

Mrs. M. Renwick (Scarborough Centre): Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister of Social and Family Services.

Can the Minister tell the House whether Valerie and Peggy, wards in the care of the children's aid society for the county of Waterloo, are still together?

Hon. J. Yaremko (Minister of Social and Family Services): Mr. Speaker, I am advised that the answer is yes.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, a second question, for the Minister of Social and Family Services.

What are the names of the four members, other than the chairman, on the Minister's advisory committee on adoption and foster care?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, the other four members have not as yet been appointed. I hope to have that matter completed in due course.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Mr. Speaker, a question to the Prime Minister.

Is the government presently giving any consideration to encourage Asian-British nationals from Kenya to settle in Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, we have not as yet given any consideration to this question.

Mr. Lawlor: May I ask a supplementary question?

Mr. Speaker: Yes.

Mr. Lawlor: Does the government intend to give further consideration to the question?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, we have not given any consideration to date, so that it is rather difficult to give further consideration. We really have not taken the matter into consideration at all.

Mr. Lewis: The Labour Party put him on the spot again.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Not a bit of it. Never.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): Mr. Speaker, last week I asked the hon. Provincial Treasurer a question as to whether investigators into the situation at the Ontario Hospital at Whitby had been ordered from the grounds, and at the time I protested that he did not answer my question and you suggested I peruse *Hansard*. I have now done so, sir, and I wish to protest he has not answered my question.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Speaker, yes, I pursued that matter and can tell the hon. member that there was, as a result of a misunderstanding by the staff at the hospital in question I believe, a request for the representatives of the commission to leave the hospital grounds.

Mr. Shulman: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have two questions of the Minister of Transport.

Will the Minister introduce legislation providing for mandatory periodic car safety inspections?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Speaker, it is my intention to introduce amendments to The Highway Traffic Act, this session, and when that bill is brought down the members of the House will be apprised of its details.

Mr. Shulman: I thank the Minister for his very elaborate answer.

Have safety standards been established for dealers to follow in carrying out section 49, subsection 1, of The Highway Traffic Act?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Speaker, the form of mechanical fitness certificate required under section 49 (1) is prescribed in regulation 227. The content of that certificate is currently under review.

Mr. Shulman: Thank you. Mr. Speaker, for the information of the House I wish today to table a report on the report of the Royal commission to investigate allegations relating to coroners' inquests. I will see that copies are made available to the other side of the House.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. Deans) asked a question yesterday which I could not answer.

Will the Minister investigate the new carburetion system developed by the Doughboy Industries Incorporated of New Richmond, Wisconsin, which reduces exhaust contamination below emission limits set by the United States government. If such an investigation agrees with the claims made by the company, will the Minister make it mandatory for the new carburetion system to be installed in the automobiles built in Ontario?

The answer, Mr. Speaker, is we do intend —the department does intend—to investigate this, but we cannot be committed on an "if" basis.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: First order, resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the amendment to the motion for an address in reply to the Speech of the Honourable, the Lieutenant-Governor at the opening of the session.

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, in rising to take my first part in any formal debate in the House this session, I think the first thing I would like to do would be to extend a very warm welcome to the House on behalf of the government to all those members who are here for the first time.

There was an election on October 17 last to which I might make some slight and passing reference in a few moments. All elections are the same in this respect; we lose a lot of good friends and we gain a few new ones.

I would like, as I say, to extend a welcome to those members who take their seats in this House for the first time. I would hope that they would have a fruitful and rewarding period of office. Some of them I might wish to be here longer than others, but that is in the nature of this particular endeavour, but while here you have earned your seats fairly and honestly, and you accept with the right to sit here a responsibility, not only to those people who elected you, but to all the people of Ontario.

Despite the debates that will take place here and the opposing points of view that will be presented, I think we all realize and all know that, fundamentally, we are after the same thing, and that is the best government we can possibly produce for all the people of this province. So welcome, and strive mightily, and I can assure those in the Opposition that we will do the same. We will all do our best to ensure that we leave this a better province four years hence than when we found it.

It was interesting to notice as some measure of what we have to deal with in this Legislature that since the last session opened in the last year we have added to the population of this province about 175,000 people. To put this in terms that might be a little more understandable, this is the equivalent of the population of the cities of Sarnia and Sudbury, or Port Arthur and Fort William and Kingston combined. So if you think of these two areas and the various problems which will occur in areas of that size, this is the measure of the growth of the province in this one short year since last this Legislature met. Thus it is no wonder in a province growing at this speed, we have many problems, and many opportunities to solve problems facing us.

I would like, too, to say a special word of welcome to those who are representing areas that were not represented in this House. There are nine new seats here. This is the way, Mr. Speaker, this progressive government looks after the people of this province.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I knew I would get a rise with that remark, but I would just point out to you that in the last five or six years this government has been responsible for creating 19 new seats—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: We will get to that in the Budget speech. We have created 19 new seats in this province in the last four or five years—six years perhaps—and this is in line with the policies of this government to be progressive, to ensure that the people of this province are properly represented here. We have altered boundaries; we have shifted the weight perhaps to take into account the changing social and population pattern in Ontario. There are nine of you here that represent areas which did not have the right to a member of their own in the last Legislature and a special welcome I give to you.

To you, sir, in your capacity as Speaker, I would simply say this. It was a great pleasure for me to nominate you as Speaker and to have that motion seconded by the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Nixon). The institution of which we are part of the Legislature of the province of Ontario is one that we should treasure and look after.

We see in other places what might also be termed to be a partial breakdown in our parliamentary system and in our way of government, and I think it behooves every one of us, and I do mean every one of us in this House, to be aware of the privileges that are ours when we have the right to come here; have the right to debate; and have the right to speak freely and to make our points without fear or favour.

We must ensure that we respect and maintain the traditions and the forms that exist in this chamber, and as far as the government side of the House is concerned, sir, I can assure you that you will receive complete support. We have complete faith in your capacity to rule impartially, and even if your rulings do not suit us we will accept them because it is possible for no man to do anything that will meet with the complete approval of everyone. But we have complete faith in your impartiality, and also we will

do everything in our power to maintain the dignity and decorum of the House.

This does not mean we cannot have a few interjections because this House would be very dull without them. Over the years they have added much. Sometimes it is possible to get a point across in five well chosen words which you cannot do in five well chosen paragraphs, but this is the life of the House and I hope that it will be as it has been in the past, in these four years, a place where people feel free to speak, but nonetheless respect basically the rights and privileges that belong to the members and to those people we represent as we carry on the business of the province.

I would like too, just to pay a small tribute to a man who is not here today, the hon. member for Ottawa West (Mr. Morrow), who was Speaker in the last House. I think it would be the unanimous opinion of those who were here that he served us all well. His rulings were impartial, he kept a good and high degree of order, he did a good task for all of us. He is presently not well otherwise he would be in his seat, but I take this occasion to pay tribute to him.

Now, sir, it will not be my intent to follow the practice of the two other leaders by saying anything about the Cabinet. It sits here in all its ability to be judged in the course of time. However, I would like to mention one man who has left the Cabinet, the hon. member for Haldimand-Norfolk (Mr. Allan), and perhaps you would excuse me if I were just to make some small comment on his service. He has been Minister of Highways, Provincial Treasurer, Minister of Public Works and Minister without Portfolio.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): And almost Premier.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Well you see, in the events of men, if six or seven try only one can win. Maybe, like some, he may get another chance at it and be successful then. I do not know. Nonetheless he is a man who has served his people and his province well, and I just pay this very small tribute to him on this occasion.

I would like, too, to make some small comment to the mover (Mr. J. R. Smith) and seconder (Mr. Meen) of the motion we are presently debating.

I have heard a lot of speeches in my brief period in this House, moving and seconding the motion and reply to the Speech from the Throne. We have moved a long way from the days when it used to be a completely formalistic motion speech, and a completely formalistic reply, so that nothing but eulogies of the government—and anybody else that could be found who deserved or even did not deserve a eulogy—but some comment was made by the two leaders of the other parties that there was some element, perhaps it was criticism, in the speeches of the government.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would simply say this. This is not a party of yes-men.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: These people have tried so hard, Mr. Speaker. They have tried so hard over the years to demonstrate that this was a party ruled solely from the top. I could just feel the shudders of disappointment run through the whole group when we appointed a new Minister of Mines (Mr. A. F. Lawrence), because you really wanted to go on hammering away about the maverick, about the man who politicized the government, and so on and so forth.

Mr. Nixon: The Premier tamed him.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Now, Mr. Speaker, I just point to you, we encourage free thought and free thinking on the part of all our members, every man. I might say an errant suspicion ran through my mind yesterday, when I heard the clapping and desk pounding for the hon. member for York South, that there had been a slight rehearsal—because it came with such a lack of spontaneity that I felt that they all had a copy of his address in front of them and it was marked "bang here". Now I could be completely wrong, I could be—

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Well deserved.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: —completely wrong, this is just an impression I had. An impression that was left with me. I would be happy to be corrected, but it was the impression on this side.

Mr. MacDonald: We would be happy to correct you.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: So, Mr. Speaker, I would simply point out to you that there will be nothing unusual in the months and years that lie ahead to hear—

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): That is what you think.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: There will be nothing unusual because we have heard all this before. There is nothing new or unusual in this and we have learned to cope with it, too, Mr. Speaker. But, in any event, there will be nothing unusual in hearing all sorts of ideas and opinions put forth from this side of the House. The government welcomes them. We have a group of young and active men whose abilities we want to enlist in the service of the government, and of the people of the province.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): Let us have a vote on the private members' hour?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, the question of the election I might have let go by had it not been mentioned on the other side. We do, after every election, go through a statistical exercise and a great effort is made to prove that this government really does not represent the people of the province. So, I did a little—

Mr. MacDonald: Forty-two per cent is 42 per cent.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: —analysis myself, and out of that whole mass of opposition there, there are eight men who represent a majority of the people in their ridings, there are eight—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: The other 40 of you do not represent a majority in your ridings.

Mr. T. Reid (Scarborough East): Lower the voting age to 18 and see.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: So I draw no particular conclusions from this, Mr. Speaker, because it does not, in any way, detract from the responsibility of a member. It does not, in any way, detract from the fact that he won a seat and holds it here. I just put this forward to illustrate the futility of coming into this House and saying that this government does not represent the people because of any percentage of votes we may or may not receive. We represent all the people in this province.

Mr. MacDonald: Some of them are not so sure.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: The real fact of the matter is, the reason we are here and you are over there.

Mr. MacDonald: Here we are.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: The reason we are here, and you are over there is that, in fact, we represent a broader cross-section of the people in this province than either of the two Opposition parties.

Mr. MacDonald: What about two-thirds?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Your base of support is much too narrow to ever have sufficient support to form a government. You cannot have a party that is controlled by any one small segment our our society and hope to command the respect of a broad enough group of people in the province to elect sufficient members for the government. Now this is what democracy is all about. So do not worry that you do not represent a majority of the people in your riding.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I would say this, take the same attitude we do. Once elected, we represent all the people and we will work for all the people regardless of where their loyalties lie.

And in this regard, to get back to this question of the election, which I might not have mentioned had it not been raised by the other two leaders, I would simply say this: I felt that neither of these two hon. members did their province any service at all when they tramped up and down this province for weeks before October 17, spreading the seeds of deception, trying to set one section of the province against another.

When you are in eastern Ontario, it is downtrodden, when you are in the north it is downtrodden. This great effort to divide our people when it is not so.

I just point out to you that we, as a government, represent all the people of the province, our policies are designed to be effective and to deal with regional differences. We have a complete system of equalization within this province itself, such as the hon. member for York South tried to say yesterday we were against.

Not only are we not against it nationally, but we practice the same thing within the province itself, and I assure the people of this province wherever they may be, or wherever they may live, they will receive fair and equitable treatment from this government and we will do everything in our power to ensure that the rate of progress in the prov-

ince is even, and that our prosperity is shared by all.

I just have one further comment and then, perhaps, I will be finished with October 17. And that—

Mr. Sargent: Tell that to the farmers of Ontario.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Well, Mr. Speaker, I think we did pretty well in the rural areas of Ontario. I think the farmers of this province have confidence in my hon. friend from Middlesex North (Mr. Stewart). And I think they have confidence in the policies of this government and, as I say, you must get a broader base before you will ever form a government in this province.

There is one other question that I wanted to raise concerning October 17. And once again if this had not been raised, I never would have mentioned it. This concerns the great confrontation or debate which I was supposed to have avoided.

Frankly, Mr. Speaker, I did not have time. I was too busy laying before the people of this province an all-match mile for mile, meeting for meeting, riding for riding and television appearance for television appearance with either one of you.

But the thing that astonished me, Mr. Speaker, is that they could have dragged me into it; they cannot get an audience themselves so they wanted me to build it for them. But the thing that really interested me most was that here are these two men fighting it out for the position of official Opposition. And did they debate between themselves? Did you ever see the two of them on a television show during that campaign? Not a bit of it.

They did not stack their positions vis-à-vis one another to hold this position of official leader of the Opposition—it's a ploy that you probably missed. But in any event—oh, I could go on for hours. I kept waiting to see this great confrontation, Mr. Speaker, between these two people who were so eager to debate.

But I wondered why they did not get together, or buy some television time if they could not get it for nothing, and put on a big debate—this big debate they wanted. It never materialized. I have wondered why.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): They could not find a telephone booth.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Owen Sound does not like the member for Grey-Bruce.

Mr. Speaker, I would like now to take a look at what is labelled in these notes I have here as the Conservative quarter century. I want to take a look at some of the basic matters that concern our province. I propose later on in my remarks to speak about some of the constitutional matters which have seen a lot of activity since this House last met. And I feel that it is my duty and responsibility to present to the House, the events that have occurred since last May and to make some comments about them.

However, before doing that I want to go after some other matters and discuss a few matters here that are fairly basic to the whole operation of government in our province. On October 17 next, we, on this side of the House, will celebrate the 25th anniversary of the Progressive Conservative Party being in power in this province.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, but if the hon. member has a question I would be glad to hear it but I cannot hear him.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Certainly not October. You are not serious.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I am sorry—August 17.

Mr. Sopha: It is one of my functions to see that you are correct.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Thank you very much. Sometimes you do it better than other times. And that time was quite recently. I misread my own notes. But I am duly grateful the hon member for Sudbury—

Mr. Sargent: Will you repeat that?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I write my own speeches, Mr. Speaker. Now August 17 of this year, it will be the 25th anniversary of the Progressive Conservative Party giving continuous service as the government of the province of Ontario.

We, as a party, have carried the responsibility of government in this province for this 25 year period and I would say, in all honesty, that we do not shoulder it lightly. We are very honoured that the people of Ontario have seen fit to give us this responsibility, but nonetheless, we accept it in a spirit of humility and, perhaps, of dedication to the people. We are very proud of what has been accomplished in these 25 years.

Mr. Sargent: Quite a machine.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: As a matter of fact, when you look at the record you will find that since the turn of the century, the Conservative Party has been in power for 50 years out of a total of 68 years.

I do not think we would be immodest if we were to look around this province and think of the developments that have taken place here since 1900 and accept some small degree of credit for what has been done.

We had certain periods such as the 1940's, when we were hard put to overcome what had been done by the previous administration—I think of such things as the cancellation of hydro contracts, which came close to having a very serious effect upon the economic development of this province.

However, we managed to survive and the first task in those days of the 1940's was to get the province back on the rails, because we lost control for those few years and things were not going very well. As a matter of fact, at the end of that period, I am informed by those I speak to around here who were here in those days, there really was no government in the latter days of the Hepburn administration.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: The government had disappeared, and this province was being run pretty well by the civil servants. Now, I was not here in those days—I was engaged in some other activities—but, nonetheless, I have a deep interest in the history of our province and I have made it my business to question men who were here. It is an interesting story indeed.

However, when you look upon this period of time, 50 years in power out of 68 years, you wonder what is at the basis of it. Why? Because there must be a reason. A Conservative was defined by Disraeli as one who accepts what is good in the new, and retains what is good in the old.

Another definition of Conservatism is that it is reverence for the past, joined to a high hope for the future.

Mr. Speaker, at the present stage in our development and our history, it seems to me that if anybody even looks at history or anything old, this is to be discarded and thrown away and dealt with as if it were nothing. I can assure the hon. members of this House that this is not the feeling of the great majority of the people in this province, even though it is, perhaps, an attractive cult to be adopted by some people.

Certainly, we on this side of the House do not accept this position, and we do not think that our position here for all these years could have come about had we simply shown the disregard for almost anything that has tradition attached to it. That appears to be the popular approach to things today.

Mr. Sopha: Depends whose traditions they are.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: We accept, as Progressive Conservatives, that the views I am putting forth here, sir, are fundamental to our philosophy of continuous progress, based upon the solid foundation of past achievements. I am confident that the record of the various Progressive Conservative administrations in Ontario will demonstrate the wisdom of this approach to government.

Perhaps of even greater importance, and I think something we must look at very carefully today, is the credo of the Progressive Conservatives in Ontario that progress can only be attained in a society which respects human freedom. We must leave our people free to make decisions for themselves. We must leave them free to benefit fully, as fully as possible, from their own efforts. And I think, too, that the adherence of the people of this province to this party is, in no small degree, attributable to this credo which we hold.

I would say to the House that the growth of development and the prosperity which we enjoy today is directly related to the policy established and followed by successive Conservative governments. We have followed the policy that governments must play a positive role in the economy of the province. But we have ensured that the role of the Progressive Conservative government is one of guiding development and not directing it. That we have been right is evident wherever one travels about Ontario.

The life we enjoy in Ontario today reflects the happy marriage of these following elements:

The welcoming to Ontario of tens of thousands of people of all nationalities, each of whom has contributed energy, initiative, cultural achievements and personal involvement in the process of building a greater and richer community; in other words one of the keystones to the development of this province has been the fact that we have been fortunate enough to have continuing and recurring

waves of immigrants, who have come here from all parts of the world.

When one thinks about it, one should realize of course that those who leave their homelands and give them up and come to a new land must have some spark of adventure in their souls which stands them well, and stands this country well, when it is put to work here among the almost unlimited opportunity that we offer.

Secondly, we have had, as one of the bases of our government, a very vigorous educational programme, so that we are able to prepare our people to meet the challenges of today and tomorrow. Education has been a top priority of every Progressive Conservative government that has ever held office in this province, and I think the evidence of that priority exists all around us.

Thirdly, we have in this period of time, conducted a very dynamic programme to provide a vast network of modern highways and transport facilities which span Ontario and open our rich natural resources, and when I mention resources I include all the industrial growth in the south and the farmlands as well as the lands in the north country.

The fourth element which has been very fundamental to every Progressive Conservative government's accomplishments over this long period of time has been a pioneering programme of hydro-electric energy development, to power the industry which has developed in the congenial atmosphere of Ontario. It is a programme which is now well advanced into the development of nuclear power, and which in more recent years has been augmented by a system of pipelines to bring natural gas into the province in order that we have an unlimited supply of power at reasonable rates available for development of industry in the province.

These are the broad elements about which I am speaking. There are others, but these are the broad, basic areas in which we have concentrated.

There has been a very vigorous programme of trade, industry, and economic development as embodied in our trade crusade and general trade promotion programmes, such as the recent highly successful Ontario Unlimited Week in Los Angeles; overseas trade missions with Ontario businessmen; participation in trade fairs in the United States and overseas; and in the establishment of trade development offices in key commercial areas of the world—all of which has enabled us to provide good-paying jobs for the many millions of people we have welcomed here in this period of time. All of our activity in foreign countries we attempt to keep off the cocktail circuit, and in the business office circuit. All of our missions abroad are there to do business and they are certainly paying off.

Of course this pays off for those young people who are the natural increase in our population. In the postwar years I believe that we had the highest birth rate in the world. This of course poses great opportunities, and also poses great problems as these young people mature and take their places in the business community and must have productive and rewarding jobs to go to.

If we go back and deal with this question of immigration, I suppose fresh in everybody's memory is the programme of immigration launched in 1947 by George Drew when he airlifted 10,000 residents of Britain to Ontario in a period of one year. We opened our arms to them after the second world war and received from war-torn Europe many tens of thousands of people who settled into the life our our country and are making their contribution presently. Then came the Hungarian freedom fighters after their revolution in Hungary—as a matter of fact the hon. Minister from Bellwoods (Mr. Yaremko) went to Austria, sat in Vienna and welcomed on behalf of Ontario, refugees from across the border in Hungary. He made the necessary arrangements on behalf of this government to bring these people here to Ontario, and as a result we received some very fine people indeed.

But these are incidents in the long history of the welcome that Ontario has given to people from many areas. It was Mr. Frost's government that established The Department of Citizenship. It was the Progressive Conservative government that launched anti-discrimination legislation in Ontario which is now embodied in Ontario's human rights code, to ensure that these people who came here would be given every fair and equal chance to live and develop and become the good Canadians and the good Ontarians that they are.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Over the years, various priorities have been placed on the needs of the people of Ontario. It was Sir William Hearst who was the head of the Conservative government which launched the development of the highway system in Ontario. This was given great priority in later years by Leslie Frost who created the "main streets" of Ontario, including the Macdonald-Cartier freeway—Highway 401 it was in his day. I

might say in the days of the hon. member for Haldimand-Norfolk that the Queen Elizabeth Way was widened to its present status, and turned into a controlled access highway. I think that the Queen Elizabeth highway was in fact the first four-lane highway built in North America. I recall being in Pennsylvania, and being told down there—I think the hon. member for York South was with us in those days when we went to the Pennsylvania turnpike—that they had studied the QEW before they started construction of the Pennsylvania turnpike, which was the first big, modern turnpike built in the United States.

So, in any event, these are the things that have been done by the Progressive Conservative government over the years in the fields of transportation.

As I said before, education remains the top priority for the Conservative government. Under Conservative administrations the growth of our great universities has taken place. Just as a matter of interest, there have been five new universities, and two satellite colleges established since 1961. We have established new types of post-secondary education to meet the particular needs of our young people.

In the last 18 months we have seen the establishment of an entirely new level of education, the colleges of applied arts and technology. Nineteen of these colleges are now in operation, and of course the grand-daddy of them all, and from which they were all born was the Ryerson institute of technology, which was established by George Drew in 1948.

It was the Progressive Conservative government that brought in the foundation tax plan which has had such a widespread effect on our secondary school systems, and that was introduced in 1964. It was the Progressive Conservative government which introduced programmes to protect the rights of the people of Ontario.

The Conservative government of Sir James Whitney created the workmen's compensation board, and I might say that it was the same government that created the Hydro-Electric Power Commission in Ontario.

It was another Conservative government that first created a separate Department of Health, and it was a Progressive Conservative government that first created the Ontario hospital care insurance plan and the Ontario medical services insurance plan, both of these unqualified successes, and both of them designed to meet the needs of this province. It was a Conservative government which brought in legislation to establish the first old age pension in Ontario; we developed the homes for the aged; we developed the legislation presently on the books to protect children; it was a Conservative government which established the 48-hour week, vacations with pay, minimum wage legislation, fair employment practices legislation, an age discrimination Act, the Ontario labour relations board and other model labour legislation. These are some of the things that have been done by Progressive Conservative administrations.

If you go back in history far enough you will find that it was a Conservative government that extended the provincial franchise to all women over age 21. We created the consumer protection bureau; we established the legal aid plan, which of course is something quite unique; we developed the system of provincial parks, which people take for granted now. We developed the Niagara and the St. Lawrence parks systems; we developed conservation authorities and—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sopha: Most of those things were done by Mackenzie King.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Oh come, come now! Mr. Speaker, that is the last gasp of the die-hard Grit when he has to go to Ottawa to justify programmes in the province of Ontario. My gracious! That is terrible!

Mr. Speaker, in the field of agriculture—the hon. member for Grey-Bruce was talking about farmers—it was this government that established the first marketing legislation in this province to permit the producers to protect the prices at which their products would be sold. We have put forward various programmes in national financial assistance and farm consolidation; we are the ones who set up the conferences to deal with the present plight of the farmer in which we seek a rational answer to his problems—this is a Conservative government that has done these things. This is what I tell you. Now then—

Mr. Sopha: Tell us about the 22 points.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, I cannot answer interjections if I cannot hear them. I would only suggest to the hon. member for Sudbury that he either speak up or do not speak at all.

An hon. member: Go back to your family!

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, they like it here.

Now, sir, we have always been interested in development. It was a concern of government that established what is now the Ontario Northland Railway. It began as the Timiskaming and Northern Ontario Railway; it was this government that developed and instituted The Department of Lands and Forests. It was a Conservative government that established the first Department of Planning and Development and it was this government that established the Ontario development corporation, and the Sheridan Park research community.

These are just a few of the things we have done.

It was a Progressive Conservative government that pressed and insisted upon joining in the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway, the ultimate effect on the economy of this province we have yet to judge.

Mr. Sargent: And imposed a sales tax, too.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Yes, we imposed the sales tax, Mr. Speaker. There is no doubt about that, and a good tax it has been.

Mr. MacDonald: On the recommendation of the Liberal leader.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, I do not recall that particular recommendation. I have a little book here I will get to in a few minutes. It contains recommendations that were made by the Opposition over a period of one year. The words "pork barrel" were mentioned here so I have been keeping a little record for some time on suggestions that have been made and how much they would cost. It is all within that little black book. We will get to it in due course. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Nixon: It must keep your staff very busy.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: It is not difficult. I just sit in here day after day and write down these irresponsible suggestions as they come forth. I must say that where the research was really required, Mr. Speaker, was to cost them. I never heard a programme advanced from the other side where there was any—occasionally I have to be fair to my friends here—they costed them with false figures. I do not mean they deliberately falsify the figures to be strictly honest about it, but do not think the figures are in any way accurate.

However, Mr. Speaker, we must go on with some of the other things that have been firsts in this period of time. Under Leslie Frost, of course, the metropolitan form of government was established in the Toronto area—one of the very large moves, I would say, that have been made in this century in the area of municipal governments.

We have carried that forward. We are proceeding, as was mentioned in the Speech from the Throne, to establish a form of metro government in the Ottawa-Carleton area.

I was rather interested in the way we are being berated by the Opposition because of what is in the Smith report. I would like to take this opportunity to point out, Mr. Speaker, that it was this government that appointed the Smith commission; we appointed it because we wanted a study done and some guidelines upon which we could reform the tax system of this province. We wanted some assistance from their opinions of what might be done in this whole and very complex problem of regional government and I will speak about this a little later on in my remarks.

It is rather interesting to see that it is being used to berate us when in fact it is our baby. We appointed the committee; we required its findings; and we propose to use them. We do not propose to berate anybody with them, we propose to use them as a basis of rationalization of a tax system in the province and to bring our taxing practices into conformity with the facts of the 1960s and the 1970s.

Now, sir, I can just point out to you that we led all Canada in the establishment of securities legislation. It has since been copied in other provinces.

Mr. Sargent: You had to do it.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: We have the most modern securities legislation in Canada. We were the first jurisdiction in Canada to bring forward deposit insurance. The whole programme is very successful.

I know that this is another wonderful target and I do not propose to say very much about it because I have a very able Minister who is quite able to lay before this House, as he will in due course, what this programme is doing and what we have done. Even the papers to which we cannot really turn for any great support in this province, have had to admit—some grudgingly, others a litlte more gracefully—that Ontario leads all Canada in the provision of housing.

There are many other things I could mention which I think are of very deep importance. The law reform commission; would

you not like to know about that? The hon. member for Sudbury can leave the House if he does not want to listen. I very often leave when he is talking and it would not bother me if he left when I was speaking.

Mr. Nixon: He was just trying to help the Premier.

Mr. Sopha: I speak more kindly of the Premier.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Well, Mr. Speaker, I did not think there was really anything unkind in what I had said. I know my hon. friend. I would not say he is terribly sensitive. If I thought he was, of course, I never would have said anything to offend him.

Now, sir, we hope very shortly to be able to table at least the first instalment of a very broad and detailed consideration and examination of the whole matter of civil rights in this province, which is another matter that we have taken to our hearts.

I mention these things only to point out to all members of this House that there are some very sound and solid reasons why the Progressive Conservative Party have formed the government of this province for 50 out of the last 68 years. Barring any great upset it appears that we have another three or four years ahead of us.

I think that we will continue to enjoy the support of the people of the province, if we adhere to some of the basic principles that have served us so well in the past. We must create economic and social opportunities for the people of Ontario, so that they will maintain their independence of action with but minimal guidance from the government.

This province has been built, and the present position it occupies has been reached, by people who worked hard and wanted rewards for what they did. They wanted the state to do the things that they could not do for themselves, but they wanted to be left alone. If my judgment of the current thinking of our people is correct, they want the right to spend their own income and they are getting a little tired of having governments spend it for them.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I quite agree with you that there are vast areas where we must develop programmes to help those who cannot help themselves, and these responsibilities we have always assumed and we always will. But this is what the great debate presently regarding universality is all about. In all forms of welfare and assistance programmes, are we to offer assistance to the millionaire in the same amount and on the same basis as we offer it to someone who through misfortune has no money at all?

These are some of the places where we will part company with our friends over here.

Mr. Gisborn: Whoever suggested that?

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Universal medicare.

Now sir, I have said on many occasions that every time the state is asked to do something for you as an individual, you lose a little bit of your freedom which never really is regained. I think that as we go ahead developing programmes to ensure opportunity for people and to ensure that those who need help receive it, we must always remember that the individual and his position in our total society must come first. We must not put him in a position where his personal liberties are being chipped away, little by little, which over a period of time amounts to a great deal.

I would only say this, that the policies which led to these achievements which I have mentioned today were based on some of the principles I have mentioned. We have every intention of following these same principles as we develop the programmes that lie ahead of us.

I would like to turn for a moment to a matter which perhaps is of not immediate and day-to-day concern in this province, but one that is of some interest to, I think, a good many members in the House. There are many members here who have a deep interest in the history of our province. I think really to be able to—

Mr. Sargent: Not too much. Just talk about today.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: The member will have his opportunity when he can talk about today in due course, Mr. Speaker.

I just would say to the members that if one is to appreciate some of the problems we have today and the decisions with which we are struggling, some knowledge of our history stands one in good stead in coming to conclusions.

Joseph Howe, over a century ago, said a wise nation preserves its records, repairs its great public structures and fosters national pride and love of country by perpetual reference to the sacrifices and the glories of the

past. I think that we here, in this House in our own way and in our own time and with our own abilities, as we bring them forth, are perhaps making history, but I think also at the same time we should be aware of what has gone ahead of us, and that is why we established the Ontario heritage foundation last year. It will be discussed no doubt in more detail in the estimates of the Minister who is responsible for it.

But there are some very positive things that we have done in order to ensure that our history is alive and living and that we honour the men who made the decisions from which we benefit today. Perhaps the members who were here in 1964 will recall we inaugurated a programme to honour Sir John A. Macdonald. 1965 was the 150th anniversary of his birth.

There were certain things we did. We erected a bronze plaque to his memory in Glasgow. We presented an extensive collection of Canadiana bearing his name to the University of Glasgow. We made a special grant to Professor A. R. M. Lower who delivered the Sir John A. Macdonald lectures at three leading Scottish universities during 1967, and we established the Sir John A. Macdonald graduate fellowship in history, which has been awarded to an outstanding student in Canadian history for two years of graduate study.

You might be interested to know that there have been three fellowships awarded under this plan: to Miss Patricia Reid of Toronto, Miss Gail Cuthbert of Ingersoll, both of whom are studying at the University of Toronto, and Mr. Elwood Jones of Saskatoon, who is studying at the University of Western Ontario.

And in 1965 as well, we presented 500 two-volume sets of the life of Sir John A. Macdonald to honour history students in our secondary schools. And then of course it was at that time that we named Highway 401 the Macdonald-Cartier freeway, in order to recognize not only Sir John A. Macdonald, but Sir George Etienne Cartier, the 150th anniversary of whose birth occurred in 1964.

In 1968 will occur the 150th anniversary of the birth of another of the great fathers of our country, George Brown. There has always been a little problem about dealing with Sir John A. Macdonald, because he was a Tory and there is always the suspicion that a Tory government would perhaps have some particular leaning towards him. This is not so. George Brown was a great Canadian, he was a Liberal, he fought his battles in this Legislature and made one of the very great and very significant contributions—

Mr. Sopha: Why does the government not buy his house?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I will come to that. This is why we established the heritage foundation and that matter is presently being looked into. This is the type of thing, Mr. Speaker, that we are interested in doing.

It was Brown who really broke the political deadlock that made it possible for Upper Canada to even take part in Confederation debates. The fight between himself and Macdonald was not only political, but I believe it could probably be termed a little personal. And Brown overcame his feelings in this regard in the light of his probably deeper feelings for his country and made it possible for this province to participate in the events leading up to Confederation. And we are making special plans now to observe the 150th anniversary of the birth of Mr. Brown which will occur on November 29 of this year.

The first step in recognition of this man has already taken place in the naming of the George Brown college of applied arts and technology here in Toronto. It is most appropriate that this be named after him here in this city. He was, of course, the founder and publisher of the *Globe* and I suppose that was when the *Globe* was at its most Liberalish and—

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): Not very good these days, is it?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: It does not exist anymore. It is only a part. It got married with the *Mail and Empire.*

Mr. Trotter: A bad marriage.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Imagine that word, "empire", it sounds rather archaic but now it is the *Globe and Mail.* In any event we will establish too, a George Brown fellowship in journalism and the Minister of University Affairs (Mr. Davis) will be making a more detailed statement about these events in due course.

We are making arrangements between the University of Edinburgh and the University of Toronto for a George Brown exchange professor some time during this year. We propose to present some George Brown Canadiana to the University of Edinburgh during the year—

Mr. Sopha: Good for you!

Hon. Mr. Robarts: —and we will also present 500 sets of the life of George Brown. This was done by Professor J. M. S. Careless, and will be presented to 500 top history students in our secondary schools. These things are being done, Mr. Speaker, in order that we may recognize the great men who have done so much for our country.

It is of some regret to us that no really significant action was taken to honour the 150th anniversary of the birth of Macdonald on any national basis. There was a gathering in the city of Kingston which I was privileged to attend, but the whole matter was pretty much overlooked, I would say on a national basis, which we feel is a shame. If there were to be some national celebrations this year in honour of George Brown, we would be more than happy to join in—

Mr. Grossman: It is too partisan up there.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: —because we feel that these things are very important. Now there is one other slight point I might make.

Nineteen sixty-eight has been designated by the United Nations, and by member governments, as international year for human rights and, of course, we propose to take our full part in these activities. It is interesting to know that Mr. Brown and Sir Oliver Mowat, last of the great Liberals, not necessarily perhaps, but in any event—

Mr. Nixon: The Premier does not have to back down.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Well, when people say we have been here too long, as they are wont to say, particularly on the hustings, I always recall that Sir Oliver Mowat, as a Liberal, was leader of the government in Ontario for 26 years.

Mr. T. Reid: We will give the Premier 26 years, starting in 1943.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: You will not give us anything. We are going to take it, at least 28.

However, Mr. Brown and Sir Oliver Mowat were very active in the anti-slavery movement of over a century ago and the St. Lawrence hall, recently renovated as the city of Toronto's centennial project, is the spot where Mr. Brown delivered some of his most famous speeches in regard to that question of slavery.

Then if we move on to Sir Oliver Mowat, who really was a great statesman, I find his life very fascinating indeed. He was a student in Sir John A. Macdonald's law office, then subsequently became leader of the government here when Sir John was Premier of Canada, as he called himself then. A lot of Sir Oliver Mowat's success in holding power in this province for that great length of time, was because he was his own Attorney General, and he was fighting before the Privy Council in England, of course, against his old boss, Sir John A. Macdonald. It was Sir Oliver Mowat who is probably as responsible as any single man for the development of that long line of cases which established provincial rights as against the rights of the federal government which, perhaps, were intended by the fathers of Confederation, but really never came about.

The 150th anniversary of Sir Oliver Mowat's birth is going to occur two years hence, and I think that we will honour his memory in some way as well. This is a couple of years hence and I do not know just exactly what form it will take, but certainly I can advise the members here that it will be done and we do propose to arrange to have some distinguished Canadian historian prepare a new biography of Sir Oliver Mowat.

As a matter of fact, my old friend Robert Macaulay, who sat in this House with me at one stage, had some of the groundwork laid to write a biography of Mowat. I do not know what happened to it. Maybe it got lost in the shuffle of other events.

In any event, we hope, by his sesqui-centennial, to have an authoritative modern biography of this great Canadian prepared, and, of course, will be naming one of the buildings in the new complex over here, the Mowat building.

In 1972, we will have another 150th anniversary. That is the birth of Alexander Mackenzie, who was Canada's second Prime Minister and, I believe, came from Sarnia. He was Provincial Treasurer in this House at one time. I came across one of his budget statements sitting on the top of an ash can ready to be thrown away, and I now have that document in my desk. It is quite an interesting document. However, in some way we will mark the observance of his birthday as well.

So sir, these activities I mentioned to you —as I say, they are not of immediate and pressing significance in the day to day life of the province, and yet, in the long range, they may be very significant indeed.

I think they are indicative of what we hope to achieve with the Ontario heritage foundation, which was established by the previous Legislature in the last session. That organization now has a functioning board of directors and one of the things that is receiving its

attention is George Brown's house on Beverley Street, not so very far from these buildings in which we stand. In that building, George Brown's children were all born; he died there, so I am informed, in May of 1880. I wondered about that. I thought he spent the latter years of his life back in the United Kingdom but I could be wrong.

Mr. Sopha: You are. He died in Toronto of an assassin's bullet.

Mr. Trotter: George Brown was murdered right here in Toronto.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Well, you see, Mr. Speaker, these are some of the matters that will preoccupy us and on which I might detect some reasonable degree of co-operation and collaboration across the House.

Mr. Sopha: May I ask, sir, is there any report about the Sir John Graves Simcoe association?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, do you mean the—

Mr. Sopha: The one we set up a few years ago.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Oh, yes.

Mr. Sopha: Have they been to England recently?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I have been to England but not there.

Mr. Sopha: Not even to see if his grave is all right?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I am sure the hon. Minister of Tourism and Information (Mr. Auld) will, in due course, report to the House. They have been successful in establishing a trust fund, and they have been successful in raising money outside the government circles to support Wolford chapel, and things are going just about exactly as planned, Mr. Speaker. We will give you a report in due course.

I would like to turn for a few moments to the question of the Confederation debate. This has been touched upon in this debate to date and there was a commitment made in the Speech from the Throne that I would give a full report of the activities of the government. This report will start fom the time the last Legislature met and will deal with matters related to the future constitutional development of Canada. The Speech from the Throne at the last session, Mr. Speaker, set out the intention of the government of Ontario to call a Confederation of tomorrow conference, at which the leaders of Canadian governments would meet to discuss some of the basic problems of Confederation.

When this announcement was first made, it was not received with whole-hearted enthusiasm by my friends opposite. However, by the time we came to debate it, I am happy to say that there was only one vote against it in the House, which is probably about as unanimous as we could ever expect to get here. In the debate that took place in that resolution, we placed a resolution on the order paper that we intended to call this conference.

That resolution was called for debate and was debated very thoroughly here over a period of time. During that debate, I outlined the reasons why we as a government took the initiative in this matter.

In any progressive society, change is a factor with which we must cope. In a federal state, change creates additional strains on an already complex governmental structure. Developments of the last two decades, not only those which have occurred in the province of Quebec, have raised the healthy and sensible opportunity of considering the possibility of significant changes in many of our public practices and institutions. Today, it is no longer wise to shun a painstaking, fundamental, re-examination of our political system.

Let me offer some concrete reasons for this general view. In the last 20 years we have seen a tremendous growth in governmental functions, governmental responsibilities and a rapidly increasing demand for government services at all levels. Some of these services have fallen under the legislative jurisdiction of the federal government; some have come under the jurisdiction of the provincial governments; and some have fallen in between.

Some do not really fall clearly in one jurisdiction or the other. The most important means by which we have attempted to solve these problems of Canadian federalism has been the institution of the federal-provincial conference.

As I have said on many occasions, these federal-provincial conferences have been characterized basically by a need to resolve important and pressing problems of a very specific nature. In other words, for the most part, federal-provincial conferences have been set up to deal with very specific problems. I might say also that the whole form of the federal-provincial conference has grown without any conscious direction.

We have seen some rather broad changes in the method of operation in the last few

months. We have certain studies being conducted at the present time into the whole matter of federal-provincial conferences and what their effect is upon the whole governmental process in the country. They have grown up because, I think, of need—and yet, I do not think that their development has been what I would call a conscious rational development.

It has been a development more to meet the exigencies of certain situations, than a development which has been conducted according to any preconceived plan with any fixed objective. The last few months have been notable for the number of federal-provincial and interprovincial conferences. In addition to almost daily consultation by various Ministers and officials, federal and provincial leaders met in Ottawa on constitutional questions in early February about two weeks ago, discussing pressing problems related to housing during December; and met in Ottawa in July on the occasion of the visit of Her Majesty the Queen. During December, there were very significant discussions held by the Ministers of Finance and Provincial Treasurers, related to the work of the tax structure committee. This meeting really constituted an important beginning of budgetary consultation between the federal government and the provinces—I might say something that we have been advocating for some years.

The leaders of the provincial government met in Toronto in November for the Confederation of tomorrow conference. We also met at our eighth annual Premiers' conference in Fredericton in August, and these conferences have developed into a very useful and a very important link among the provinces. They have produced a number of meaningful results in such areas as interprovincial administrative co-ordination, portability of pensions was developed at these conferences; steps toward uniformity in educational matters, uniformity in securities legislation, uniformity in legislation affecting financial institutions.

You see really here we are operating in a field where each province is developing its own particular method of dealing with these problems where it might very well be argued that we would be better off if we had a national organization which extended right across the country. However, because of certain limitations constitutionally these things cannot be done. These are the matters that we deal with when we meet together as provincial leaders.

Perhaps the most significant development arising from these interprovincial conferences has been the accelerated development of close relationships among all the provinces at both the governmental and civil service levels. These relationships cannot help but assist us on the long evolutionary task of bringing all our governments closer together as we seek to develop policies and programmes geared to one Canada, at the same time giving free rein to regional needs and regional thinking.

The changes to which I have referred are generally characteristic of any federal system. These are the problems which revolve around the establishment of an acceptable equilibrium between the central—in this case the federal government—and regional—in this case, provincial governments. Our problem really is to devise an acceptable equilibrium between these governments.

However, in our federal system in Canada we have a further dimension. Not only are we confronted with wide regional differences —differences which in themselves were, and remain, great enough to justify the creation of a federal state, but we must also recognize and make allowance for the existence in our country of two major language groups, one of which is concentrated mainly in the province of Quebec.

Since the end of the second world war, Quebec has been subject to all the influences and changes which have affected the rest of the country. However, the result of these influences has perhaps been more deeply felt by that province than elsewhere in Canada.

Quebec has undergone an evolution from an agricultural parish-oriented society to an urban industrialized society. Yet it is only recently that the full implications of this evolution have been accepted by the majority of the residents of Quebec. As a result of this change in attitude many Quebec people have come to view the role of the state in a far different light than they had previously.

Traditionally they had assigned only a minimum role to the state in its relationship to the life of the citizen. However, the modern view requires that the state provide a wider variety of public services. In short, what was demanded of the state was that it adjust from playing a passive role to playing an active role. The assumption of this active role by the government of Quebec in part, at least, has accounted for what we have come to call the "quiet revolution".

This change of attitude among French Canadians in Quebec has carried with it serious implications for the operation of our

federal system. As they developed a new view of the role of the state, they turned to rely increasingly on their provincial government, because it was the only government in Canada in which French Canadians were in the majority. Thus over the past few years, the Quebec government has been charged with finding solutions which meet more directly the variety of problems faced by its province and its people.

The development by Quebec of policies uniquely tailored to its needs has resulted in stresses and strains between Ottawa and Quebec City which have been clear for all of us to see.

Despite these strains, Mr. Speaker, I would say that this reawakening of the province of Quebec holds out to all Canadians the promising opportunity to shatter at last what some have described as the "two solitudes" which have for far too long existed in our country. It also promises the creation of a deep and meaningful relationship between the two language groups. This is the goal of the government of this province. This was our aim in convening the Confederation of tomorrow conference.

It was not by choice, it was by necessity, that Ontario decided to undertake the responsibility of initiating the process by which we could calmly and sensibly take stock of the problems that were besetting Canada.

We believed at that time, as we do now that such initiative involving the future of our country and originating from Ontario was more likely to produce a constructive response from Quebec rather than a similar initiative from the federal government. That this should have been the situation was perhaps unfortunate, but it was nevertheless a fact.

We believe that our decision to call the Confederation of tomorrow conference made it possible for the federal government, if it chose to, to reassume its primary role in these matters, and I think that events have proved us to be correct.

There are a number of reasons which we outlined in this House last February—for Ontario's responsibility in matters affecting the future of Canada, and I think that these remain valid today, and perhaps they bear repetition.

> First of all, we are Quebec's neighbour. The two provinces touch along a boundary of 500 miles, from the point where Quebec lies south of Ontario across the St. Lawrence River at Cornwall to the shores of James Bay. Ontario and Quebec share part of the same geographic and economic region. The problems of our north are similar throughout the precambrian shield area. In the south the St. Lawrence lowlands from Windsor to beyond Montreal is the heart of Canada's manufacturing, industrial and financial activities.

That is a quote from what was said about a year ago.

I would go on to say that economic development does not very often recognize political boundaries. In many cases this is as it should be, and particularly this is so, when we consider that the economic development of the St. Lawrence and the Great Lakes area extends from deep in Quebec, through all of southern Ontario, to Detroit and on to Chicago; on both north and the south shores of the lakes; and goes north through Lake Huron, the canals of Sault Ste. Marie and through Lake Superior to the riches of the north.

If for no other reason—and there are many others—than our ultimate economic interdependence, we carry an enormous responsibility here in Ontario to ensure that this huge and potentially wealthy area fill its full role in the life of all of Canada.

> Second, Ontario and Quebec are the largest provinces in population, and as such share many similar administrative problems, both internally and in the area of federal and provincial relations. Ontario and Quebec are the only provinces large enough to support an administrative organization in several important fields of public administration which other provinces prefer to regard as federal responsibilities.
>
> In fact, if we disregard for the moment those problems related directly to culture and language, Ontario and Quebec may have similar attitudes together which might differ from several of the other provinces.
>
> Third, Ontario has the largest number of French-Canadians outside the province of Quebec. In 1961, over 10 per cent of Ontario's population was of French ethnic origin, some 650,000 people. This is a much larger group than from any other ethnic group, except the British Isles, and has been added to substantially since 1961.
>
> The counties and districts of eastern and northern Ontario are more than one fifth French-Canadian, and in four Ontario counties and districts French-Canadians form a majority of the population.
>
> Fourth, I believe that the people of Ontario, private organizations in the province, the newspapers and other forms of communication in this province—I think that this has been demonstrated—have shown a greater understanding and sympathy with the attitudes and actions associated with the so-called revolution in Quebec.

A large part of the success of the conferences in Toronto and Ottawa resulted from the fact that all provinces gained a greater awareness and appreciation of the problems that we must all face. My fellow Prime Minister and Premiers deserve credit for their vision of, their concern for and their devotion to the future of Canada. It is only if we work together that we shall be able to ensure that future.

While Ontario accepted the responsibility to initiate this conference and meeting, we

could not, of course, guarantee a successful conclusion, and I am proud that the members of that final session of the 27th Legislature last year so overwhelmingly concurred in the resolution of the government to convene the Confederation of tomorrow conference.

That was the situation when the Legislature prorogued last June. During the summer, as Canadians delighted in the success of Expo 67, and the thousand and one centennial celebrations which developed across the province, discussion continued to take place—

Mr. Sargent: Still waving the flag.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: —both officially and among the people of Canada.

I participated in one of these discussions on August 9, which was a meeting of the policy advisory committee of the Progressive Conservative centennial convention at Maison Montmorency in Quebec.

Mr. G. Bukator (Niagara Falls): Was Judy LaMarsh the guest speaker?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: No! If she had had anything constructive to say she probably would have been welcome.

I would like to repeat to the House part of what I said on that occasion. It represents—

Mr. Sargent: We have heard it before.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Well, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member was not there. I know that he asks questions. If he is not interested and he really does not want to listen to what we have to say, it is his right to leave.

But these are matters that set out the position of the province of Ontario, and I consider it to be my responsibility to come into this House to put the position that we have taken when the House was not in session so that members know what we are thinking, saying, and doing.

On that occasion I made these comments:

> Our concern in Ontario is to ensure the existence of Canada as a viable nation. We believe that Canada is the national home and the single voice of every Canadian citizen. Within this concept of a single nation there is room for richness and diversity in culture, language, and ethnic backgrounds, which is nowhere more evident than in Ontario.
>
> Fundamental to this conviction is the dedication of Ontario to the maintenance of the sovereignty of the federal government as the binding force that makes Canada a nation.
>
> Ontario in its relations with Ottawa and the other provinces has maintained a continuing basic approach related primarily to economic and financial matters. Our position can be summarized as follows:
>
> 1. We in Ontario consider ourselves to be Canadians, nothing more and nothing less. We take deep pride in this nationality.
>
> 2. We recognize and support the responsibility and the necessity of the federal government to exercise control over the national economy, using fiscal and monetary policies as tools for national stability and growth and development. There is a concomitant responsibility to carry out national programmes and policies within those fields granted to it by The British North American Act.
>
> 3. In our system, each province has the responsibility to provide those services to its residents which are under its jurisdiction within the terms of The British North America Act. These services, designated in their wisdom by the fathers of Confederation, are those most closely associated with, and those which provide the basis for, economic and social growth and development.
>
> 4. To carry out these responsibilities the provinces must have financial resources commensurate with these responsibilities.
>
> 5. We believe that our compatriots of French origin must be guaranteed certain basic rights and privileges. We recognize, and are in sympathy with, the French in Canada in their desire to preserve their language, customs and culture as an integral part of Canadian life.
>
> 6. We recognize and accept that a strong Ontario has a vital and important part to play in the moulding of a strong and united Canada. We recognize also that the goals, and objectives of other Canadians in other provinces may differ from ours, and may require a high degree of compromise and understanding on our part.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think that we have deviated from these goals in the intervening months since this position was put forward, and I do not think that we have deviated from them in the events that have taken place during those months.

As the events unfolded during the late summer and early autumn, the debate about Canada's future continued. Such disquieting occurrences as the intervention of the Presi-

dent of France in the internal affairs of Canada; the publicity surrounding the decision of Rene Levesque to opt for separatism; the separatist character of the Estates General of French Canada served only to reinforce the need for the Confederation of tomorrow conference.

This was the atmosphere in which official delegations of all provinces gathered in Toronto on November 27 for the Confederation of tomorrow conference. I believe that all members, and all the people of Ontario, shared the sense of importance of the occasion and were pleased by the success of the conference.

In many ways, it was a unique gathering. It was the first intergovernmental conference completely open to the public through the communications media, so that by means of television, radio and the press, all Canadians became aware of, and involved in, the issues that were being discussed.

It was the first such conference to explore those problems and difficulties which had been worrying Canadians in recent years. It was a conference which had, as its sole objective, the exposure of all Canadians to the issues which had never really been clearly defined but, nevertheless, had been debated and alluded to in many conferences and speeches over some long period of time.

This conference taught us a great deal about the similarities, and the difficulties of Canadians. Specifically, the conference defined three major problems, all of which are interdependent and all of which we must be prepared to solve if Canada's survival is to be assured.

These three problems are: the linguistic rights of English- and French-speaking Canadians; the constitutional arrangements which should govern our federal system, particularly in regard to division of responsibilities, powers to discharge these responsibilities and financial ability to back up the constitutional power and responsibility; and the economic inequalities which exist within and among the regions of the country.

As a result of our discussions, it was decided to establish a continuing committee on Confederation and this came out of the Confederation of tomorrow conference. This continuing committee on Confederation was composed of the leaders of the governments of Alberta, Nova Scotia, Ontario and Quebec. This committee was charged by the whole conference with the continuing examination of the three major areas of concern which I have just mentioned.

In January, officials from these four provinces met in Toronto to make recommendations on the most efficient ways to carry out the necessary research and investigations. While agreement was reached at the recent Ottawa meeting to establish a continuing constitutional conference, it has been decided that the interprovincial committee should continue its own work. The interprovincial committee is investigating a variety of problems which are mainly provincial in nature and which are best discussed in an interprovincial forum.

The federal-provincial conference of Prime Ministers and Premiers, which was held in Ottawa between February 5 and 7, was the second step in our re-examination of the Canadian federal structure. This was a highly successful meeting which, I believe, profited greatly from the earlier discussions which had taken place in Toronto at the Confederation of tomorrow conference.

At the constitutional conference, I think we were all gratified by the general willingness to reach a consensus on the language rights of Canada's two primary linguistic groups. I believe that it is worthwhile to repeat here the formula on which the conference agreed. This was the official position the conference took:

1. Recognition by this conference that, as proposed by the Royal commission on bilingualism and biculturalism and as a matter of equity, French-speaking Canadians outside of Quebec should have the same rights as English-speaking Canadians in Quebec.

2. Recognition, as the Royal commission on bilingualism and biculturalism has recommended, of the desirability of proceeding by government action as speedily as possible, in ways most appropriate in each province and without diminishing existing rights, recognized by law or usage.

3. Establishment of a special committee to examine the report of the Royal commission on bilingualism and biculturalism and the views expressed at this conference on the report, and on other matters relating to language rights and their effective provision in practice, and to consult on methods of implementation, including the nature of possible federal assistance, and on the form and the method of constitutional amendment.

As I have mentioned, Mr. Speaker, it was also agreed that there should be established

a continuing conference of Prime Ministers and Premiers, or their designated representatives, and of federal and provincial officials.

This committee will create the machinery to examine the following topics, and really when you absorb this list, you will have some idea of the true magnitude of the paths that lie ahead of us:

1. The official languages of the country.
2. The fundamental rights of Canadians.
3. The distribution of powers.
4. The reform of federal institutions, for example, the Supreme Court of Canada and the Senate.
5. Regional economic disparities.
6. The constitutional amending procedure.
7. Federal-provincial relations.

Mr. Speaker, that covers a very wide range of activities indeed. This is the stage that we have reached presently in our deliberations. This is where we were as of February 7, 1968.

The next several months, and indeed years, will require that we all do a great deal of study in considering these issues. Thanks to the work of the Ontario advisory committee on Confederation, whose background papers and reports were tabled in this House last spring—

Mr. Sopha: Do you have another one? Do you have one now?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: There is one in preparation.

Mr. Sopha: Well, one has been received, has it not? From Professor John Conway?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, there may be a specific report that has been received. I thought the hon. member was referring to another publication of the work done by the committee.

Mr. Sopha: I regret to see that you have bound the last ones in an elaborate volume, which I am glad to say I did not receive.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: If the hon. member would like a copy, I would be glad to send him one.

Mr. Sopha: No, I do not want one. I do not think it has much worth, and I do not want to grace my library shelf with it.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Then do not refer to it at all.

Mr. Sopha: I refer to the three by Forsey.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, I really cannot understand if the member agrees or disagrees with Mr. Forsey. Perhaps it does not matter.

Mr. Sopha: I have said here—I have given my opinion.

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Minister of Municipal Affairs): There are many others in the House.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: In any event, Mr. Speaker, thanks to the work of the Ontario advisory committee on Confederation, which I, for one, have found very helpful—and I do not read these things, I might say, as necessarily being the end-all and be-all of the opinion expressed in them—but I find them very stimulating, and I find that they give me background which they are designed to do.

They are described as background papers and reports, and they are designed to provide information to those people who are interested in these problems and want to keep themselves informed.

I have made this very clear on several occasions, because we do not publish them as being statements of government position. The advisory committee is exactly that; it is an advisory committee on Confederation. It is not designed to establish government policy. It is designed to establish the background information one can use in order to then establish policy.

I might say that the government has already benefited from a good number of research studies done by that committee. The work of the committee is continuing in the light of the many developments which have taken place since these earlier studies were prepared. I am happy to advise also that we have developed, in the federal-provincial affairs secretariat, which is a section of the civil service, a body which is fully competent to organize all the studies that are being done over the very wide areas encompassed by the activities of the continuing committee of Prime Ministers and Premiers.

I can assure the members that there is going to have to be a great deal more work done before we will be able to arrive at conclusions in these various areas that I have outlined.

Our work here has been underway for some years. It will continue in order that we may discharge our responsibilities, both to the people of this province and to all of Canada in the momentous days of decisions which lie ahead of us.

In summary, and as I reflect on the events of the past few months, I believe we have reached a significant new plateau in our deliberations. The focus of the discussion is sharpened on three issues in particular: language rights, constitutional review, and regional economic inequalities.

With respect to language rights, there is no question that the two conferences in November and in February helped tremendously to further the growing practical recognition of Canada's two linguistic communities and helped to advance all our attitudes across Canada on this question. It would be unwise and premature to suggest that there now exists a national consensus on this matter. We face immensely complex problems of implementing our proposals but I believe we all recognize the central importance of seeking just and workable solutions to the language problem; that in itself is a major achievement.

The issue of Constitutional review is equally if not more, delicate and complex than the language problem. Witness the wide divergence of opinion that characterized the conference in Ottawa in February and the continuing discussion with many differing points of view that is expressed in the daily press of the country, and which can be heard in the conversations of our people generally as they talk about these matters. Again it would be unwise and premature to suggest that there is a national consensus here, but I believe the great step taken in Ottawa on February 7 was the agreement that we recognize the need for change and are prepared to not only consider but proceed to a close, and major scrutiny of The British North America Act, of the institutions mentioned in that Act and of our general governmental practices in this country.

I think that providing we approach this task with care and determination, nothing but good can come of it. Indeed the process strikes me as being a normal and invigorating exercise for a country which has now had over a century of experience with its present constitution. We shall not throw out the baby with the bath water, but if I were to venture a prediction I would suggest that eventually we will have a new, written constitutional document made by the Canadians and made for all Canadians.

Mr. MacDonald: That is a little different approach—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I am going to deal with it. This development will be a long one, but I think that we can look forward to its successful conclusion within the next decade.

Mr. Speaker, anybody who speculates as to what is going to happen in the ten-year period could be awfully wrong either way, because ten years is a long time—and a great deal can happen, so that I do not want to be immediately held down to the fact that I said we would have everything all tidied up in ten years. It would be the height of foolishness to think that this is so. On the other hand, once this process has started, and if we approach it with vigour and enthusiasm, I see no reason why we cannot achieve our aims.

If the pace of change was what it was a century or more ago we might likely not have to contemplate this action; but this is the 20th century, changes swirl about us and it would be irresponsible not to bend our every effort to influence that change so that we can all benefit from its impact.

May I refer to some of my earlier remarks in this debate when I described one of the principles of Progressive Conservatism as being retention of the best of what is old while embracing the best of what is new. This is the principle we will follow.

Mr. Sopha: That is what I am afraid of.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: This is the principle that we will follow.

Mr. Sopha: That is what I am afraid of.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I am not too concerned, Mr. Speaker, I think that we will find our way—

Mr. MacDonald: It could be worse.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: The third issue of regional economic inequalities is no less pressing than the two I have just mentioned. In fact, in some parts of Canada it is more important and of much more interest than constitutional matters. For a rich country we have far too many areas where people are ill housed, ill fed and ill clothed, and we have far too many people who through little if any fault of their own have no opportunity to realize their full potential.

We are aware of these problems within our own province and have many programmes designed to alleviate such conditions and provide equality in all regards, in the truest sense of the term. The necessity for national policy and national programmes in this area of national activity is, in my opinion, one of the overwhelming reasons

for strong central government. So long as we delay positive action on this matter we shall have a stigma on our conscience which will call our brave words into question.

So Mr. Speaker, from this you can see that lying ahead of us is a full agenda, and the sooner we get on with the job the better.

Mr Sargent: He is a good reader; I can tell him that.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I have to reassure my hon. friend that I am not finished yet.

Mr. Speaker, some days ago, some place in this pile of paper work—

Mr. MacDonald: Do not tell me it is getting as confused here as Ottawa.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Well, perhaps I can deal with it.

I was interested in the comments that were made by the hon. leader of the Opposition when he said we scuttled the civil rights bill, along with the human rights bill, presented by Mr. Trudeau with the submission that was made by the Attorney General.

Mr. Sopha: Yes, he does not understand the problem at all.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I can only say that there are going to be vast areas of disagreement and differing points of view, so I think we might just as well start now on a basis whereby we are going to listen to one another and see if we can find areas on which we can agree. I am quite certain that we are never going to automatically come to a consensus. When I say we, I mean those of us in Ontario, regardless of political allegiance. Certainly when we meet, as leaders of government from across the country—

Mr. Sargent: What can we do about it?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: If the hon. member would listen he might find out. I have noticed his most outstanding characteristic, after talking, is not listening. However, I always enjoy his questions, Mr. Speaker, they really are the highlight of my day.

On February 15, there came to me from the Speaker's office a question from the leader of the Opposition. However, the question was never asked. I am not saying this in a critical way at all—the member dealt with the matter in his remarks—but his question was: Does the speech of the Attorney General for Ontario at the federal-provincial conference on the constitution indicate that the government of this province is opposed in principle to the entrenchment of a bill of rights in the constitution of Canada? Then I believe that his comment in his remarks, Mr. Speaker, those of the hon. leader of the Opposition, was the word that we had "scuppered" Mr. Trudeau—the Attorney General had.

I would just like to deal with this question; because of course we did not.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker it might be—on a point of order if you will permit—it might be wise at this point to indicate that the question to which the Prime Minister refers was put forward by myself, and that I did not ask it because I knew that I would have an opportunity to deal with it the following day. For your information, sir, I did have an opportunity to observe the progress of the conference. Although I was invited by the government to attend, I took myself there and paid my own costs, and was very anxious to avail myself of that opportunity. After the chief law officer of the Crown for Ontario, as he might be referred to, gave his comments on the federal proposal, there was no doubt that a pall descended on the conference. It was supported by only one provincial Premier—that is the federal position was supported by only one provincial Premier. I thought that under Ontario's leadership the Premiers very definitely did scuttle the proposal that had come from the federal level.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I can only say this, Mr. Speaker. The Attorney General took the position at the conference which we thought was sound. I must say that I never really thought it through in terms of any other province; after all we are only one of ten provinces dealing with the federal government.

I would say, quite definitely that what the Attorney General said, and the ideas he expressed, did not in any way indicate an inevitable and complete opposition to the principle of the entrenchment of a bill of rights in the constitution of Canada.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): It must inevitably be—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, let us just get into this and perhaps they will understand our point of view.

We asked only—and I have the statement here and I am prepared to read it into the record for the benefit of the members. They may have it, but I wonder whether they have read it.

Mr. Singer: I have read it very carefully.

Mr. Sopha: This is the extent of the contact.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: In any event, may I say that what we asked at the conference was that all governments be given adequate time to study the proposal and to study its broad implications on our parliamentary system of government.

The final paragraphs in the statement of the Attorney General reads as follows:

> Considering a bill of rights, it might therefore be submitted that: (a) Such a bill should be considered in the light of constitutional reform generally.

In other words, here was a proposition put before us in what I might say has been the method in the past. A somewhat common procedure in the federal government, take it or leave it. We submitted that such a bill should be considered in the light of constitutional reform generally. Such a bill should be dealt with in the light of provincial situations with consideration for existing powers.

The declaratory or other nature of such a bill should be reviewed in the context of the existing constitution, and the important relationship between the bill of rights and the constitution, and in the case of Ontario, the government might await the McRuer report which should reflect the very many submissions received from people and organizations throughout Ontario.

Mr. Sopha: Now, we understand you have received it, the report?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: We have received one section of this report which I hope to be able to table in the House next week.

I would point out this. We had very little opportunity to consider adequately the proposed Canadian charter of human rights prior to the conference. Three copies of the bill, two in English and one in French, were delivered to the government here by the office of the Prime Minister of Canada on Tuesday, January 30 preceding the February 5 constitutional conference. We were in no position to go to that conference and say, "yes, we accept this document."

As a matter of fact, whether the hon. leader of the Opposition thinks that we cast a pall on the proceedings or not, the Prime Minister of Quebec had said it was unacceptable to him before the conference ever opened, so certainly he could not be influenced by anything that Ontario said.

Now we do not rule this out, in any way, but we do say, and I think the Attorney General's statement says, that we want time to study this in order that we may understand its full implication.

If, when we understand all implications that it has, if we understand what its influence may be on our system of parliamentary government and if we fully understand the disadvantages of an entrenched bill of rights, as well as the advantages, when all these things can be thoroughly examined, then is the time to make a decision.

But I felt that it was not proper, I could never think so. I doubt, if you had the responsibility, if you either would have agreed to accept the document that was put forward at the conference, because we simply do not know enough about it. We received it on January 30, the conference opened on February 5 and, of course, the true significance of it in its true form, and all the implications of it, and many of our institutions, had not been examined and it will take some time to do that.

And I felt personally that it probably was not a very good diplomatic move to put this thing forward on the basis of anything other than, "here is a good idea that we might use as a lead off base for a study of this." It may be that in the final analysis, the proper thing to do is to entrench a bill of rights in our constitution. We do not say that this is a distinct possibility, but what we do say is that we are not going to, we need time to study it.

This was the position we took and, as I say, as I read these I do not know how you could place any other interpretation than to submit that such a bill should be considered in the light of constitutional reform generally. We are just starting on the largest area of constitutional reform that has ever been instituted in Canada. Now surely—

Mr. Sopha: Could I just ask a question?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Yes, what is it?

Mr. Sopha: This is a very serious matter in our national life and I should like to ask the Premier if item (b) on page 7 of the Attorney General's statement does not anticipate that Canadians living in different parts of our nation might have different rights. Now, surely, that in principle must be wrong?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Well, I do not think it necessarily is wrong. I really do not, Mr. Speaker. These are some of the matters—

Mr. Sargent: Be careful now.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: The point I want to make here today is that we, and I want to correct really what was said by the leader of the Opposition, and I have *Hansard* here, page 122 in which he said:

> It is with a great deal of regret that I would say to you, sir, that Ontario has effectively killed federal initiatives relating to the entrenchment of a bill of rights in the Canadian constitution.

Well, I would just simply say that I do not think we have done this, that this was not our intent and, frankly, I do not think we have done it in any event. I am quite certain that this matter will be brought back. I am quite certain that it will be dealt with by the continuing committee, and I think that this is the interest and the desire of everybody who was at that conference.

I do not think anybody had turned it down out of hand. There were other suggestions made at the conference which were dealt with by the hon. member for York South. It would certainly require a lot of examination before they could be accepted out of hand. All I am saying is this, that our position on the bill of rights was that it did not and it was not intended to indicate that we had closed the door on the entrenchment of the bill of rights, or entrenchment of any rights—getting away from the words bill of rights—of the citizens in a constitution.

All we suggest is, that before we do so, let us be fully aware of what we are doing and what the full ramifications of it may be. If, in the light of those studies, and the opinions that we have, we still think it is a good idea, then, we, of course, will have no objection to it whatsoever.

There is one other matter I want to deal with in connection with these constitutional points. I would like to emphasize two points about the development of the discussions on the future of Canada and, in particular, about the policies in this very crucial issue which have been announced by the government of Ontario, and which are, therefore, of most immediate importance to our people.

First, I want to reply to the comments I am sure we have all received from concerned residents of this province. Now I can only speak from my own mail and correspondence, I have received a great deal of mail from people all over Ontario, people who have followed both these conferences and the developments arising from them with interest, sometimes with apprehension, sometimes with approbation and sometimes with downright damnation, of what we propose and the stands that we have taken.

We have set out to arouse public interest in these matters, and I can only say that we have succeeded in our endeavour. I have been very happy to receive these letters with their wide variety of opinions, for they make it possible for me to know what people are thinking. They are also an indication of what misunderstandings may exist, arising out of the welter of news and reports which come out of our deliberations, and which appear day by day on the television and on radio as the daily political life of our country unfolds.

These matters are being debated in terms of everything that is political in our country, all the political events that take place. The crisis in Ottawa, the leadership race for the Liberal federal party; all these things are interwoven, and our people are being barraged with a lot of statements and positions. I find these letters very enlightening to me because it gives me an opportunity to judge what the real understanding of our people is.

Mr. Sopha: Who is going to win the federal Liberal race?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: At one time, I had an opinion, Mr. Speaker, but after the events of the last week I would not—I do not think I could see it in my heart to bet on anyone. However, it will settle down. Ask me in a couple of weeks and perhaps we might be able to—

Mr. Sopha: Does anybody want to know?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: The Premier predicted an election last year.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I did not realize that, Mr. Speaker. This is news to me. I think maybe we need transistor radios in this chamber to keep up with what is going on.

In any event, first of all I would like to reply to some of the fears and apprehensions that have been put to me by people who have written to me since these events took place. Secondly, I want to stress what we are doing, what we are not doing, what we are prepared to do and what we are not prepared to do.

All members of this Legislature have received copies of my statement of February 5, delivered in Ottawa to the federal-provincial conference of Prime Ministers and Premiers. I wish it were possible to send copies to every

resident of Ontario. Those who have written to me and wired and called will receive a copy, and we would be happy to meet any future requests. I hope that all who do receive a copy of it will read it with care, because I am convinced that, after reading the statement nobody can say that what we are doing is irresponsible or that our course is not practical.

I think it is a particular obligation of each and every one of us in this House to read the statement, and to explain fully and fairly to our constituents the policy of the government in this regard.

I am aware, of course as we all are, that even when we have reported in whatever fashion we may, some people in the province will have other views about the way we should proceed. That they have these views is their privilege, and it is a privilege we all respect. At the same time, I would implore everyone to recognize their individual responsibilities in this matter, as well as the responbilities that we carry as government. I hope that everyone will make every effort to understand why we have acted as we have done, what we are striving to accomplish, and above all, I think people should understand what really is at stake.

I would like to measure my words very carefully here. We are really talking about the survival of Canada. If there is anything more important than that I do not know what it is. We are attempting to meet, as part of the solution to our national crisis, the just, reasonable and legitimate aspirations of the French-speaking residents of Ontario. We are attempting to ensure to French-speaking Canadians that they will have the means of preserving their language and preserving their culture.

We have no intention of forcing the French language on any Canadian who might not want it, and if this effort makes French-speaking Canadians in other parts of Canada at ease in our country, more at ease in our own province of Ontario—which is their country too, and it is their Ontario too, because Ontario is part of Canada—then this government believes it is a small price to pay for our national survival.

Well sir, I would like to be quite clear in dispelling the many rumours about our policy. Despite the very explicit statement of our intentions made on February 5, I have seen some wildly distorted headlines and some highly speculative stories and, indeed, some incorrect accounts which equate rumour or misinformation with fact.

Did we declare the province of Ontario to be officially bilingual? We did not. Many have advocated, including the member for York South, that we should so do forthwith, but we are not of this opinion.

Did we state that any person in Ontario would have to learn a second language? We did not.

Did we take such action as we did to appease the province of Quebec or any other part of the country? We did not. Did we adopt our policy without regard for the feelings of all residents of Ontario? We did not. What did we do? We stated without equivocation that insofar as it was both practicable and reasonable we would attempt to ensure that both English- and French-speaking residents of Ontario will be able to deal with their local and provincial governments and be educated in the language of their choice.

Now that is the simple statement that covers, as briefly as I could put it, what was in the statement we made on February 5, and surely the justice of aims such as this is beyond question. These aims have been pursued in various parts of Ontario for many years. They have implications which range far beyond Ontario. Their purpose is to contribute to what I believe, most sincerely, will be the result—a stronger Canada, a more united Canada and a Canada in which we all can take even greater pride.

I would also like to make it quite clear that while the government of Ontario has accepted bilingualism, we have not accepted biculturalism. It is a fact of life that Canada is a multi-culture mosaic and this is nowhere more apparent than in our privince here of Ontario. Of this we are very proud and we think our multi-cultural aspects of our country are really part of the true Canadian nationality.

And let there be no misunderstanding of what our aims are. We do not intend to be a party to the transformation of this country into a republic nor do we intend to allow anyone to interfere with the basic concepts of our constitutional monarchy and our parliamentary form of government in Canada. We do not intend to be a party to any decisions which will undermine or imperil the essential powers of the federal government. It is imperative that the federal government be able to act within its rightful jurisdiction on behalf of all Canadians.

Changes, of course, are necessary and we welcome them but they must be examined carefully and placed against all that has served us so well during these 100 years and

against the institutions and processes of law and government under which we were brought up and which we cherish.

While we must ensure that the federal government has specific national powers—and just for example, I could mention control of the Bank of Canada, control of tariffs, power to prevent artificial interprovincial trade barriers, national relations with other countries, defence, national development and so on—yet we say there must be consultation with the provinces in areas where they are involved and where regional differences require regional approaches. Such consultation can lead only to strength; and the future of our country depends on the maintenance of the strong, properly functioning and effective federal government.

However, it also depends on strong provincial administrations with the authority and the financial resources to carry out significant responsibilities. In the coming discussions over distribution of powers these considerations must be paramount and we must approach the issues with objective and open minds.

Now Mr. Speaker, as a government we are determined to meet the fair and just needs of our two great linguistic groups. We are determined to participate in the full review of our constitution, our institutions and our practices. We are determined to do everything in our power to provide equality of opportunity to all Canadians so that they share in the prosperity of this province and this country.

Thus to be Canadian will have real meaning.

We are not afraid, and indeed we are determined to do our utmost, to make our province and our country a better place in which all Canadians can realize their full and just ambitions and capabilities. The costs we shall have to bear pale into insignificance with the rewards we shall reap.

We must approach this problem in such a way that we will preserve the traditions and customs of the people of our province. This will apply to those of our people who have been with us through many generations and those who have joined us more recently. We must ensure the continued prosperity and welfare of all our residents here in Ontario, as they themselves by their own efforts seek to better their position and that of their children.

At the same time, while pursuing these aims, we must never forget that we are an integral part of and owe much of our prosperity and development here in Ontario to our country as a whole. These two basic ideas are foremost in our minds as we seek to keep our country together through forbearance and understanding, through the exercise of common sense and through the application of all the knowledge and the skill that we possess.

What are the alternatives? What do we face as alternatives to what we are doing?

We face the possibility of Canada divided into two or three or four, or any number of separate sections, with great barriers between them, each trying to be a self supporting entity; or an attempt to link up in some way with the United States. We face the complete disruption of all our country-wide domestic markets; the cessation of free flow of goods, agricultural products and people back and forth across Canada. We face the disappearance, really, of all that we have come to know and to love as Canadian.

It is unthinkable, but I suggest to hon. members that it is not impossible.

Sir, I want to deal for a few minutes with what we have done to implement the proposals we have made, and particularly those we made on February 5. It has been insinuated that we might be giving an indication that we did not mean what we said. When I hear these insinuations I think of that phrase, and perhaps my biblical quotations are not accurate, but I think of that phrase: "Oh ye of little faith."

When we set out on this course of action two weeks ago in Ottawa it was not done lightly; it was not done without fullest examination; it as not done without having examined the full implication of what we were proposing. We have no intention of reneging on what we said we would do; we have no intention whatsoever of paying lip service. As a matter of fact such a suggestion almost makes me speechless, because it angers me so much that anyone would think that we would take our responsibilities so lightly that we would attend a conference of that type where we are dealing, as I have said, with the future of our country; it is really quite unthinkable that anyone would go to such a conference and advance concrete proposals they did not have any intention of carrying out.

I am going to go through in some detail the implementation of what we propose.

The first volume of the Fowler report of the Royal commission on bilingualism and biculturalism was published last December and it came at a very crucial time in our history.

It stressed the wider recognition of the English and French languages, and we believe this step is fundamental to a solution of some of the most pressing problems facing Confederation.

The commission received its mandate from the federal government in the latter part of 1963. During the course of its investigations, the commission held regional meetings across Canada and this procedure made it possible to meet thousands of Canadians from Victoria, B.C., to St. John's, Newfoundland. It also permitted all Canadians to become deeply aware of the divers regional differences that exist within their country.

It soon became apparent to the commission that its task was not to paper over an unsatisfactory situation. Rather, because of the gravity of the situation which was emphasized in its preliminary report of 1965, the commission concluded that the French and English languages must be equally and formally recognized and protected.

Since most of the recommendations of the report deal with matters under provincial jurisdiction such as education, municipal affairs, provincial public services, Legislatures, administration of justice, the government of Ontario chose to place the highest priority on a full and fair examination of the findings of the report, and in reporting to you here in this Legislature, I would like to repeat what I said in Ottawa on February 5:

> We endorse the guiding principle and the spirit of the first volume of the Royal commission report on bilingualism and biculturalism, that both official languages be recognized wherever the minority is numerous enough to be viable as a group. Indeed, it is clear to us that this principle and spirit must serve as a touchstone of what should be, and what I am sure will be, the Canada of the future. In much of the expression of this report we have at last tangible evidence of what we can do to ensure our national survival.

The process of implementing many of the proposals will not be accomplished overnight. The commission wisely recognized this fact. In Ontario, the process of implementation is already under way. We shall lead by deed because we are convinced that this is necessary for the survival of Canada. We have established four task forces:

1. To investigate the feasibility of implementing the recommendations concerning the administration of justice;

2. On the Legislature and provincial statutes;

3. On the municipal administration; and

4. On the provincial public service.

Studies of these groups are being assisted by the advisory committee on Confederation, and are being co-ordinated by the federal-provincial affairs secretary and of The Ontario Treasury Department.

I want to emphasize that this activity has already commenced. This phase of our implementation will be completed by this summer. At the same time, and in conjunction with the work of these task forces, we are looking into a broader question of establishing bilingual districts in appropriate parts of Ontario.

As additional volumes of the report are published we will establish new task forces to deal with further specific recommendations which may apply to Ontario. The government of Ontario will provide, wherever feasible, bilingual public services so that the people of Ontario will be able to deal in either the English or French languages at the various levels of government with which they come into contact. This is in keeping with a most important statement in the introduction to the report of the Royal commission which I should like to repeat:

> A bilingual country is not one where all the inhabitants necessarily have to speak two languages. Rather, it is a country where the principal public and private institutions must provide services in two languages to citizens, the vast majority of whom may very well be unilingual.

The same is true for a bilingual province. The approach we have adopted closely parallels a suggestion in the report that each government concerned will have to conduct its own inquiry on the recommendations, and select the most sensible ways of putting the ideas into practice. We are determined, however, to take specific and immediate action in a number of areas.

First, we propose that any member of the Legislature of Ontario shall have the formally recognized right to address the Legislature in either English or French. Our intention, of course, to submit this resolution was announced in the Speech from the Throne and I am therefore, giving notice for the notice paper that henceforth, every member of this House may, as a matter of right, address the House in either of the two official languages of Canada.

My intent, Mr. Speaker, would be to call this resolution at some future date, and I am quite certain it will receive the unanimous approval of this House, but at the same time, if it is called for debate, it will give the members an opportunity to express their opinions in this regard.

Secondly, we have adopted the following policies with respect to the practical provision of public services in French:

> The Department of Civil Service and The Department of Education will establish language courses for civil servants whose duties require a knowledge of French. All letters received in French by the Ontario government will be answered in that language.
>
> All government departments are encouraged to provide bilingual services in those field offices located in areas where there is sufficient concentration of French-speaking persons. The government will expand the facilities of its translation bureau, particularly to deal with communications in French, and to accomplish this each department, in conjunction with The Department of Civil Service, will determine which employees could improve their effectiveness by having a command of both languages.
>
> Such employees could include those who direct an extensive contact with Franco-Ontarians and those who are in regular contact with their French-speaking counterpart in other governments.

If I may stop for a moment and say this presently is the case in many departments in this government, and then I resume quoting:

> Again in conjunction with the various departments involved, The Department of Civil Service will expand its endeavours to recruit bilingual people for positions where a command of both languages is necessary. Special arrangements for French-speaking civil servants from other jurisdictions as well as Ontario to take special courses in English will also be studied. To create the most efficient techniques of providing the language training facilities, a number of approaches are being investigated by the staff development and research branch of The Department of Civil Service.
>
> Arrangements will be explored with local school boards for the use of existing facilities on a shared cost basis such as language laboratories and special teachers in oral French. Requests will be made to provide space for Ontario civil servants in the French language training programme from the federal government; creation of a provincial centre at which selected civil servants can be given intensive instruction in French is being examined; steps have been taken to hire specialist staff in applied linguistics and develop a programme from various levels of proficiency in the French language.

In the third area, the government of Ontario has adopted policies with regard to the use of French and English in municipal administration. I should like to outline our general approach:

> We will encourage the use of both English and French in those Ontario municipalities having a sufficient concentration of French-speaking persons. These communities are mainly located in eastern and northeastern Ontario in the counties and districts of Stormont, Glengarry, Prescott, Russell, Carleton, Nipissing, Timiskaming, Cochrane, Subury and Algoma.
>
> Also in this general category, are communities in southwestern Ontario such as Penetanguishene on Georgian Bay, Welland, on the Niagara peninsula, and parts of the county of Essex. These communities will be urged to adopt a number of policies —for instance, employment of sufficient bilingual staff to deal effectively with the public in French and English in oral and written communications; the provision in both languages of local official forms and notices such as assessment notices, tax forms, water bills, and voters' lists; the provision of road and traffic signs which can be readily understood by anyone; and the use of both English and French in municipal council and other local government meetings.
>
> At present, an official record of council meetings must be kept in English. We intend to introduce an amendment to The Municipal Act to provide that municipal council meetings may be kept in French so long as properly authorized English translations are made available of any portion of any such minutes required for use in the courts, for the Ontario municipal board, or for such other purposes as a ratepayer may reasonably require, the use by appropriate municipal employees of the language training facilities to be established by the government of Ontario.
>
> The government is now examining methods of reimbursing co-operating municipalities for all, or part, of the extra expenses which may be incurred from the provision of services in the two languages.

In this connection, as the Royal commission suggests, we may seek the assistance of the federal government.

To a considerable extent, these plans for action in the municipal field represent the recognition of existing practices in a number of Ontario municipalities. For many years, several local governments in eastern Ontario have effectively conducted much of their business in French. For example, Eastview and Hawkesbury have provided most municipal services in both languages but with steps now being taken to ensure a full range of educational opportunities for Franco-Ontarians, it is expected that the implementation of this new policy in the municipal field will be made much easier.

The fourth major area of our concern deals with the administration of justice:

We are acutely aware, as well as the Royal commission, that the employment of the two languages in the administration of justice in Ontario poses great difficulties. Nevertheless, we are now investigating these possibilities. The provision that the government shall meet the expenses incurred for appropriate interpreters and translation services and any pleading or process before courts under provincial jurisdiction; the provision of bilingual court documents in designated judicial districts having a sufficient French-speaking population; the encouragement of judges, lawyers, clerks, sheriffs, bailiffs, and male stenographers to take advantage of the language training facilities we are establishing.

In our view it would be wisest that these proposals be initiated in the lower courts where most people have their only contact with the law.

Now that is the end of the quote.

That is the situation and the undertaking, if I may use that term, that we put before the conference in Ottawa. As I emphasized in our statement at that time we have already inaugurated this programme and I would like to give members the details of what we are doing. It is only two weeks ago but broadly speaking the programme we have initiated consists of two parts: (1) the provision of language training facilities for French- and English-speaking members of the Ontario public service; (2) the provision of a variety of public administrative services in the French language in selective areas of the province.

Although the effective provision of bilingual services will depend to a considerable extent on our success in hiring competent bilingual people, language training for civil servants now on staff is also very important. A language training programme is being organized and managed by The Departments of the Civil Service and Education, in cooperation with other departments which have major contacts with French-speaking residents throughout the province.

To date the plans have taken the following shape:

French language training will be provided to Ontario civil servants at two levels. Senior civil servants who are in regular contact with their colleagues in the civil service of the federal government, in the province of Quebec and in other provinces with substantial numbers of French-speaking persons, will be provided with French language training in a course amounting to 200 hours spread over 40 weeks. This instruction will be provided in the Toronto area.

At the outset it is planned that these courses will be given to 72 senior civil servants per year. The Department of Civil Service is now recruiting the necessary instructional staff.

French language instruction will be provided for a second group of civil servants whose responsibilities include direct contact with the general public in the provision of government services. Initially, this instruction will be provided for approximately 600 civil servants per year. Such instruction will be provided both in Toronto and in those areas of the province with a substantial concentration of French-speaking persons.

In this way instruction will be decentralized and local facilities will be used as far as possible. In order to ensure that the instruction is of a uniformly high quality, The Department of Civil Service will set up a system of liaison and inspection. Plans are also being made for immersion seminars in the French language for those who are now capable of benefiting by them. These seminars will be used to increase and maintain competence in the French language for those who have received the basic instruction.

Now, sir, apart from language training, four task forces have been created to study the measures necessary for the provision of public administrative services in the French language in selected areas of the province.

The task force on the provincial public service will form the core of these forces. It will consist of two representatives from The

Department of Civil Service, two representatives from the federal-provincial affairs secretariat of the Treasury board and one person from the Treasury board secretariat who will act in an advisory capacity.

The role of this task force will be to establish a set of general principles which might then be applied to meet the particular needs of each department. The task force will hold discussions with representatives from each department to determine their needs and special requirements. The responsibility for implmenting the details of the general programme will rest with each department concerned in conjunction with The Department of Civil Service.

The entire programme will be co-ordinated by the federal-provincial affairs secretariat to ensure that decisions taken are uniform and compatible; to pass on suggestions to the task forces from other advisory groups, such as the Ontario advisory committee on Confederation, and finally to report on the progress of the programme to myself and to the Deputy Provincial Treasurer.

The task forces on the Legislature and provincial statutes and on the administration of justice are now in the process of organization and we hope that the initial phase of this programme will be completed by this summer, as I said in Ottawa, and at the same time the government will examine the question of establishing bilingual districts.

In addition to this, Mr. Speaker, when the hon. member for York South was speaking, he suggested that there might be certain members of the Legislature who would like to change their schoolboy French into something that could be used in this chamber and elsewhere and I imagine there are a good many of us in the same boat. I can read a speech in French, but I find it very difficult to engage in any rapid conversation, although I could understand the hon. member for York South quite clearly the other day, because I think that he speaks French much as I do and he was slow enough that I could follow it.

But I suppose I am an exact product of our public school system in this province. I started with kindergarten and actually came out at grade 13 and then went to one of our Canadian universities. In that period of time, if I may be personal, I think I studied French for either seven or eight years, but I was never taught to speak it. I was taught to read it and I was taught to write it, and I was taught a great deal of grammar and I was taught a great deal of vocabulary, but I was never taught the gentle art of conversation. And it may be that there are means that have been developed and which would make it relatively simple to change what must be quite a deep background of knowledge of French which I have, into something which would be a working practical instrument. I find it quite possible to take any given number of pages and if I go slowly enough, I think I can speak French that can be understood.

I remember delivering a speech in Quebec and I used this technique, and a woman I know in Quebec who is completely bilingual and with French background, rushed up to me after I had finished speaking in French and said, "Now I am so delighted I can speak to you in my own language," but she went so fast I could not understand a word she said.

These are some of the practical difficulties that face people in this province. I might say that in my remarks to the conference in Ottawa, I did say that it did occur to me that when our children and our grandchildren read these great discussions we have had about bilingualism, they will simply say, "What were they fussing about?" Surely in the world as it has developed today, it is going to be necessary to be able to communicate around the world and with world citizens in more than one language. But we are stumbling and fumbling about here now. I think that this will become commonplace and perhaps before our brief span here is completed.

Mr. Speaker, I have not said anything about French education in the province, and I do not know whether I will get into that on this occasion or not. However, I can report to the House that we have every intention of going ahead with the position that we laid out in a speech that I delivered in Ottawa some time in August.

To date we have had a very commendable and heartening degree of co-operation from the local school boards. The Minister of Education established a committee to look into ways and means of ensuring that we would have secondary schools in which French would be the language of instruction, in those areas where the population warranted it, and this committee was to investigate how it was to be done, and it is working.

I am happy to report to the House that in many areas the boards have not waited for that committee to bring down its report and make its recommendations, they have taken it upon themselves to go ahead and they are

making the necessary arrangements. So before this session runs its course, there will be a full report made to the House upon the progress we are making in filling in that last gap in education in French in the province, because I do not know if the members are aware, but we have had schools at the elementary level in which instruction has been given in French for many a year.

And of course, we have established a bilingual university—the Laurentian University of Sudbury, which was established not very many years ago. More recently, of course, Ottawa has come into the area of provincially supported universities, and Ottawa University is bilingual. So we ended up in this position where we had the beginning of the educational scale in French and the end of the educational scale in French, but in the secondary area in the middle the young people who had had their elementary education in French had no secondary schools to attend. This led to a disproportionate percentage of dropouts among those young people. We were determined that we would close this gap and provide as far as is humanly possible, equality of educational opportunity for all our young people.

Mr. Speaker, it is ten to six. I do not know when I started and I have some other things to say to the House but they are going to take more than ten minutes. With the indulgence of the House, I am going to move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Mr. Speaker, may I just ask a question of the Premier? I think that he intended to say something else, but he did not indicate specifically whether the civil service would be able to join with members to take these courses.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I got sidetracked there. I said during the general remarks of the member for York South that I would be happy to make some arrangements for the members to become bilingual, and we have had some discussion. We will proceed forthwith to put together a three-party committee to devise ways and means by which this can be done.

Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we will resume this debate.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 5:50 o'clock, p.m.

Revised

APPENDIX

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF THE MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

The following list of members supersedes the one which appeared as an appendix to the No. 4 Report of the Debates and Proceedings of Monday, February 19, 1968

(117 members)

First Session — Twenty-Eighth Parliament

Speaker: Hon. Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C. **Clerk of the House: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.**

Member	Party	Constituency	Post Office Address
Allan, James N.	P.C.	Haldimand-Norfolk	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Apps, Syl	P.C.	Kingston and the Islands	50 Roden St., Kingston
Auld, Hon. James A. C.	P.C.	Leeds	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Bales, Hon. Dalton	P.C.	York Mills	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Belanger, J. Albert	P.C.	Prescott and Russell	Sarsfield
Ben, George	L.	Humber	1134 Dundas St. W., Toronto 3
Bernier, Leo	P.C.	Kenora	Hudson
Boyer, Robert J.	P.C.	Muskoka	620 University Ave., Toronto
Braithwaite, Leonard A.	L.	Etobicoke	Suite E, 1500 Royal York Rd., Weston
Breithaupt, J. R.	L.	Kitchener	90 Church St., Kitchener
Brown, John L.	N.D.	Beaches-Woodbine	339 Millard Ave., Newmarket
Brunelle, Hon. Rene	P.C.	Cochrane North	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Bukator, George	L.	Niagara Falls	Box 280, Chippawa
Bullbrook, James E.	L.	Sarnia	881 Tudor Close, Sarnia
Burr, Fred A.	N.D.	Sandwich-Riverside	4005 Howard Ave., Windsor
Carruthers, Alex	P.C.	Durham	Garden Hill
Carton, Gordon R.	P.C.	Armourdale	217 Sandringham Dr., Downsview
Cass, Hon. F. M.	P.C.	Grenville-Dundas	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Connell, Hon. T. Ray	P.C.	Wentworth North	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Davis, Hon. William G.	P.C.	Peel North	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Davison, Norm	N.D.	Hamilton Centre	100 Delaware Ave., Hamilton
Deacon, D. M.	L.	York Centre	Glenburn Farms, Unionville
Deans, Ian	N.D.	Wentworth	38 Beaconsfield Dr., Hamilton
Demers, J. C. G.	P.C.	Nickel Belt	Chelmsford
De Monte, Dante M.	L.	Dovercourt	29 South Kingslea Dr., Toronto 18
Downer, Rev. A. W.	P.C.	Dufferin-Simcoe	Box 239, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Dunlop, Edward	P.C.	York-Forest Hill	45 Charles St. E., Toronto 5
Dymond, Hon. Matthew B., M.D.	P.C.	Ontario	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Edighoffer, Hugh	L.	Perth	147 Nelson St., Mitchell
Evans, D. Arthur	P.C.	Simcoe Centre	Box 87, Bradford
Farquhar, Stan	L.	Algoma-Manitoulin	Box 421, Elliot Lake
Ferrier, Rev. William	N.D.	Cochrane South	552 Tamarack St., Timmins

Member	Party	Constituency	Post Office Address
Gaunt, Murray	L.	Huron-Bruce	Wingham
Gilbertson, Bernt	P.C.	Algoma	R.R. #1, Richards Landing
Gisborn, Reg	N.D.	Hamilton East	26 Martin Rd., Hamilton
Gomme, Hon. George E.	P.C.	Lanark	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Good, Edward R.	L.	Waterloo North	175 Tennyson Place, Waterloo
Grossman, Hon. Allan	P.C.	St. Andrew-St. Patrick	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Guindon, Hon. Fernand	P.C.	Stormont	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Haggerty, Ray	L.	Welland South	R.R. #1, Sherkston
Hamilton, Maurice	P.C.	Renfrew North	R.R. #5, Pembroke
Haskett, Hon. Irwin	P.C.	Ottawa South	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Henderson, Lorne C.	P.C.	Lambton	R.R. #3, Oil Springs
Hodgson, R. Glen	P.C.	Victoria-Haliburton	P.O. Box 240, Haliburton
Hodgson, William	P.C.	York North	R.R. #1, Kettleby
Innes, Gordon W.	L.	Oxford	R.R. #1, Woodstock
Jackson, Donald	N.D.	Timiskaming	Box 333, Kirkland Lake
Jessiman, James	P.C.	Fort William	127 South May St., Fort William
Johnston, Allister	P.C.	Parry Sound	South River
Johnston, R. M.	P.C.	St. Catharines	10 Canal St., St. Catharines
Johnston, W. Erskine	P.C.	Carleton	Carp
Kennedy, R. Douglas	P.C.	Peel South	2065 Camilla Rd., Cooksville
Kerr, George A.	P.C.	Halton West	377 Brant St., Burlington
Knight, Ron H.	L.	Port Arthur	Box 109, Mobile Village, R.R. #2, Trenton
Lawlor, Patrick D.	N.D.	Lakeshore	154 Lake Promenade, Toronto 14
Lawrence, A. B. R.	P.C.	Carleton East	90 Sparks St., Suite 500, Ottawa 4
Lawrence, Hon. Allan F.	P.C.	St. George	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Lewis, Stephen	N.D.	Scarborough West	342 Millard Ave., Newmarket
MacDonald, Donald C.	N.D.	York South	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
MacKenzie, Harold	L.	Ottawa Centre	Box 1279, R.R. #2, Ottawa
MacNaughton, Hon. C. S.	P.C.	Huron	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Makarchuk, Mac	N.D.	Brantford	15 Lynwood Dr., Apt. 601, Brantford
Martel, Elie W.	N.D.	Sudbury East	46 Ferguson St., Capreol
Meen, Arthur K.	P.C.	York East	95 Lord Seaton Rd., Willowdale
Morin, Jules	P.C.	Ottawa East	101 Wurtemburg, Ottawa
Morningstar, Ellis P.	P.C.	Welland	97 Alberta St., Welland
Morrow, Donald H.	P.C.	Ottawa West	2975 Richmond Rd., Ottawa 14
McKeough, Hon. W. Darcy	P.C.	Chatham-Kent	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
McNeil, R. K.	P.C.	Elgin	R.R. #2, Springfield
Newman, Bernard	L.	Windsor-Walkerville	1290 Ypres Blvd., Windsor
Newman, William	P.C.	Ontario South	Balsam P.O.
Nixon, Robert F.	L.	Brant	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Olde, Neil L.	P.C.	Middlesex South	Melbourne

Member	Party	Constituency	Post Office Address
Paterson, Donald A.	L.	Essex South	1 Georgia Ave., Leamington
Peacock, Hugh	N.D.	Windsor West	1555 Pelissier St., Windsor
Pilkey, Clifford G.	N.D.	Oshawa	801 Regent Dr., Oshawa
Pitman, W. G.	N.D.	Peterborough	1364 Gordon Ave., Peterborough
Potter, R. T., M.D.	P.C.	Quinte	276 Charles St., Belleville
Price, Henry J.	P.C.	St. David	27 Bloor St. E., Toronto 5
Pritchard, Mrs. Ada	P.C.	Hamilton West	93 Bold St., Suite 904, Hamilton
Randall, Hon. Stanley J.	P.C.	Don Mills	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Reid, T. Patrick	L.-Lab.	Rainy River	P.O. Box 187, Fort Frances
Reid, Tim	L.	Scarborough East	38 Guildcrest Dr., Scarborough
Reilly, Leonard M.	P.C.	Eglinton	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Renwick, James	N.D.	Riverdale	Suite 15, 20 St. Dennis Dr., Don Mills
Renwick, Mrs. Margaret	N.D.	Scarborough Centre	Suite 15, 20 St. Dennis Dr., Don Mills
Reuter, Allan E.	P.C.	Waterloo South	45 Main St., Galt
Robarts, Hon. John P.	P.C.	London North	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Rollins, Clarke T.	P.C.	Hastings	R.R. #1, Bancroft
Root, John	P.C.	Wellington-Dufferin	Orton
Rowe, Russell D.	P.C.	Northumberland	546 Lakeshore Rd., Cobourg
Rowntree, Hon. H. Leslie	P.C.	York West	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Ruston, Richard F.	L.	Essex-Kent	Box 4, South Woodslee
Sargent, Eddie	L.	Grey-Bruce	868-2nd Ave. E., Owen Sound
Shulman, Morton, M.D.	N.D.	High Park	378 Roncesvalles Ave., Toronto 3
Simonett, Hon. J. R.	P.C.	Frontenac-Addington	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Singer, Vernon M.	L.	Downsview	111 Richmond St. W., Suite 603, Toronto 1
Smith, Gordon E.	P.C.	Simcoe East	P.O. Box 128, Orillia
Smith, John R.	P.C.	Hamilton Mountain	42 Sunninghill Ave., Hamilton
Smith, Richard S.	L.	Nipissing	676 McIntyre St. W., North Bay
Snow, James W.	P.C.	Halton East	589 Argus Rd., Oakville
Sopha, Elmer W.	L.	Sudbury	Box 1206, Sudbury
Spence, John P.	L.	Kent	Muirkirk
Stewart, Hon. William A.	P.C.	Middlesex North	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Stokes, J. E.	N.D.	Thunder Bay	Box 62, Schreiber
Trotter, James B.	L.	Parkdale	227 Riverside Dr., Toronto 3
Villeneuve, Osie F.	P.C.	Glengarry	Box 27, Maxville
Welch, Hon. Robert	P.C.	Lincoln	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Wells, Hon. Thomas L.	P.C.	Scarborough North	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
White, John H.	P.C.	London South	119 Base Line Rd., London
Whitney, Norris	P.C.	Prince Edward-Lennox	R.R. #1, Consecon
Winkler, Eric A.	P.C.	Grey South	Hanover
Wishart, Hon. Arthur A.	P.C.	Sault Ste. Marie	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Worton, Harry	L.	Wellington South	15 Queen St., Guelph
Yakabuski, Paul J.	P.C.	Renfrew South	Box 219, Barry's Bay
Yaremko, Hon. John	P.C.	Bellwoods	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Young, Fred	N.D.	Yorkview	717 Woburn Ave., Toronto 12

MEMBERS OF THE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

Hon. John Parmenter Robarts, P.C. Q.C.	*Prime Minister and President of the Council*
Hon. Thomas Ray Connell	*Minister of Public Works*
Hon. Matthew Bulloch Dymond, M.D.	*Minister of Health*
Hon. John Yaremko, Q.C.	*Minister of Social and Family Services*
Hon. Henry Leslie Rowntree, Q.C.	*Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs*
Hon. Allan Grossman	*Minister of Reform Institutions*
Hon. William Atcheson Stewart	*Minister of Agriculture and Food*
Hon. Charles Steel MacNaughton	*Treasurer*
Hon. Irwin Haskett	*Minister of Transport*
Hon. James Alexander Charles Auld	*Minister of Tourism and Information*
Hon. William Grenville Davis, Q.C.	*Minister of Education, and Minister of University Affairs*
Hon. John Richard Simonett	*Minister of Energy and Resources Management*
Hon. Stanley John Randall	*Minister of Economics and Development*
Hon. Arthur Allison Wishart, Q.C.	*Minister of Justice and Attorney General*
Hon. George Ellis Gomme	*Minister of Highways*
Hon. Rene Brunelle	*Minister of Lands and Forests*
Hon. Dalton Arthur Bales, Q.C.	*Minister of Labour*
Hon. Robert Stanley Welch, Q.C.	*Provincial Secretary and Minister of Citizenship*
Hon. Thomas Leonard Wells	*Minister without Portfolio*
Hon. William Darcy McKeough	*Minister of Municipal Affairs*
Hon. Fernand Guindon	*Minister without Portfolio*
Hon. Allan F. Lawrence	*Minister of Mines*



No. 10



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

First Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Wednesday, February 28, 1968

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1968

5

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Wednesday, February 28, 1968

Presenting report, Mr. Welch 285

Municipal Act, bill to amend, Mr. McKeough, first reading 285

Farm Products Marketing Act, bill to amend, Mr. Stewart, first reading 285

Hunter Damage Compensation Act, 1962-1963, bill to amend, Mr. Stewart, first reading 286

Consolidated Cheese Factories Act, bill to repeal, Mr. Stewart, first reading 286

Seed Grain Subsidy Act, bill to repeal, Mr. Stewart, first reading 286

Fruit Packing Act, bill to repeal, Mr. Stewart, first reading 286

Highway Traffic Act, bill to amend, Mr. W. Newman, first reading 286

Questions to Mr. Davis re the Ontario College of Art, Mr. Nixon, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Pitman 288

Statement re the new freeway between Sarnia and London, Mr. Gomme 290

Questions to Mr. Davis re superannuated teachers, Mr. Lewis 290

Questions to Mr. Davis re appointment with representatives of school boards and councils, Mr. T. Reid 290

Questions to Mr. Davis re bursary assistance to university students from other provinces, Mr. T. Reid 292

Question to Mr. McKeough re grant incentives to municipalities, Mr. Pitman 293

Questions to Mr. Bales re the construction safety association, Mr. De Monte 294

Question to Mr. Davis re T4 slips to teachers, Mr. Deacon 295

Question to Mr. Welch re the Municipal Bankers' Corporation (1931) Ltd., Mr. Deacon 295

Question to Mr. Davis re grants for retarded children, Mr. Haggerty 296

Question to Mr. Stewart re import of chicken broilers from Quebec, Mr. Good 296

Questions to Mr. Robarts re submissions of briefs on Smith committee recommendations, Mr. Jackson 296

Question to Mr. Bales re labour-management disputes, Mr. Stokes 297

Question to Mr. Gomme re road grants, Mr. Burr 297

Questions to Mr. Dymond re Detroit incinerator opposite Windsor, Mr. B. Newman 297

Question to Mr. Wishart re shortage of assistant Crown attorneys, Mr. B. Newman 298

Questions to Mr. Wishart re facilities for the detention of juveniles, Mr. B. Newman 298

Questions to Mr. Wishart re a central registry for liens against automobiles, Mr. Shulman 298

Questions to Mr. Wishart re night inquests, Mr. Shulman 299

Question to Mr. Wishart re coroners' inquests, Mr. Shulman 299

Question to Mr. Dymond re OMSIP, Mr. Shulman 300

Questions to Mr. Grossman re parole of prisoners, Mr. Shulman 300

Question to Mr. Yaremko re the Big Brother movement, Mr. Lewis 301

Statement re reception to honour the Ontario Olympic athletes, Mr. Robarts 301

Resumption of the debate on the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Robarts, Mr. Deacon, Mr. Deans 302

Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Reilly, agreed to 320

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Wishart, agreed to 320

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 1968

The House met at 2:30 o'clock p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are pleased to welcome as guests to the Legislature today: In the east gallery, students from Bedford Park public school, Toronto, and Dallington Road public school, Toronto; and in the west gallery, students from Beamsville high school, Beamsville, and Richard W. Scott separate school, Toronto; and in Mr. Speaker's gallery we have visitors from the Jewish home for the aged in Toronto.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Hon. R. S. Welch (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present to the House the University of Western Ontario financial statements, June 30, 1967.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Mr. L. M. Reilly moves that the hon. member for Kingston and the Islands (Mr. Apps) be substituted for the hon. member for London South (Mr. White) on the standing committee on education and university affairs.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: Introduction of bills.

THE MUNICIPAL ACT

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Minister of Municipal Affairs) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Municipal Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, this is not, and I can see that my friend from Downsview (Mr. Singer) is concerned, this is not the normal series of amendments to The Municipal Act. This very small amendment arises out of the incorporation, or rather the necessity for the amendment arises, out of the erection of the former township of Toronto into the town of Mississauga.

If I may read the explanatory note: the amendment makes the provisions of sections 17, 19 and 22, respecting matters consequent on the incorporation and erection of municipalities, applicable where a township is erected into a town. These amendments are made effective on the same date as the amendment of the Act in 1966 which permitted the erection of the township into a town.

This was I think perhaps an omission in the original legislation, and I might also say that much of the legislation pertaining to the township of Toronto was private legislation and neither the department nor the township realized that we would get into the position we are now. The situation now is that the solicitors for the purchasers of their debentures are not prepared to certify the debentures without this amendment.

It is my intention, Mr. Speaker, to ask the House to give this a speedy first, second and third reading, and if we can prevail on His Honour for Royal assent sometime next week it will make the good people of the new town of Mississauga most happy.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister would permit a question. Is the province prepared to undertake to reimburse them for the loss in interest because of their negligence?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: If I might answer the question, Mr. Speaker: Assuming the Legislature moves along the course which I have suggested, there will be no loss to the town of Mississauga.

THE FARM PRODUCTS MARKETING ACT

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Farm Products Marketing Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, I might say by way of explanation that this sets up the Ontario apple marketing commission

and provides a separate section for the establishment of that commission.

THE HUNTER DAMAGE COMPENSATION ACT, 1962-1963

Hon. Mr. Stewart moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Hunter Damage Compensation Act, 1962-1963.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, by way of explanation the purpose of the amendment is to establish maximum amounts that may be paid in respect of any kind of livestock and sets out the types and kinds of livestock to which this Act will apply.

It provides as well that under any contracts of insurance an owner of livestock may have he can only collect the value of the animal from one or either or both sources and not collect twice.

THE CONSOLIDATED CHEESE FACTORIES ACT

Hon. Mr. Stewart moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to repeal The Consolidated Cheese Factories Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

THE SEED GRAIN SUBSIDY ACT

Hon. Mr. Stewart moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to repeal The Seed Grain Subsidy Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

THE FRUIT PACKING ACT

Hon. Mr. Stewart moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to repeal The Fruit Packing Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Singer: I wonder if the Minister is going to have any department left to administer at this rate.

THE HIGHWAY TRAFFIC ACT

Mr. W. Newman (Ontario South) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Highway Traffic Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order: Just before you complete introduction of bills I would like your comments on the practice the government has undertaken to introduce legislation without notice. Certainly, the bills that were received today are not in any contentious discussion, but I know that notice is important as far as the work of the Opposition is concerned and I would like you to give me your opinion as to how the application of this rule should be changed perhaps in the future.

Mr. Speaker: I am sure that what the leader of the Opposition has said is quite correct. But in that we are anxious to get at the first of the session, legislation before the committees of the House and while the rules of the House as presently written and as carried out require the normal notice and, of course, a bill cannot be introduced if there is an objection to it if notice has not been given, I would ask the leader of the Opposition to clarify whether this is an objection to the receiving of them or just a comment on the method of proceeding.

Because if it is the former, then of course a certain procedure will follow. It if is the latter, then I would like to say to him that as far as I am concerned I know of no good reason why the government should not follow the rules of the House, and I will endeavour to ensure that we do until they are changed as perhaps they should be.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I can say that I have no objection as far as these particular bills are concerned and yet we see that other Ministers have notices of motion or the intention to introduce bills on the order paper, standing in the name of Mr. Simonett, Mr. Rowntree, Mr. Wishart, and Mr. McKeough who introduced these bills today.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, perhaps I could make a comment. I think the requirement of notice is so that the Opposition will not be faced with a bill in the House that might be well known in all its intricacies to the government but not well known to the Opposition.

In actual fact, in the practice of this House over the years we have left bills on the order paper as long as anybody has asked for them to remain so that they might be studied. It has very seldom been the practice of the House that we call second reading of a bill in anything much less than a week after the bill appears on the order paper or has first reading.

It is then printed and put in the books on the members' desks. So in actual fact, in the practice of the House the requirement for notice really serves no purpose because the bills are not pushed through. We generally accumulate the bills, for instance, before we deal with them in third readings and so the practical result of the rule is not required in this other practice which has grown up.

I remember this used to be a tactic used in previous Legislatures by the then member for Woodbine; if he did not like the bill and there was no notice then he would make some objection when it was introduced. Then, of course, the bill would be held out, the notice would be put on the order paper, and everything would be delayed for 48 hours and we would go through precisely the same routine 48 hours later.

This course of action is open to any member who objects to a bill being introduced without this notice, but in the actual practice of the House I do not think it makes much difference.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Speaker, the member for Ontario South did not indicate the purpose of his bill. I wonder if he might do that?

Mr. Speaker: Would the member give a short statement of the purpose and contents of his bill?

Mr. W. Newman: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. There are two items on the bill to amend The Highway Traffic Act.

The first one is dealing with the car tail-lights. As they are now seen on the highway, they are all red. It is suggested in the amendment to The Highway Traffic Act that we look into it very seriously and bring into this House discussion on the tail-light structure of cars and the changing about of them.

The second part of the bill is to enact legislation to ensure that all motorcycle riders wear crash helments when driving on our roads.

Mr. G. Ben (Humber): Mr. Speaker, on the topic of the bills being introduced without notice, I feel that in this House we are getting too many rules by tradition. We are moving away from written rules and there is more precedent by tradition than one could probably put in all the volumes of the RSOs.

The bills introduced by the Minister are innocuous. They do not introduce anything, they simply repeal what would be called antiquated legislation. But the fact is that there is a principle involved here and that is—are we going to set up a tradition that bills can be introduced without being put on an order paper without first giving notice—and I think this is a very bad precedent to follow.

It is quite true that today we may have spotted these bills being introduced without notice. Sometimes we may not be as alert and I do not accept this method of procedure by which the Prime Minister gets up and says, "well, if anybody can object he is welcome to object and we will hold it over for 48 hours." That to me is not the point. The point is that we have certain rules of procedure, and if anybody should insist that the rules should be followed it is the government who is charged with the responsibility of passing laws.

If it does not expect its laws to be followed or its rules to be followed how does it expect the general public to follow the laws that it passes? To me this is a very important principle and I for one object to the bills being introduced without proper notice.

Interjection by hon. member.

Mr. Speaker: I believe—and I am so advised by the Clerk of the House, who is the authority on these matters in this House—that the objections must be received before the bill is given first reading. These bills all having been given first reading, it is now not within the competence of a member to object and thereby interfere with the course of this bill.

I do feel, however, that the point of the member for Humber is well taken and I say to him as I have said to the leader of the Opposition that as far as I am concerned I will endeavour to persuade the government to give notice of bills. It is always open to every member of the House, including the member for Humber, to be alert and note these bills if in the future they are introduced before notice has been given.

I would also say that the unwritten laws and traditions of the British parliamentary system, whether it be here in Ontario or in Westminster or even in Ottawa, are often more voluminous and much stronger than the written rules and regulations upon which the actions of the House are also founded.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to repeat something that you have said in support of my own contention here.

You have drawn to my attention the ruling that the Clerk has suggested that once the bill is read, the first time, one cannot object. And that is the very weakness in the system, Mr. Speaker, because we do not know what

the bill being introduced is until after it has been read the first time and the hon. Minister gets up and gives a short summary. That is the very weakness in the system.

Mr. Speaker: The member is misconstruing his original submission which was that it was a matter of principle that bills should not be introduced without notice, no matter what was in the bill.

Before the orders of the day I would ask the co-operation of all members and particularly those in the Opposition parties as to the problem which always arises when the question period reaches us. Without your co-operation it is quite impossible for my office to do the job it is supposed to do and for reasonably intelligent and comprehensive answers to be given by the ministries or members concerned.

So I would first say this. It is the right of every member of this House, be he a private member or Minister to ask any other member of the House in his capacity as a member or as a Minister, a question either orally before the orders of the day, in accordance with the rules and traditions which we follow here, or by notices directed to the Clerk. And in due course, those questions of course, will be answered.

Second, I would say this, that our present set-up provides that we, in the Speaker's office, will receive the questions for checking before 12 o'clock noon on the day on which the question is to be asked, except Friday and then by 9.30 on Friday morning.

I think that the members will all realize that by the time those questions are received by me and looked over, and necessary discussions—sometimes in respect to wording—have been carried on with the member's secretary—because very seldom is a member available—then transmitted to the Minister, quite often the Minister is handed the question as he comes into the House. It is also a practice of at least one of the Opposition party offices to send in all their questions at 11.55 a.m. You will realize that this is very bad from the view of the Speaker's office and also, I presume, of the party office concerned, because at 11.55 a.m., with 20 more questions or thereabouts arriving—

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Twenty-five!

Mr. Speaker: —it is almost impossible to deal with the questions as well, as intelligently and as fairly as I would wish to. So I would ask the co-operation of the members of this House in this regard, because if those questions which come in at that hour—unless they are questions which obviously could not earlier have been formulated at that time because the newspaper was not out, or something like that—have to have some amendment to them, I will not receive them for that day; they will be held over for the next day.

So I am sure that with the co-operation from not only Opposition members but from members of the government party who wish to ask questions, this question period will go more smoothly and the answers which the member is looking for will be forthcoming.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, in regard to the questions, may I suggest to you that if the government cannot answer questions, why does it take so long to answer them on the order paper? Sometimes we wait six months to have a question answered. This is ridiculous. If the Minister cannot answer the question, we should be told within a reasonable amount of time, maybe within a week, anyway.

Mr. Speaker: Had the member either been here or had read *Hansard* as it is printed, he would have found that not only is this a new session, it is a new Legislature. I suggested, not only to the Opposition parties, but the government, that this year we would endeavour to have the answers much more quickly; and I think that has been happening. I remember that the Minister of Economics and Development, I think, had five or six questions in one week, and they were back the next week and he was answering them.

So I think the member for Grey-Bruce should perhaps give us another trial period, because as far as I am concerned it has been working very well and the answers are forthcoming much better than perhaps in the past.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Education.

In view of the continuing difficulties at the Ontario College of Art, is the Minister now prepared to offer his services as a mediator hopefully to arrive at a solution to the situation?

Hon. W. G. Davis (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, I think that to suggest that the Minister be mediator is perhaps presuming a greater talent than the Minister possesses. I would say that I met this morning with the representatives from the students at the college—and perhaps this would help answer the question of the member for Scarborough West, Mr. Speaker—for an hour and a half to discuss the situation with them. I think it is fair to state, Mr. Speaker, that from my

standpoint, at least, I thought it was a very constructive meeting and information was made available that certainly I did not know before, and perhaps was not available prior to that time.

Unfortunately, and this fact was made known to the students who were in my office this morning, I was unable to receive their deputation here at 12.30, but I did tell the student representatives—which information I hope was conveyed to the student body at large—that I would go myself to the college late on Friday afternoon, and I have arranged a further meeting with the student representatives later on Monday.

I think, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member appreciates the complexity of this situation and the desirability of bringing it to a speedy solution if possible. I fully recognize the desirability of it.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Minister if he would permit a supplementary question?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I certainly will permit it. I cannot guarantee the hon. member that I will in fact be able to answer it.

Mr. Nixon: That goes without saying, I suppose.

I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if the Minister would now feel that the circumstances would warrant intervention of the Minister in his capacity as a director of the educational system?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, certain suggestions were made by the representatives this morning and I informed them that I would take the suggestions under consideration. I think that implicit in that, Mr. Speaker, is an indication that if possible we shall endeavour to do something about it.

Mr. Nixon: I wonder if the Minister would agree with me that this is a subject that might very well be referred to the standing committee on education for some further investigation, once some immediate solutions are arrived at?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I have a question from the member for Peterborough (Mr. Pitman) in that regard. My answer would be that, at this point in time at least, I would not recommend that it go to the standing committee on education—and I say "at this point in time".

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Mr. Speaker, I have a question similar to that of the leader of the Opposition. I wonder if I could ask a supplementary?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Again, Mr. Speaker, if a supplementary relates to the general discussion, I shall endeavour to answer it.

Mr. Lewis: It relates directly, Mr. Speaker.

While I understand the Minister's reticence, would he not recognize that the summary firing of these two instructors, without any security of tenure, with 34 years of service combined between them, presents the greatest affront to acadmic autonomy in the history of the Minister's tenure, and surely that justifies his intervention.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, of course, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is presuming that prior to this morning I had certain information which I did not have, and he is asking me to come to a conclusion on the basis of certain statements which he is making here today. With great respect, I do not really think this is supplementary to the question that was asked by the leader of the Opposition. I think it was an opportunity for the member for Scarborough West to put his own point of view before the House, which is quite legitimate, but I suggest with respect, Mr. Speaker, the appropriate time to do that would be in the debate on the Throne Speech or perhaps on some more appropriate occasion.

Mr. Speaker: Order. Is the member for Scarborough West satisfied that his question has been answered?

Mr. W. G. Pitman (Peterborough): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask—

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, I want to say to the Minister that if he does not wish to reply to me, he can simply say so, he need not—

Mr. Speaker: Order, order!

The Minister has replied. The member for Peterborough.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Pitman: I wonder if the Minister of Education would agree—in view of the fact that there are deep problems of curriculum and administration involved in this struggle to bringing the principal and those who are involved before the committee?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I think I answered the hon. member when I stated that

at this point in time it would not be my suggestion to have this matter before the committee on education. I think that answer speaks for itself.

Mr. Speaker: The Minister of Highways has a statement.

Hon. G. E. Gomme (Minister of Highways): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I am pleased to announce the proposed route of the first stage of the new freeway to be known as Highway 402 between Sarnia and London. The first stage of this important new artery for southwestern Ontario will extend easterly for 48 miles from Maudlin Road in Sarnia to Highway 22, west of London. Location studies are now in progress to determine a further extension of Highway 402 through the city of London, and an announcement on that will be made following the completion of the studies.

The new freeway will be a four-lane, controlled-access highway, bypassing all towns and villages along the route and it is estimated that it will take approximately one year to complete the preliminary design. It will be designed to modern highway standards, with emphasis on safe operation, aesthetic features and conservation of farm land and scenic areas along the route.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Scarborough West had another question for the Minister of Education.

Mr. Lewis: It is a pleasure to be able to put it, Mr. Speaker, and have it precisely answered.

Would the Minister report on the results of his meeting this morning, which I believe took place, with the delegation from the superannuated teachers of Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is quite correct in suggesting the meeting did take place. It did in fact take place, and at this point I have no further report to make to the Legislature. The moment I have I shall be delighted to do so.

Mr. Lewis: May I ask a supplementary of the Minister?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Of course.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, this is the fifth successive meeting. Does the Minister ever intend to reply to the superannuated teachers of Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member will go back a number of years he will find that we have had delegations from the superannuated women teachers—as I recall the terminology – the "retroactive widows" who sent delegations here for many years. And I think the member will recall that we came up with a solution.

Mr. Lewis: That is the Minister's phrase.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, this is the terminology I think that they used themselves—

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): There is a lot of lousy English spoken in this province.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, Mr. Speaker, I would not want to comment on whether the English spoken in the province as suggested by the member for Sudbury, is good, bad or indifferent, I will leave that completely up to his assessment.

I can only say, Mr. Speaker, that we have had perhaps four or five meetings and it may be, Mr. Speaker, that we will have more meetings.

Mr. Singer: The problem will not go away, because you will not have any left if you have many more meetings.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I do not want to prolong this discussion, but the member for Downsview should appreciate that this does not involve the same group that we were discussing before. There are some 6,000 of these teachers, and as I indicated to the member for Peterborough, we are talking—which I know is not too significant to the member for Downsview—approximately $1.5 million on an annual basis and perhaps a capitalization of $15 or $16 million, which to this government is a fairly significant sum.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Speaker: Order! The member for Scarborough East has the floor.

Mr. T. Reid (Scarborough East): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I have a question for the Minister of Education. Did 120 representatives of 54 school boards and councils from Oxford, Perth, Waterloo, and Elgin counties, make an appointment with the Minister of Education, sir, to present a brief to him regarding the proposed reorganization of school boards on a county basis?

If so, did the Minister agree to receive the brief in Toronto on January 29, 1968? If an

appointment was made, was the Minister in town to keep the appointment?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I always find the question periods enlightening and stimulating. I like to think that the majority of questions really are of an urgent nature and that in most cases the hon. member who asks the question does not know the answer prior to the time he asks it.

I must confess that on this occasion I am somewhat suspicious that not only does the hon. member know the answer to the question, but that if he does not, he only has to ask his colleague, the hon. member for Oxford (Mr. Innes), in order to ascertain the facts. But in that he has asked the question, I feel that it is necessary for me to give an answer.

Perhaps the hon. member is not familiar with the sometimes informal practices here, and I think it is fair to state that the Ministers are always prepared to meet delegations where arrangements have been made by members of the Opposition. This at least has been my practice to the best of my ability.

The member for Oxford, not the members of the delegation, but the member for Oxford phoned the office. And I regret that he is not here because I think that he could very substantially confirm what I am going to say, and I am delighted to know that the member for Scarborough East is so interested in the problems of the member for Oxford. He phoned the office; there was no written communication.

He asked my secretary if I would be prepared to meet with a group from his riding. My secretary informed the member that I would be quite prepared to meet a group. We then discovered that the representation would perhaps extend into Perth county and, I believe, into Waterloo county, and into Elgin.

I point out that at no time was any formal request made by the groups to which the hon. member has referred, the 120 individuals representing the individual boards. It was done on a very informal basis. It was sometime either on Thursday or the Friday prior to the appointment that we were informed it was a larger group.

I believe, and I am only going from memory, that I sent a message to the member for Oxford, or to one of the groups, that because of the size of the delegation I would be very pleased to go to Woodstock or whatever convenient place could be arranged, along with one or two of the officials of the department, to meet with this delegation.

I should point out to the hon. member that they felt they should come anyway, and I was out of town. I regret taking so much time, but obviously the hon. member is interested in all the details, or he would not have asked.

On the Sunday evening I was due to return to the city of Toronto, but due to a matter over which even this government has no control, Malton International airport was completely fogbound. I was confirmed—

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): The federal government—

Hon. Mr. Davis: —on, I believe—

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): They are fogbound all the time.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I forget the exact flight number and the hour, of the Air Canada flight. I was at Kennedy airport, and I was there until nearly midnight, then I had to find accommodation because the planes were not flying.

On the Monday morning, as the hon. member well remembers, the same climatic conditions prevailed. I endeavoured once again to return to this fair city to meet my obligations to this delegation—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I encountered the same type of problem.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Again, I made some effort, and I was able to get on the first flight out of La Guardia airport at some time around 2 o'clock that afternoon. We were informed when we got on that the captain was not sure that we were going to make it to Toronto, but nevertheless we left.

Before I left New York city I informed my secretary and asked that she inform the group —and she did—that once again I would be prepared to go to Woodstock and that I was perhaps not going to meet the commitment I had made. Once again they determined to come and I think that this is understandable.

At about 3.30 p.m., when I had hoped to be able to return, when the hon. member asked if I was in the town, and I assume that he means in the city, I must confess to the hon. member that I was not. But I will say this, that I was 20,000 feet above the city, circling very slowly to see if there was any remote possibility that American Airlines could in some way get into the International airport so that I could meet, with—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I usually travel Air Canada, but this was the first flight, I should tell the hon. members, out of La Guardia or Kennedy airport that day to come back to the city of Toronto.

I must admit that the hon. member might have been more creative. He might have found a way to get from 20,000 feet above; he might have found a way to get down to the ground. I could not, I must be very frank.

Mr. T. Reid: I would need a parachute!

Hon. Mr. Davis: It is very difficult, but the flight then landed in the city of Buffalo and it was necessary to take motor transportation back to the city of Toronto. By the time that I did this, and I must be very honest, the delegation had left, because this was around seven or eight in the evening. But I think it is fair to state that a pretty fair effort was made to meet this commitment.

I want to point out that two of his colleagues were at the meeting, the member for Waterloo North (Mr. Good), I believe, and the member for Perth (Mr. Edighoffer). And I think it is only fair to point out that I did not have any communication from either of those members as to the delegation, or to their intention to attend the meeting.

The day after I arrived home I wrote to all three expressing my regrets and as is the custom with some of the members here in the House, I met with the member for Oxford at the reception. I said to him, "If I can in any way help, or meet with your group again I would be delighted to do so." Just so that hon. members will be completely informed on this matter, I have a letter from the Tavistock school board saying, and I quote:

> Dear Mr. Davis,
>
> We have been informed by Mr. Gordon Innes, MLA, for Oxford—

I will not read all of it, some of it is a little—

> —that you had kindly consented to attend a meeting of school board members and municipal councillors for the surrounding area on Friday, March 8, at 3.30 p.m.

I have made these arrangements, Mr. Speaker, and I intend to be there. The gentleman writing the letter has very kindly invited me to dinner afterwards, and I must confess I am not in a position to give the hon. member an indication as to whether I will have time to attend the dinner afterwards. But I shall be delighted to inform him on some future occasion, when this decision has been made.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to have been answered by the hon. Minister. I am sorry that he was lost in a fog, and he may not have got out of it.

Mr. Speaker, I was wondering if the Minister would allow a supplementary question?

Mr. Speaker: I do not see any need for a supplementary question in view of the answer by the Minister, and I would ask the member to proceed with his other questions.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, if I could, the supplementary question is highly relevant to the question that I put to the Minister.

Mr. Speaker: May I hear it?

Mr. T. Reid: The question is, did the Minister instruct the member of his department who met with this delegation to inform the delegation that regardless of the content of their brief, the change of the county boards would be made as scheduled?

Mr. Speaker: I would like to point out to the member that I will not allow that supplementary question at this time, relevant though it may be. It should be quite obvious that this should have formed part of the original question. The member will proceed with his other question.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Speaker, I have a point of order. I have the greatest respect for you personally and for your office, but I do suggest that it is up to the Minister to decide whether a supplementary question is in order or whether he will answer it.

I do not think that the Speaker should say he will not allow a supplementary question until he hears it.

Mr. Speaker: I heard the question and I have made my ruling; the member will proceed.

Mr. T. Reid: Before the orders of the day, I have a question for the Minister of Education.

In the Speech from the Throne, February 14, 1968, it was stated, and I quote:

> The centennial of Confederation was a turning point in the life of Canada, and therefore the very special responsibility of the people of Ontario and the government of Ontario within our federation became very apparent.

Would the Minister of Education advise why undergraduate students at Ontario universities, from other provinces of the Canadian Confederation, are not eligible to receive

bursary assistance from the government of Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I think this is a more relevant question than the former one asked by the hon. member; I shall try to answer it in the same fashion.

I think that it is not inconsistent with the statement in the Throne Speech and with the position taken by the Prime Minister of Ontario, a position which, I think, has added much to the potential development of this nation. I do not think there is any question about it. I think it is not inconsistent with that position to recognize that our obligations lie basically, nonetheless, with the people who are the residents of the province of Ontario.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is sufficiently aware of the problems we have with the financing of higher education to readily appreciate that we already, as taxpayers and citizens of the province of Ontario—actually I do not like the term "subsidized"—but we invest substantial sums of money in young people who are carrying on their studies in the province of Ontario from other jurisdictions.

Perhaps this figure will come as no surprise to the hon. member, that the anticipated cost per student on a provincial average in the coming academic or fiscal year will come very close to $3,000 per student. As I understand the practices of the several universities of Ontario, there is no extra fee for an out-of-province student, which means they are paying, on the average, about $500 each.

I think this is a rough figure, it could vary to $450 or $550, but it is somewhere in the neighbourhood of $500.

So, it indicates very clearly to the hon. member that the public of Ontario is investing in students who come from outside Ontario, close to $2,400 or $2,500 per student. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, with respect, that this is not only a question of being generous; I think it is a very enlightened approach to assisting the education of students from outside our own province who wish to pursue their higher studies here within our own jurisdiction.

As the hon. member well knows, this is not the practice in many states of the Union, where fees for out-of-state students wishing to attend a state university in particular—and this applies in the state of California and elsewhere, even where they are non-fee-paying institutions—are in many cases substantially higher than those that are paid by in-state students. We have not, Mr. Speaker, in this province, discriminated or in any way differentiated with respect to the monies allocated on the basis of students coming from outside our own jurisdiction. This, just for his own information, is somewhat contrary, I think, to the philosophy expressed by a former member of this House who sat on the front bench; I can recall that on one or two occasions he said to the Minister of Education: "Why are we paying for these out-of-province students at all? Why is the public of Ontario paying?" I think this is a fair assessment, and he had what to him was a very valid point.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that this is a comprehensive answer to the member.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Speaker, I have a relevant supplementary question to put to the Minister, in all honesty.

Suppose, Mr. Speaker, a first-year student coming to an Ontario university from, perhaps, Quebec, signed a pledge that he, upon his graduation, wanted to become a full citizen and a resident of this so-called Province of Opportunity?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I think one could take issue with the phrase—so-called Province of Opportunity. I do not want to become political, I really wonder just what other province he would go to in this great country of ours where he would find greater opportunities.

And Mr. Speaker, I have some hesitancy. This is not really a question, he is putting a hypothetical situation to me which just does not, in fact, exist and I think one should be very careful before becoming involved in either statements or policies whereby you are asking young people to sign a pledge in order to accept funds that they will, in fact, do something.

Mr. Pitman: Mr. Speaker, first may I say how pleased I am not to be asking another question of the Minister of Education. I wonder if I could direct a question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

In view of the difficulties experienced by rural municipalities in planning their development, is the Minister considering any special incentive of grants for the preparation of an official plan either on a township or county level?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, let me first say that I firmly believe that all municipalities, be they rural or urban, must plan, and following that the province must do everything it can to help them develop sound plans for growth and change.

Provincial assistance to date has taken the following forms:

First, the sponsoring of workshops and conferences to stimulate an interest in and better understanding of planning.

Second, the provision of a general planning advisory service to all municipalities. Hundreds, if not thousands, of meetings were held last year by my staff and the community planning branch and representatives of municipalities to discuss general and specific development problems. The Minister, himself, is not immune to these discussions. I have three waiting for me downstairs.

Third, bringing groups of municipalities together to impress on them the advantages of joint municipal action and planning on a larger area basis. Many of the successful joint planning operations including county planning boards have been initiated through direct action of the department. We are now working actively with a number of counties throughout Ontario with a view to establishing strong and effective planning operations within their limits which will greatly assist the smaller rural municipalities in achieving effective growth policies.

Fourth, providing very substantial funds through urban renewal programmes in many municipalities. The studies undertaken through this programme are already extensively used by the municipalities in preparing new plans for overall community development.

Fifth, in several situations we have offered, and in one case, are actually contributing funds for a planning programme on a three-year experimental or pilot basis.

Last, sir, the urban transportation studies undertaken with 75 per cent financial assistance from The Department of Highways of Ontario are most valuable in helping the municipalities to formulate development policies as expressed in their official plans.

We are, of course, actively considering at this time, and at all times, ways of stimulating more and better planning by individual municipalities and groups of individual municipalities. It may well be that we will conclude that provincial funds will have to be provided to reach the level of planning which we must have. We have not yet reached that conclusion.

While I have had a relatively limited time in my present portfolio, I have already come across many situations where planning is not being done and I question very much in any of those cases whether the reason is purely financial. I look forward, of course, to further discussions on this matter and related matters during the course of our estimates and I will be interested in hearing the advice of our friends opposite on this.

Mr. D. M. De Monte (Dovercourt): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the hon. Minister of Labour.

Has the construction safety association any regulatory powers in connection with safety on construction sites?

And I have another question, Mr. Speaker, connected with that.

What was the total grant to the construction safety association in the year 1967, and for what purpose was it used?

Hon. D. A. Bales (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, in reply to the question from the hon member for Dovercourt:

The answer to the first part of his question is "no". And in connection with the second part of the question: The cash grant from the workmen's compensation board was $1,415,500. This money was used for safety education purposes. In addition, the board provided premises and central office services for the association.

Mr. De Monte: Mr. Speaker, will the hon. Minister answer a supplementary question directly connected with the second part of my question?

Was the payment of the premises and the offices supplementary to the $1,415,500?

Hon. Mr. Bales: That was what I indicated in my answer, yes.

Mr. De Monte: I did not get that. Thank you.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): I have a question for the Minister of Mines.

Would the Minister advise the House whether any action, and what action, is being contemplated as a result of the inspection of the INCO coal plant and copper plant on December 18, 1967; and in the second part I would like to change, with the Minister's permission, one word. There has been a misprint, it should be "plant" instead of "mine".

In view of the telegram dated December 17, 1967, one day before the inspection at the INCO coal plant took place, which was sent to me and which reads as follows: "Elie, emergency work being done in coal plant, Copper Cliff. Mining inspectors coming Monday". Can the Minister advise the House whether it is the practice of his department

to send notices of inspection to plants and mines prior to the arrival of mining inspectors?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence (Minister of Mines): Well, Mr. Speaker, at the risk of detracting from the obvious good humour of the House this afternoon, may I appear rather testy and indicate to you, sir, that I think this is another example of an abuse of the question period of this House. If you will remember, sir, last Monday afternoon the hon. member asked me a question in respect of the findings of an investigation at that coal plant on that particular day, and I gave my answer in respect of those findings. Then, as a supplementary question, he asked me the question that he has repeated today. I was slightly irked and indicated to you, sir, that I did not think that was a proper supplementary question, but in any event I would take it as notice.

If the hon. member really is interested in seeking information rather than making a point of view, it should have been obvious to him and to everyone in this House that it would take a few days' effort and investigation by the departmental officials here to find an answer for him. Afterwards he did mention to me that he would send over this telegram to me. I did not receive this from him until late yesterday afternoon in these chambers. Therefore, my department officials did not see the telegram until this morning and here on the question period again, this afternoon, I have exactly the same question.

My answer obviously must be that I am taking this as notice and as soon as I have the information I will give it to him.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Education.

Does the Minister expect that the T4 slips will be mailed to teachers prior to the first week in April, which was last year's mailing date? If not, when does the Minister expect them to be mailed?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I am informed that the first group – not the T4 slips, because they actually come from the boards, but the material that is contained in the T4 slips—was mailed out last Saturday. The balance is going out Friday. If there are a limited number of boards that may be a few days late it will only be because the information has not been received from them or was not received from them in time to be included in the two mailings. But the vast majority went out either last Saturday or the balance will be going out this coming Friday.

Mr. Deacon: Thank you, sir. I have another question, this one for the hon. Provincial Secretary. What action did the Provincial Secretary take with regard to the petition of the bondholders of the Municipal Bankers' Corporation (1931) Limited?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member will recall, he was in my office last November, at which time we discussed that matter once he had expressed his interest in the petitions to which he has made reference.

Following the receipt of some 112 or more petitions, and certain inquiries which I made of the company, I wrote on November 24, 1967 to all the bondholders. In part:

> I am advised that the rights of the bondholders are governed by the trust indenture between the corporation and the trustee for the bondholders under the trust indenture namely the Montreal Trust Company. The company and its president, having received copies of the memorandum of action and petition have expressed to officials of this department their grave concern about the implications in the material sent to you. They have volunteered—and I now convey to you the information given to me by the company, and its president—that the company has every intention of meeting its obligations to you on March 15, 1968, under the deed of trust and mortgage.

And then:

> Your trustee, the Montreal Trust Company, informs me that it is not aware of any event of default on the part of the company and to the best of its knowledge it is the intention of the company to meet its obligations on the maturity of the bonds on March 15, 1968.

That is November 24, 1967, and we have in our file a letter from the Montreal Trust Company of the same date which says much along that line, together with a letter signed to all the bondholders by the president of Municipal Bankers' Corporation.

It is my further understanding that about a month ago the company, Municipal Bankers' Corporation (1931) Limited, in fact wrote to all its bondholders suggesting that they would send in their bonds for redemption. I understand that the majority of the bonds have now been deposited with the trustee, the Montreal Trust Company, and that cheques, in fact, will be mailed out to them, as payment in full, on March 15, 1968.

I trust that this will be some tangible evidence of the interest which our department took upon recipt of petitions to which the hon. member makes reference.

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): Mr. Speaker, I have a question to the hon. Minister of Education.

Has the Minister given any consideration to providing grants for capital expenditures on the same basis that grants are now provided for operational expenditures for retarded children's education programmes in Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Davis: This is a matter which has been discussed, I believe, here on previous occasions, certainly during the last one or two years, in the estimates of the department. Representation has been made by the various retarded children's associations around the province for the government to give consideration to this. Obviously this has been, and is, receiving the attention of the department.

I should also point out to the hon. member that some suggestion has been made that the responsibility for the education of retarded children, which is presently under the jurisdiction of the retarded children's authorities, may be included in the new responsibilities of the county boards of education. This is a suggestion that has also come forward.

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Agriculture and Food.

Does the Minister view with concern a large number of chicken broilers coming into the province of Ontario from Quebec at lower prices?

Secondly, does the Minister think that the present quota and pricing control by the chicken broiler marketing board is causing the backlog of birds in Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, the answer to the first question is an unqualified "yes." We do view with very great concern the large number of chicken broilers that are coming into the province of Ontario.

With regard to the second question, it could be said that the Ontario chicken broiler marketing board have done such a good job in establishing stronger prices for their producers that they have, in effect, created an umbrella under which broilers are flowing into this province from outside jurisdictions. This is a matter of very great concern and, I believe, substantiates the argument that I have used not only in this House, but on the public platform on more than one occasion, which suggests that we should have a national marketing commission for poultry and poultry products.

Mr. D. Jackson (Timiskaming): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister.

Will the Prime Minister extend the March 1 deadline for submission of briefs on the recommendations of the Smith committee for all organizations and individuals?

And, Mr. Speaker, with the Prime Minister's permission, I would like to add a supplementary question at this time.

Will the Prime Minister extend the March 1 deadline as requested by the city of Toronto for municipalities?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to see the hon. member putting all his questions at once, because I am then able to answer and perhaps we will be able to get the question period over in something less than an hour.

When the report of Ontario committee on taxation was made public towards the end of August, the Provincial Treasurer indicated that the government would prepare a white paper which would be the basis of discussion of the government's position in regard to the recommendations contained in that report. Then more recently on January 13 the Provincial Treasurer outlined a timetable to be followed in which we set up certain specific dates. Now it is not our intention, of course, to disregard any brief that might come in subsequent to those dates. We are interested in getting the information. We are interested in getting the position and the benefit of the research done by all those who have interest in what will flow from this report.

On the other hand, if we are to conduct the reforms in our taxation system that we think need to be made, then we must have some finality and some definite indication as to when the discussion stops and the action commences. That is why we set up the timetable we did.

If it proves to be too tight, if it proves to be unworkable for the municipalities and the people concerned, then the whole operation, you will understand, will be delayed as well and it will be longer before we are able to take the action we wish to take. It may be that our timetabling is a little too tight. But we set up these dates in order that there would be some finality to the discussion prior to the action. Our timetables are not completely rigid and, of course, as I say, we want everyone to have an opportunity to make

their views known. At the same time we want those submissions made with a working timetable.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Lakeshore has the floor.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have another question for the hon. Prime Minister.

Does the Prime Minister, sir, intend to reappoint the select committee on company law?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Yes.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Labour.

In a recent speech to the labour relations committee of the industrial contractors' association the Minister is reported to have stated that legislative force will be used if necessary against labour or management in disputes that threaten the public welfare. What action would the Minister take against management if they acted in a manner which is not in the public interest?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Speaker, in reply to the question from the hon. member for Thunder Bay, when I was speaking to the industrial contractors association I referred to the problems that were faced by labour, management and the public at this time and to the studies that are under way to find answers to some of these same problems. I referred particularly to the study, commissioned by the Canadian construction industry with the co-operation of the trade unions, that was undertaken by Mr. Carl Goldenberg and Dr. John Crispo. If I may, Mr. Speaker, I would quote from part of the remarks I made at that time. I said then:

> I am hopeful that we will soon have answers to some of the big problems. But I do not think that the solution will come overnight and government cannot force either side to give way except in those rare cases where the public interest appears to be in serious danger.
>
> But we do have a free political system with universal suffrage and if labour and management clearly endanger the national welfare, or even become a serious public nuisance, then the public may demand that the government use coercive action to remedy the situation. And I can assure you, gentlemen, that the government of Ontario would loathe using coercion against either management or labour but I am sure it will not hesitate if the public interest is seriously threatened. An answer appears to me to lie in more co-operation between management, unions and government and I think this partnership is possible without either management or labour giving up fundamental freedom.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that this will clarify the report of my remarks on that occasion.

Mr. C. G. Pilkey (Oshawa): Mr. Speaker, could I ask the Minister a question on those remarks? I cannot?

Then I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Highways. What formula is being used by The Department of Highways to determine which service clubs may place their signs at an entrance of a town or a city?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Speaker, as the member for Oshawa probably knows, the most important convention of our year is being held downtown, namely, the Ontario good roads association, and this has taken a lot of my time. Through no fault of anyone I received this question just before I came in and I will take it as notice. However, Mr. Speaker, I have the answer to a question that was asked me two or three days ago by the hon. member for Sandwich-Riverside (Mr. Burr). The question: Is the Minister giving favourable consideration to the request of the city of Windsor that provincial subsidies towards the cost of constructing and maintaining pavements be granted for roads with a minimum width of 24 feet where existing and anticipated traffic volumes do not warrant construction of a 28-foot pavement?

The answer is "no". In urban communities 28 feet is considered the minimum width since this is the least that will provide for two lanes of residential traffic and parking on one side of the road between curbs and gutters.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Health. Would the hon. Minister consider sending a representative to the hearing for objections to be held March 5, at 1 p.m. in the city county building in Detroit, sir, concerning the proposed application by Incinerators Incorporation to erect an incinerator on the Detroit River opposite the city of Windsor?

And then, as a supplementary question would the Minister, if answering "yes" to the above question, instruct his representative to voice the objections of the province of Ontario if such an operation would prove

detrimental to the wellbeing of Ontario residents?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, although the province does not have any official standing in a matter of this kind since it comes within federal jurisdiction we will send a representative to the hearing and if there is any possibility that this proposal will be detrimental to the wellbeing of the people of Ontario, objections will be raised and we will ask that we be given time to study the matter and present a brief.

Mr. B. Newman: Thank you. I have a question for the Attorney General.

The Windsor *Star* in its issue of February 23, reported that the Windsor magistrate's court will have the greatest log jam of cases yet, caused by the shortage of assistant Crown attorneys. When does the Minister propose to appoint the necessary permanent assistant Crown attorneys required to keep the wheels of justice turning in the Windsor area?

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I have not seen the article in the Windsor *Star* to which the hon. member refers but I believe it was probably precipitated by what might be called a premature resignation of an assistant Crown attorney who—

Mr. B. Newman: One of the Crown attorneys.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Well, this gentleman resigned and, I understand was off duty, for a few days, but then reconsidered and has returned to his duties and proceedings are going on with the usual staff. I would make appointments when the Crown attorney indicates that he needs assistance.

Mr. B. Newman: Has the hon. Attorney General received no requests for appointments, Mr. Speaker?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Not that I know of.

Mr. B. Newman: Thank you. I have another question for the hon. Attorney General.

Since the government has announced in the Speech from the Throne that the province will assume the costs of the administration of justice, when may we expect the establishment of proper facilities for the detention of juveniles in the Windsor area—the largest area in the province without such facilities?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, I think it was the intention of the government to assume the cost of the administration of justice for those facilities which up to this time have been provided by municipalities. Now it may very well be, and I think we are prepared to admit, that there are facilities lacking in perhaps more than one municipality. These would have to be considered and fitted into a scheme of priorities in the whole matter of the administration of justice.

But I might say to the hon. member that we find, while municipalities were prepared to live with these situations when it was their obligation, now many of them come to the government and say "when are you going to provide these new facilities?" Members can well understand that the government cannot do this overnight—cannot find the means to do it. We shall have to study the whole matter and consider the priorities and then fit it into the whole programme. That is the way I would have to answer the hon. member.

Mr. B. Newman: May I ask the Attorney General a supplementary question?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Yes.

Mr. B. Newman: May I preface it by saying that we do not ask necessarily for new facilities; there may be facilities that can be modified to satisfy the demand for the present time.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I would assure the hon. member that we have a very serious concern and interest in this matter particularly the matter of detention homes to which he has referred but as I say it is a large programme; it is an important programme; it is not one that we can accomplish as quickly as we would like, and there are many requests not only for this type of facility but for new court houses, new registry offices, and so on. It is a matter of studying the needs and fitting them into a system of priorities.

Mr. M. Shulman: (High Park): Mr. Speaker, I have three questions which I submitted to your office Monday and Tuesday for the hon. Attorney General.

The first is—will the Attorney General consider establishing a central registry for liens against cars?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, the House, I think, may be aware that in last year's session, The Personal Property Security Act was passed and received Royal assent on June 15. That Act provided for the establish-

ment of a central registry for all types of personal property including automobilies and motor vehicles which were subject to liens, conditional sale agreements and that sort of thing. This, I think I may say, Mr. Speaker, is the first such Act perhaps in North America. There is an Act in the state of New York, which refers to a central registry, but actually it is nothing more than what we now have, that is a central registry for counties.

Mr. Singer: But the Act now says we have not—

Hon. Mr. Wishart: And this was made very clear—that it takes time to collate, to get the information and work it out. It was contemplated that the Act would have the central registry established as soon as it was possible to bring it into effect.

We contemplated that it might take a couple of years or longer to do this, and I think the members can understand that to record the data and establish the system will take some time.

I might say, Mr. Speaker, that in July of last year, after the Act had been passed, July 17, actually, we sent out to all county and district court clerks in this province, a memorandum relating to this Act and to other Acts which are affected by it. This is a memorandum running something better than four pages. I think it might be helpful to the hon. member if I might send it to him.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, may I ask a supplementary question of the hon. Attorney General.

Can he advise the House when he expects the central registry to be in effect?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: No, Mr. Speaker, I cannot suggest, too closely, a date. I think I might say that our discussions in connection with this matter are going on with other departments of government, particularly The Department of Transport, and you will understand that a computer system would be necessary to bring it into effect.

As we indicated at the time the legislation was passed, this will take a little time.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, in light of the request of the Crown attorney for York county, that inquests requiring the presence of a coroner be held in the evening, what is the explanation for the Toronto coroner's office ceasing night inquests?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. member would allow me to comment on the question, which I think should be worded "requiring the presence of a Crown attorney"—

Mr. Shulman: The hon. Attorney General is quite right.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: —because all inquests have a coroner. So if I may take the question as being worded that way—

An hon. member: Wrong again!

Hon. Mr. Wishart: My understanding is that back in 1964, Mr. Henry Bull, the Crown attorney for Metro Toronto requested that inquests perhaps be held at night so he could make Crown attorneys or assistant Crown attorneys available, and a directive or a suggestion then went out to that effect.

Now, it has been found that in practice it is very inconvenient for jurors and witnesses to attend night inquests and it has been worked out that Crown attorneys are made available in the daytime. There is no rule against holding night inquests, not only in Metro Toronto but across the province, but it is more convenient to everyone concerned apparently to hold them in the daytime and that is the practice that is generally being followed.

Mr. Shulman: Will the Attorney General allow a supplementary question?

Is the Attorney General aware that coroners in Toronto have been instructed that they are not to hold night inquests?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Well, I do not want to admit that is a firm direction. I think the effort is made, as I tried to indicate, not to inconvenience people by bring them out at night, if it can be avoided. There is no hard and fast rule.

Mr. Shulman: Will the Attorney General consider re-instating the rule which was in effect at the Toronto coroner's office until April 7, last year, by which all affected persons were given the right to cross-examine witnesses, in person or through counsel?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, the question refers to the rule in effect in the Toronto coroner's office.

I would first of all point out that the same practice exists throughout the province. There is no distinction between the rest of the province and Metro Toronto. I would say this, that in the holding of inquests, the coroner is the person given a very wide discretion to have all the evidence brought out and to afford a very wide latitude in questioning of

witnesses—usually, and I think rightly, by counsel. It is not a right of a witness attending an inquest to cross examine, but the coroner is given a wide discretion to conduct an inquest in this way.

Further to that I would like to say that I am aware that the Hon. Mr. McRuer in his study on civil rights is giving consideration to the matter of coroners' inquests and I think I have a very good reason to anticipate that when his report is received and tabled here, as I am sure it will be very shortly, he will have some recommendations and comments to make on this very subject, which will guide us in our studies which we are carrying on at this time.

If the hon. member would perhaps be patient to await that, as I am waiting, I think we can work something out which will be very helpful in the matter of coroners' inquests.

Mr. Shulman: Thanks.

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Health.

Is OMSIP using a spot-check system of accounts similar to that now used by PSI to prevent overcharging by doctors or charges for calls that were not made?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, yes.

Mr. Shulman: Thank you.

I have a question for the Minister of Reform Institutions.

Is there any reason why the Minister's department refuses to give reasons for refusal of parole to the family or the elected representative of the refused prisoner?

Hon. Mr Grossman: In answer to the hon. member's question, Mr. Speaker, the information regarding the reasons for the granting or refusal of parole are of a strictly confidential nature. This is the policy of the Ontario parole board. The board advises me that there are good and sufficient reasons for this policy, such as the fact that much of the information has been obtained from confidential sources, and many times from the psychiatric and psychological reports.

In many cases, if this information is known, it could upset the treatment programme on behalf of the inmate. It could militate against his rehabilitation when released and cause family rifts and other matters of a like nature. In other instances, information of this nature may have been obtained from the family doctor, or members of the family itself. It would have the same negative effect on the person's adjustment after release.

Mr. Shulman: Would the Minister allow a supplementary question?

Would the Minister not agree that if the prisoner gives his permission this information could be given in confidence to the elected representative of the prisoner, to ensure that no abuses occur in the parole system?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I do not know, Mr. Speaker, precisely what the hon. member is referring to. If he is suggesting that the prisoner is not at liberty to give the elected representative any information he desires, this is not so. He can tell him anything he likes.

Mr. Shulman: This is not my question. I am referring to the fact that the parole board will not release the information, even when requested by the prisoner and by the elected representative.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Oh, no. Mr. Speaker, there are very many reasons that this could not be done if we are to retain a viable parole board—at least a viable system of parole work. There are many things in the parole report—the report that the parole board has on the inmate—which they would not want even the inmate to see; many things which have been said in many instances by the inmate's own family, which would have a very deleterious effect on the rehabilitation of the inmate.

All this information is of a confidential nature. As a matter of fact, it is so confidential, Mr. Speaker, that the general departmental records do not contain any information from the parole board. The parole board itself keeps its own files, and those files are not available to anyone else in the department. The parole board advises me that it would be the worst thing in the world for the rehabilitation of the inmate if any of this information were given out.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I should add that from time to time there have been members of the Legislature making representations to me on behalf of inmates, asking for parole—these have come from members of all parties here. These letters are directed, without comment, to the parole board.

In some instances, questions have been asked by the hon. members as to why an inmate has not been granted parole. The only information I am able to give them, and some of those who are here can confirm this, is that this is a matter for the board of parole and is completely within their

jurisdiction, and this is information given in confidence to the elected representative:

> That as far as we can see from our files, insofar as his behaviour is concerned, it may very well be that this may have been a factor in the actions of the parole board in refusing parole.

But outside of that, we do not give out any information.

Mr. Shulman: Would the Minister allow another supplementary question?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes.

Mr. Shulman: In the light of the fact, as I understand the information just given, there are no records in the Minister's department of the reasons for the action of the parole board. Is the Minister satisfied with the supervision that his department now has over the parole board?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The only supervision we have over the parole board is to appoint that parole board. I am sure hon. members would agree that the system whereby the Minister and the balance of the department keep themselves at arm's length from the parole board is a very good one.

The reason is, of course, very obvious. This is what is carried on in every jurisdiction we know because there could be political influence applied to the parole board.

Mr. Lewis: Suppose the parole board abuses this privilege? What then?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: If we found out that the parole board abuses this privilege then we would—

Mr. Shulman: But how can the Minister find out if his records do not contain the information?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: There are ways of finding these things out; it would soon come to public attention—

Mr. Shulman: But it cannot come to public attention because the Minister will not answer our letters of inquiry.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —through the representatives. Let the hon. member give me a chance.

The representatives in this House receive letters from inmates, I am sure, by the dozens. If there is any particular case they wish to bring to the attention of the parole board through the Minister here I would be glad to answer. I would bring to the attention of the parole board the complaint which was made and find out what justification there is for the complaint, or otherwise.

Now, if the hon. member has any particular case in mind, I would be very pleased to look at it, ask the parole board its advice in this respect, what their answer to it is, and give it to the hon. member—perhaps through a confidential letter, but still not divulging any of the confidential matter within the files of the board. I do not think this could be done.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of—

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the member will allow the member for High Park to complete his questions. I have another question from him.

Mr Shulman: Sir, the question has been reworded. It will be submitted tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Scarborough West.

Mr. Lewis: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Minister of Social and Family Services will know that the Big Brothers association for Ontario has advanced to members of the Legislature the argument that they should be eligible for government subsidy as a preventive counselling service under section 6, subsection 2, clause (c) of The Child Welfare Act and the appropriate parallel items of the regulations. Would the Minister please comment on his department's position?

Hon. J. Yaremko (Minister of Social and Family Services): Mr. Speaker, I will read for the hon. member, who evidently has not had the opportunity of doing so, the relevant section of The Child Welfare Act, Statutes of Ontario, 1965, chapter 14, and section 6, (1) (2), which reads as follows:

> Every children's aid society shall be operated for the purpose of (c) providing guidance, counselling and other services to families for protecting children or for the prevention of circumstances requiring of the protection of children.

This section is not applicable to agencies other than children's aid societies.

I repeat my earlier remark that I am very sympathetic to the merits of the Big Brother movement, but as I have indicated at the present time I am not in a position to assist them.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day I would like to inform the

House that tomorrow evening the province will be holding a reception and dinner to honour the Ontario Olympic athletes, among whom, of course, will be Miss Nancy Greene. No doubt on that occasion there will be opportunities to make some few appropriate remarks concerning this young lady and her particular prowess in these games, and also the participation of the other athletes from Ontario who took part. At that time the province will present a cheque for $1,000 to Miss Greene which will be used for our national ski team. The reception and dinner will be held in the Dominion room, I think it is called, in the Toronto-Dominion centre.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The first order, resuming the debate on the amendment to the amendment to the motion for an address in reply to the speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor at the opening of the session.

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I have just one other topic I want to deal with before completing my remarks in this particular debate. There are a good many other things that will be dealt with in the course of the debates in this House. I have not by any means exhausted all the subjects I could speak about, but I think I will save some remarks which are more particularly concerned with budgetary matters for that debate.

I would like to speak for a few moments concerning some of the problems the government faces in the area of organization as we seek to deal with a very rapidly developing and a rapidly changing society. This matter has been discussed here on previous occasions. There have been some very good contributions made by the members of the Opposition and these have been given due consideration by the government. Last year I announced certain things that we were doing, certain plans that we had; some of these have been changed and I would like very briefly to deal with this subject this afternoon.

Necessarily, in the affairs of man, the government must deal very often with specific issues and particular problems—places to live, prices, laws which protect us from injustices; there are a thousand-and-one specific things with which we must deal. Also it becomes increasingly apparent that it is necessary for government to consider the lives of our people in the context of the whole. We must adopt certain concepts and certain procedures which will permit us to deal with, and consider the effect of, decisions taken in one sphere that may have effect on all spheres of activity in the lives of our people.

We in government today find ourselves in a virtual maze of interrelated decisions—and I think this is true of any government you wish to look at in any part of the world. We are confronted by multiple demands and by many complex considerations. We have discussed this in the House on other occasions, in terms of the vertical organization of government, in departments, and the increasing characteristic of our problems to be horizontal in nature.

I think one of the most glaring examples of what I am speaking about is, when we moved in—if I may put it that way—on the Indian problem and established an interdepartmental committee in order to deal with some of the problems of our Indian population. This matter in its specifics will be dealt with later by the Minister of Social and Family Services (Mr. Yaremko). But I use it as an example because when we finally arranged that interdepartmental committee we found we had ten departments of government represented on it.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): That committee has been working for two years.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: It has been working for two years; it has been in constant—

I did not wish to be drawn into the particulars, I used this simply as an illustration of what I was speaking about. There will be a place in the debates and discussions in this House where we will go into it in some detail. We think that we have done a very great deal in this area, and perhaps it will be necessary to point out where the difficulties have arisen and why we have been blocked in doing what we set out to do and what we want to do.

Mr. Nixon: It does not seem to have accomplished much.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Well, there has been a good deal that has been accomplished but I will agree with the hon. leader of the Opposition that not nearly as much has been accomplished as we would have wished. And there are some very sound reasons for this which will, as I say, in due course be put before this House.

Mr. Nixon: I can guess what you think those reasons are.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: It is not a question of what I think they are, it is a question of what I know them to be. And I think we will be able to put this forward in such a way—mind you, I realize my hon. friend is always an apologist for his friends in Ottawa, but someday he may think of Ontario first and the federal government second.

Mr. Nixon: You are ready to shift the blame to them.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: However, Mr. Speaker, it is not my intent to get into the particulars of this subject, although I am quite prepared to have these depicted as a nice shining example and you will in due course see what we have done.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): The Premier is in trouble all over, anyway.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Well Mr. Speaker, let me go on.

I would say that one of the major problems of the great maze of inter-relationships that face us today is the fact that we must always remember the government is dealing with individuals; individuals who have different expectations; who have changing values; who have varying requirements; who have varying capabilities and varying ambitions and desires as to what they may ultimately ask for from their society and from their government.

In a young and growing province such as we have here in Ontario, we have a very rapid rate of growth in the requirements for government services and a very rapid rate of growth in the need for social capital.

I think we must also recognize, in trying to approach these problems, that the more affluent the society, the more advanced it is, the more progressive, the greater are the burdens for public investment and public expenditure. Economic advances, as we strive to attain them and as we wish for them in order to provide meaningful occupations for our people, bring social costs as well as social benefits—and I am referring to such social costs as those of pollution, both air and water, directly related to our industrial and economic growth and development. I am referring to the suggestion that is developing in our province. I am referring to the ever-increasing and expanding need for more and more expensive and complicated transportation systems. These are some of the social costs.

Now, there are many social benefits that occur too. Governments are faced with the prospect of meeting these social costs. They are also faced with the prospect of meeting the cost of providing the social benefits. And I am speaking of social benefits in terms of educational systems, universities, hospitals, all the realms of culture and things of that nature. Our young must be educated, of course. Transportation must be broadened and deepened and expanded. Our communities must be developed, much more than they have been in the past. Our rural communities must be fortified in the positions they hold in the total of our province.

At the same time as all these things are going on, any government that has the interest of the people at heart, is looking for qualitative improvement as well as quantitative improvement. We do not just need, Mr. Speaker, more schools; we need better schools. We do not just need more transportation; we need more efficient transportation; not just bigger cities but better planned cities.

Mr. Sargent: Take away the frills and cut the cost down.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: The hon. member had better tell his leader about keeping the cost down. Not just agricultural renewal; we need the preservation of a rich and attractive countryside. There is more to this whole agricultural problem than just simply maintaining a viable and prosperous agricultural industry.

All these things must command the attention of government. All of them must be taken into consideration as we plan and the real issues, the basic issues that face us in operating the government today, first: in what manner the government can contribute to the social and economic development of our people more efficiently. What are the most efficient methods that we can devise for contributing to social and economical development?

Second: the manner in which the government can provide social capital to create an environment in which the private segments of the economy will contribute most effectively to the creation of economic wealth. Embodied in that statement, of course, is the philosophy I outlined yesterday in this House, that has been followed by the Progressive Conservative Party in 50 of the last 68 years, in which it has guided the destinies of this province and its people, in which we have spent social capital in areas that would provide the private portion of our economy to

grow, to develop and produce the wealth that eventually is turned into taxes and returned to our people in the form of social benefits.

The third real issue involved is the extent to which the outlays of government money—which government, of course, collects from the people—the extent to which these outlays return real returns in the community around us. This means that the government must look at its budgets as a reflection of its policies and programmes. We cannot consider just the most effective form of expenditure in any one field; we must really put together the most effective set of balanced expenditures covering a whole area. In a word, we must adopt priorities. This word has been—

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): He gets the point.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: That is the point. I am explaining this very carefully for the benefit of the hon. member and others like him who want to understand the basic philosophies of this government. We are laying before them the basic approach we are taking as the government of this province; policies that we are certain will be acceptable to people of this province for 50 more years, in the next 68 years, as they have been in 50 of the last 68 years.

Mr. Nixon: That is what the rule of perpetuity is all about.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: That is a non-lawyer, Mr. Speaker, making that comment.

However, I would say that we must decide on the most effective order and the most effective degree of expenditures. That is a refinement of the idea of priorities. It is not just as simple as establishing priorities because there are priorities within priorities, but the point remains and the point I am making—

Mr. Singer: Why does not the Prime Minister just say he is going to cut down?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I am not going to say I am going to cut down on anything.

Mr. Nixon: No, the Premier advocates bigger deficits.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I am just trying to educate the leader of the Opposition in some true—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: It is difficult but we persevere and we try.

I will tell members one thing—we must really be quite certain of, in the opinion of this government and in the opinion of men on this side of the House; we must make sure that we have looked after the production of wealth before we start finding out means of distributing it.

Mr. Louis Rasminsky in a recent speech, I believe, which he delivered in Winnipeg, stated he felt that this was one of the major problems in this country. We are so anxious to develop means of spending money that we are distributing our wealth very rapidly before we have taken the time and put the effort into the actual creation of it. With Mr. Rasminsky's remarks I find myself in perfect agreement. I think some of the programmes that have been advanced in the long run are right and proper and will be needed and will be meaningful for our country—we cannot, however, go too fast. Perhaps it takes a Progressive Conservative government to put the brakes on occasionally to make sure that our expenditures are directed in some of those areas which will produce wealth. When the wealth is produced, of course, it will be the fuction of society to ensure that it is properly and evenly distributed among all our people.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Well, sir, I would like to say to the hon. member that interrelated processes are involved. We need a very fine degree of policy co-ordination between departments and between programmes and a sound procedure for administrative co-ordination to ensure that policies are carried out most effectively.

The great challenge today, of course, is the challenge of harnessing scientific technology to social and political institutions so that we achieve direction and order in our affairs. Now what I am in fact saying here is, that we must apply, in the functions of government and in the development of policies, the most recent methods of scientific control that have been developed in other areas, particularly in the field of business and in our major corporations. We must develop these techniques and apply them to government if we are to achieve the type of direction and type of order in government affairs to which I have referred.

We have experts, I am happy to inform the House, in many disciplines within the civil service. We have been working on some of the programmes and developing these ideas for some time and we have people in the civil service of whom we can be justly

proud, who are quite competent and quite able to build the organizational apparatus to bring all the efforts of government, both administrative and policy-making, into a workable system or organization and administration.

To contribute to the process of policy development, policy co-ordination and policy consistency we have consolidated two of the Cabinet committees which I described last year. A year ago I made a report to the House on matters similar to those I am discussing today. Although we have proceeded some distance in the past 12 years, we have combined the Cabinet committees on economics and finance and the Cabinet committee on regional development into a single Cabinet committee on policy development because we found that in fact these two Cabinet committees were functioning so close together that they might well be combined into one Cabinet committee on policy development which will be concerend with the full range of policy matters in the government.

In the meantime, our reorganization of The Treasury Department will result in the creation of a department of finance and economics; in other words, The Treasury Department as we know it now will disappear and there will be created a department of finance and economics and a department of provincial revenue. The department of finance and economics will ensure effective planning, co-ordination and development so far as economic, fiscal, financial, taxation and intergovernmental policies are concerned you cannot deal with any one of these subjects in isolation.

With the Treasury board secretariat and its responsibilities for financial and administrative efficiency—because primarily, the Treasury board is designed to ensure that the administration of government stays within the policies and the monies voted by this Legislature—so that with its responsibilities this new department will greatly strengthen, in our opinion, the whole structure of government administration as it presently exists.

The Treasury board's secretariat has introduced techniques of programme budgeting, five-year budget forecasting which will assist the department of finance and economics and will assist the Cabinet committee on policy development in their functions of long-range planning throughout our province.

The secretariat of the Treasury board is also a source of advice on computer technology, on organizational structure and operating methods and systems. I would point out to the House that somebody suggested in one of the debates of the last few days that we needed an outside firm of management consultants to come in and look at government.

I would be very happy, not on this occasion, because it will take some considerable time, to show the hon. leader of the Opposition and any other members of this House—and perhaps it will be the subject of another speech on another occasion—that we have a very active functioning operation-in-methods organization which now serves this purpose for every department of government. It operates under the Treasury board's secretariat.

The Treasury board is charged with the efficiency of seeing that the administration in the departments does, in fact, carry out government policy; that they do, in fact, stay within the budget requirements as the money is voted in this House. Of course, they are very close to the operation of the departments and are, I think, completely competent to advise any department on its internal organization.

Mr. Sargent: Can the Premier answer a question?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Yes.

Mr. Sargent: In the area of big business they find it worthwhile to bring efficiency experts in, so why do you think the government should not have the same treatment?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, I have just explained that we think the government organization at the moment is such a size that we maintain as part of the government an organization providing exactly this function on a cost day-to-day basis.

In other words, rather than taking a specific instance and going out and hiring somebody and bringing them in we have our own group of men who are completely skilled in this work

Mr. T. Reid (Scarborough East): Will the report be published?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: No, Mr. Speaker, these are all matters of internal government administration.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, I am in no way opposed to outside advice. I think the hon. member has a suspicious mind, Mr.

Speaker. I can be led to no other conclusion because every question he asks—

Mr. Sargent: Who is to know?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Every question he asks and every statement he makes has this overtone of, "somebody is doing something wrong."

Mr. Sargent: How do you know you are not?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: *Honi soit qui mal y pense*, or whatever the expression is.

In any event, Mr. Speaker, I will continue, for the benefit of those who may be interested in the intricacies of governmental administration and organization. As you can well imagine in the operation of the size of this government now, with a budget of over $2 billion and a payroll covering over 50,000 people, computer technology itself is a very important matter that must be dealt with; not in terms of individual departments of government but in terms of the government as a whole in order that we avoid costly duplication of very costly equipment, and also in order that we are able to exact the maximum amount of organizational efficiency from the machines we own.

Now, the department of provincial revenue, will be developed to concentrate on the administration of all tax statutes and to concentrate on the collection of our revenues. This was a basic recommendation of the Smith committee, Mr. Speaker. We believe that our tax administration will be strengthened through the specialized attention of this new department and it will, of course, relieve the present Treasury board and certain personnel there of this particular responsibility.

There are two other matters of major concern; regional development and regional government, and when you start really delving into questions of regional development and regional government you begin to realize the infinite complexity of the tasks that face a modern government.

The term, "regional development," in the first place is a term that is very easily misunderstood because it is basically a concept. It is, in fact, an exercise in policy co-ordination. Now, if you are thinking of particular activities and events it is obvious that regional development is going on all the time, in all regions, in a multitude of ways, all over the province. We could spend weeks here cataloguing acts of industrial development, mining, transportation, tourism, urban growth. These things are occurring all over the province.

But regional development is a great deal more than simply the sum of these total activities which are presently taking place across the province. In a word, the true meaning of regional development is – the development of a plan of attack, a strategy for development, an overall set of regional guidelines established by the provincial government. It is an issue that goes far beyond the sphere of simply collecting statistics. It goes far beyond simply a series of specific examples of what is being done in various areas.

In fact, it is the need for orderly development of the province's resources and the province's wealth and ultimately for the planning of land use in the entire province. To accomplish this objective on a broad, province-wide basis, we require a careful set of plans for each of the ten economic regions of the province so that all our governmental activity and expenditures, wherever it may be, whether in transportation; whether in education; whether in power, water, resource development, are all co-ordinated and directed towards the achievement of specific goals of economic development.

That is the true meaning of regional development, apart from simply what are you going to do here and what are you going to do there. With a budget now in this province of well over $2 billion and no indication that it is ever going to be less, and every indication that it is going to be larger, we must, as a government, place the yardstick of economic development and productivity against all of our expenditures to ensure that we get the greatest returns for the people from whom this money comes.

This means, therefore, we must accept the full implication of planning. I was rather interested in the remarks of the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. McKeough) this afternoon when he answered a question here in the House in regard to planning, and it is not just something that affects our neighbours, because regional development will affect all of us. It implies some restrictions, it will imply greater emphasis on certain areas than on others. How do we want our land to be used? How decentralized we do want our industry to be? How large do we want our cities to be? What balance do we wish between private and public transportation? Where do we stop you from driving your car and force you to use public transportation, for instance? What ratio do we want between

green fields, forests, lakes, rivers, asphalt? Such planning involves difficult decisions, and certainly involves what are going to be some unpopular decisions.

Mr. Sargent: You can say that again.

Mr. Singer: Would you like to divulge these plans?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: This is precisely what I am talking about.

Mr. T. Reid: The Premier has discovered what he meant!

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Well now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member obviously knows I am on to something good because he is trying to debunk it. If he will just listen he will see what we are doing, what our plans are, and then I will—

Mr. Singer: We will hang on your every word.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: —and then I will listen to him in due course.

Mr. T. Reid: Where is the Premier going to dump all his garbage? They are going to kick it around until it gets lost.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, that last remark from the other side indicates the breadth of their thinking in the area of regional development.

Mr. Sargent: We are glad you are here.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Well, apparently the people of the province are glad we are here. Sir, I just have to say to you that we cannot be all things to all men. We certainly have long since given up the idea that we will ever be able to please all members over there. On the other hand no doubt you will produce some ideas that we will find very valuable and that we will be very happy to accept, but we cannot, in developing plans such as we are talking about, be all things to all men. But we are determined that we will produce guideline plans for our regions so that each of the countless public and private decisions which affect our development can have realistic relationships to one another. That may sound like a lot of rather uninspired words but the absolute nub of the whole situation lies right there.

Our whole life in this province is becoming so complex that private decisions and public decisions inevitably affect one another and if we allow them to go on without a proper recognition of what the side effects are, then we are just simply going to go down the road to a form of devolopment that has occurred in other jurisdictions, and which we would like to avoid here.

We are very fortunate in this province that we still have the possibility of control over our total environment—we are very fortunate indeed in this regard. We have control over the physical beauty of a great deal of our landscape; we still have control to make balanced use of the land in the province; we have still power to control the pressure that will be placed upon many of our resources by our increasing population, and there are not too many societies in the modern world today that stilll have, within their own grasp, the powers of control that we have. If we do not exercise these powers, and if we do not exercise our powers wisely, then we will lose control of our total environment.

At the present we have it; to give you an example—and I would never submit to this House that we are doing anything other than taking the first few tentative steps—this is not something that will be accomplished overnight—but I would give you an example of what we can do in the control we are still able to exercise—the study we are doing in the Niagara escarpment on one physical feature of this province which extends from Niagara Falls to Georgian Bay.

It cuts across political boundaries; it cuts across private boundaries; it cuts across economic areas; it will give you in one example some of the enormus difficulties that one faces. But nonetheless, we are determined we will control that as best we can as a unit or as one homogenous element of our environment we are able to control. There will be others.

Mr. Singer: Seeing that you control the Niagara peninsula.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Well, there are great problems, great problems.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, as I said yesterday I do not mind asides but I would much prefer them if I could hear them. Otherwise they are just distracting.

Now, sir, I think that one of the secrets to this too is that we must accept our responsibilities to those who will come after us. To look ahead, of course, is the guarantee that we will benefit from some of the mistakes that have been made in the past and we will also attempt to benefit from the achievements of others. We will do everything in our power

to see that the design for development I mentioned is going to be updated. It was not the be all and end all; we never pretended that it would be.

Mr. Nixon: Has the Premier a new name for it?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Not yet. But one must start some place and that is why I am putting this blueprint before this House today. This is the approach we are following and regardless of the remarks that may come I simply say this—our regional development policy and our provision for planning the environment are very integral parts of the policy of this government. They are very integral parts of our daily concern; they are receiving the attention of a good many people in this government every day.

The question of planning the environment in the way that I have mentioned leads to the question of institutions of government and this is why we are moving in the direction of regional governments. The question of the most suitable type of local and regional governments is intimately related to the whole question of government expenditures because our taxation system is under searching review at the same time, and we are on the brink, I think, of some major developments in changing and modernizing our forms of government in this province because we have the findings of the Smith committee report on the one hand; we have the work that we have been doing in this area on the other; the two will move ahead hand in hand as we seek to make Ontario a better place in which to live.

Regional development, Mr. Speaker, regional government, tax reform, provincial government planning, all these things add up to one set of decisions, born of many minds and even more considerations. We would be delighted to have your comments in due course in these matters because they are in the conceptual stage now, but this is a programme for the next decade. This is something to set our minds to—to see if ten years from now we would be able to put into practice the ideas I am expressing here today.

Mr. Singer: I thought with that great preamble there was going to be something revolutionary.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Well now, Mr. Speaker, we will just go ahead gradually and firmly and in due course you will see what we will have accomplished. I gave you a very brief recitation yesterday of some of the accomplishments of this party while it has held the reins of government, none of these things were achieved overnight. All of them started from positions such as I have put forward to you today. Now, be men of faith.

And I must say this, when I—this may be my last opportunity to offer a word of advice to the—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon Mr. Robarts: —well wait till I am finished, before you start clapping; hon. members may make a mistake doing that some day.

This may be my last opportunity to offer a word of advice to the members of the House when some days hence, it comes time to vote on the motion that is before the House, of course we must first deal with the amendments and sub-admendments, and then the amendment, so I am just going to comment on that sub-amendment, and the amendment before I sit down. Perhaps I will have some small influence on some members of this Legislature, in helping them decide on how they are going to dispose of the sub-amendment, and the amendment, and the main motion.

I was reading, well, I was appalled and then I was amused, to read and study the content, if one may refer to it euphemistically as content, of these two amendments. In the first place, Mr. Speaker, there is nothing in either of them that was not—with the possible exception of a foundation tax plan coming from the New Democrats, and it will be discussed in greater detail at a later time—in either of these amendments that was not already passed upon by this province on October 17, last.

It is a complete re-hash of what you told the people of this province—

Mr. Nixon: What about the centennial museum?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: —in October.

Mr. Nixon: The Premier did not give the people a chance to vote on education boundaries.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: —and they just simply swept them away. Now the Opposition is putting it before this Legislature and expects us to vote in favour of an amendment like that.

There is nothing new in it. There is one new thing out of eight or nine points, and frankly, I do not think much of that one

new thing so it is not going to influence me too much.

So here we have in front of this House, exactly what was put before the people of this province on October 17, and rejected by them. How could the hon. leader of the Opposition expect to come in here and expect this House to support amendments which have been rejected so thoroughly by the people of the province?

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: One of these days, we will have the hon. member convinced and we will keep a spot for him—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Sometimes I have felt that he was on the point of crossing the floor, I have felt this about various members over there at one time or another, and maybe some day it will come true. I might say that we are not looking for them, we are all right the way we are, but perhaps as a favour some day, if somebody wished to see the light, we would be happy to make some sort of arrangement.

But I really want to be serious for a moment. The one thing that struck me about these amendments was the pervasive sense of gloom. Everything is wrong; nothing is right. O, ye men of little faith, come and join us on this side of the House, and let us get this province moving.

Mr. Nixon: That was last year's speech.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Let us get it going. All that is contained in these amendments is what is wrong in the province. Why do they not have any pride, some pride in their province and in their people?

Mr. T. Reid: We have been waiting 25 years.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: And in their achievements? I was disappointed that I could not find anything new. I can only say, having thoroughly and completely rejected everything in these amendments in October, I do not see how the House can support either of them. I expect that when the time for voting comes, that the main motion will be unanimously carried.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): Mr. Speaker, as one of the newer members sitting in this Legislature, I have looked at this document with particular interest and studied it carefully, and though I have noticed that I do not have a captive audience by any means on the other side of the House, I am hoping that some of the suggestions that I have will contribute to better government in this province.

At the outset, I may say that as a member of a family of 10 children I have had considerable experience in debate, but under somewhat different rules. I have also noted with interest the way that you manage the affairs and the problems of the House, and I note with interest how you are coping with them. Although you are not in a position to use some of the tools for obtaining order that were available to my father, you certainly are managing quite well.

As the hon. member for Grey-Bruce (Mr. Sargent) said, you are running a pretty tight ship, and I think that he feels that more strongly after the vote last Saturday.

My background includes a business career in Toronto, while living most of my life on the family farm outside the city, where my brother has lived, and has made his livelihood. But my prime interest and attention has been directed to trying to get Canadians to invest in their own country.

To a degree my efforts have been successful, but I have also found through many hard lessons, that the rules of the game need a great deal of changing. And not only do the rules need changing, but the refereeing needs to be improved.

Therefore, I am very pleased to have been assigned a role in a matter of financial affairs, and in order to have more time to devote to this work, I have resigned as an officer and director of the firm with which I have been associated for nearly 30 years, and I have placed my share interest in that firm in a voting trust.

In the last few years, the government has made considerable headway in improving the climate for investment in this country, but not before it was needed. I am pleased to note in this document, that further legislation is planned and proposed for this session. It was a welcome change from the attitude in 1950, when the Provincial Secretary of that time took no other action when a company refused to turn over its books and records to an auditor which the Provincial Secretary had appointed to examine it. They did nothing about it, when that corporation refused to disclose its records to a provincially appointed auditor.

I was therefore very pleased to note that the Provincial Secretary of today (Mr. Welch) did take some steps in connection with 112

petitioners in the case of municipal bankers which I might explain to members.

In that case a company had borrowed a lot of money through bond holders. That was several years ago, when the company got into difficulties, and was unable to pay its interest, the price of its debentures fell. During that period, considerable buying of the debentures took place by the minority shareholders of the company, so that later, the majority of the debentures, as well as the shares, were owned by the same people. So, it was with great consternation that debenture holders found this at a special meeting of debenture holders which was called to approve postponement of interest and of the payment of the principal of the debentures.

And it was through the action, I think, and the interest that the Provincial Secretary took in this matter, that the matter was finally resolved satisfactorily. But it shows a rule that needs to be changed. There was a conflict of interest occurring and it was certainly abusing the rights of this minority.

I will say that I think this document of the select committee on company law, is one of the finest of its kind I have ever read. It does not deal, unfortunately, with an important abuse of the right of minorities that is now possible, and that is in connection with the winding-up of companies, majority owners of which do not have any real intention of ceasing the true business. They are winding it up in order to eliminate the minority interests. There are other means for eliminating minority interests than this, and much fairer means, and means that are more stringent, but I know can be applied under proper, fair conditions in negotiations between majorities and minorities.

I cite a case of abuse, the case of Union Gas Company of Chatham, in taking over its partly-owned subsidiary, United Fuel Company of Hamilton. In that case a 56 per cent interest, in which Union Gas, or rather the 44 per cent interest that Union Gas did not have the right to claim a share of the profits on, was eliminated at about one-tenth of its true value. And I do hope that when the select committee is reconstituted it will close off this abuse of the rights of minorities.

This matter of refereeing is a very important part of any game. You can have the best rules but if the refereeing is not good, the rules are not much use either. The tragedy of Prudential Finance is one which has already been described at sufficient length in this assembly but it is a case where it is quite obvious the refereeing was not up to par. Poor judgment on the part of the commission is apparent but I do not consider that cause for the government to bail out those who lost money as a result of their own poor judgment.

If such a policy is to be adopted, the line-up of persons who have lost money on securities purchased on the basis of prospectuses passed by the Ontario securities commission would not only jam these galleries but all the building here and the grounds around it. Surely we are not developing into a society of individuals so helpless and dependent that we are not willing to accept the cost of our own errors of judgment, whether or not others erred in judgment also.

I remind this Legislature that in the spring of 1964 Atlantic Acceptance Corporation submitted a prospectus to the Ontario securities commisison, and it was repeatedly delayed by the commission. And it was not very long after that time that Atlantic Acceptance collapsed. It did not get its prospectus passed but it also saved, in the judgment that the commission used at that time, many more sad investors in this province.

I emphasize that judgment is all important and therefore I am hopeful that the commission's staff will be strengthened, and strengthened by the use of people experienced in judging securities and the details that are required for the public to know all the facts.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Deacon: After all, it is the facts the public should have in front of them, the proper full facts, and then it is up to them to judge whether or not it is a good risk.

There was a study made during the past year by York University which is very interesting. It is called "The Supply and Demand for Canadian Stocks." And I was really amazed at the results of that study. It shows that the new supply of stock that will be available for Canadians to buy in this country is going to be half the demand by Canadians for new stocks.

In other words, there is such a demand by Canadians for stock in this country that it is double what we have estimated future supply of stocks in the next 20 years will be; the next eight years, I am sorry.

Remember this when people say, "We do not have the resources to buy back our own industry in this country." The additional demand by Canadians will about double the additional supply of Canadian stocks in the next eight years.

It is estimated that Canadians will add $1.3 billion to the stock holdings each year, the supply of good Canadian stocks. If we do not have the opportunity if we do not have the ways and means to invest this money in Canada on a basis which is equally or more attractive than in the United States or abroad, it will go to the United States or abroad. And we all know that in the past year or so a considerable number of our Canadian stockholders have sold Canadian stocks and bought American stocks because they have felt the opportunities there are more attractive.

We in this government have a great responsibility in this regard. Our responsibility is to have or provide in this province a climate that is favourable to the growth of industry. Industry needs the best management brains and that is where our educational resources come into the play. It needs a climate which is not being continually condemned because of its size. One of the basic requirements of an investor is that he is in a position to be able to sell his investment when he needs the money for something else. And unless it is marketable it is not attractive. And unless a company is of a good size, you just do not have a marketable stock.

So if we have good corporate citizens—I particularly ask the members on my left to remember that good corporate citizens are not necessarily just the small ones. We have a lot of large ones and we want to encourage them to become larger and prosper a bit more.

I well remember this matter of investors and of persuading them to do things that we think are desirable. No government regulation is ever going to force investment in one direction or another. It is just like that old mare "Topsy" on our farm; I soon learned that I could lead her to water but I surely could not make her drink.

Municipal affairs has been my prime interest in the field of government for some years and I am particularly pleased to also have this responsibility in Opposition. I hope some day I will have it elsewhere.

From my experience on municipal and county councils, I certainly found it quite evident that municipal officials feel that they are just a branch office of Queen's Park, and this is fine as long as Queen's Park is giving leadership, and leadership that is working in true co-operation with them, leadership that is co-ordinating their efforts and making the best use of the ideas provided from local government.

In municipal government, I think we have a great lesson to learn from private business. A phenomenon of business in the past twenty years has been the franchise operator, IGA, Canadian Tire, Beckers Milk. It is these companies that have been the real stock sensations, the ones that have grown remarkably well.

And what are franchise operations? They are small businesses, owned by small individuals but co-ordinated by head office to the benefit of all. Their success is in pooling their resources, getting better leases. They buy better, they advertise together and in that way they have the advantage of the little fellow with his initiative and ideas and combine it with the co-ordinating power of big companies. It is not the big chains that are going ahead, it is the franchise operator. Surely we have a lesson to learn here in municipal government. The strongest government we have is local government; it is closest to the people.

At the seminar in St. Lawrence hall on Friday last, one of the best-known Canadian authorities on municipal government stated that local councils are functioning more impressively than provincial and federal. And the reason he gave is that the more senior, and therefore the more remote, the government, the less is the sense of responsibility to the electorate.

We are continually hearing this statement that we should centralize to gain efficiency. Gentlemen, this just does not follow. Like business, it does not follow in government. We are here to serve the public and with greater centralization we too often find great bureaucratic domination and inefficiency.

The Department of Municipal Affairs not only has the opportunity but the responsibility to see that local government becomes more effective. It should not increasingly usurp unto itself greater powers, but it should delegate more responsibility and increase sources of revenues to local government.

At the same time, through improved accounting and reporting techniques and through seminars, it must provide local government with general policy objectives, more efficient operating procedures and a means of sharing their knowledge and ideas.

Let us not kid ourselves that all the best ideas come from Queen's Park. Let us have that great fund of knowledge available in local government.

The Department of Municipal Affairs has at least taken some of the first steps necessary to assist local government and thus improve its effectiveness and efficiency. This

study was completed in 1966 by the department, a study on improved accounting procedures and some of the measures recommended have been adopted. But they have not gone far enough.

One of the essental parts of any report is that it is useable, understandable, by the people who need to have it and those people include municipal elected officials. They include municipal administrative people, they include the public, and so much of what we send back to people is just not understandable. A little competition on annual reports in industry has greatly improved the reporting of major corporations. I think we should be doing something in the field of municipal reporting, and perhaps our Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Randall) and the staff that he has been able to produce in the way of public relations and writing things, can help the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. McKeough) in producing improved examples of accounting, and reporting.

In this day of computers, Queen's Park could provide local government with really helpful data. You can give comparative costs of how one municipality is doing its assessment—of what it is costing one municipality for assessment, with another municipality. You can provide all sorts of comparative data on police and fire protection, and in that way point out various areas where improvements can be made because you can see where the best performance is and take advantage of that.

Cost benefit analysis is another technique which should be brought—through seminars—before the local governments of this province. We should do it on a properly planned basis, not on a hit-and-miss basis as we do at the present time. I suggest the best ideas come from the people being affected and the closer we can get to them, the better it is.

The protests we hear about the milk control board in this province are not due to the policy itself, they are due to the way the policy is being implemented. The government does not have a milk control board that is elected by the farmers themselves. They plan to do this in 18 months or two years, but it is now that the farmers want to have representation in the policies of the milk control board.

Ontario housing, in regard to the tenant relationships: I suggest that the hon. Minister could well make use of their tenant councils to find out what the tenants want. I do not think the experts in the department can do the job nearly as well as making use of the people that are actually living in the houses.

With regard to regional government, I strongly support the view of the leader of the Opposition that the government is approaching the problem on a piecemeal basis. Regardless of what the Premier (Mr. Robarts) is saying about the planning that is going on now. Why is the government now taking steps for example, in the field of public health, in setting up regions before they decide what a region is? It is causing great confusion.

In the county of York, for example, they already have a county health unit. Why should they set up a region now that has no similarity—or is probably not going to bear any similarity—to the region that is finally settled on for that area? It seems ridiculous to say it would take time to work out these regional ideas and then to go ahead in one department without taking account of the fact that overall planning is necessary to avoid confusion.

We have the county boards of education that are now being set up and organized, and yet the county has no control over the planning, and one municipality can go ahead full-pelt with the residential development, causing the need for a lot more schools, while another part of the county is holding back. But there is no basis of control at the county level itself. Surely, if we are going to have county boards of education, we should have provision for planning control that coincides with it.

In the area close to Metro Toronto, a major portion of which I am pleased to represent—and which I might add produced the pee wee hockey champions of Canada last Saturday; I had to get that lick in—we have yet another reason for leadership by The Department of Municipal Affairs.

They are now using the same boundaries in this area as were established 50 or 100 years ago and these municipalities are just not in a position to deal with a large modern metropolis like Metro Toronto. Metro Toronto does not want to be bothered dealing with these little muncipalities on its own, either.

As a result of this, last year, this Legislature, in its 27th Parliament, 1966, passed a bill, a clause in Bill 81, which is just as iniquitous as the police bill. This bill gives Metro Toronto the right to dump garbage in an area over which it has no responsibility or accountability. It is very innocently worded here. It is called the planning area of Metro Toronto. But a good portion of it has

no say in who represents them on Metro Toronto, and I suggest that this clause was put in because the department refused to face the need for a reorganization of local government outside the Metro region, so there are responsible units capable of responsible negotiations with Metro in a solution of their mutual problems.

I ask that this undemocratic piece of legislation be withdrawn as soon as possible so that we do not have this clause, which is a disgrace to any democratic Legislature, continuing in force any longer and that we deal with the problem the way it should have been dealt with—a reorganization of local government in that area. The government can do that, I am sure, in co-operation with the municipal leaders, because they are just as anxious to see a solution to their own mutual problems with Metro as anyone else.

There has been considerable discussion in our local press about the ineffectiveness of our present Metro Toronto government and the need for amalgamation and an elected chairman.

A chairman of the $500,000 centennial study and training programme on Metro problems, which reached out to 40 major cities of the world, learned that our Toronto system is indeed the envy of municipal leaders around the world, and is not only very effective, but also has the flexibility required in government of fast growing centres of population. Greater London and greater Paris are endeavouring to reach a pattern closer to Toronto's. Let us not forget that amalgamation which is the alternative to this system would lead in 20 years' time to a city state of an area many times the present size of Toronto and with virtual provincial powers, because in 20 years' time, Toronto, and the surrounding areas will contain over half the population of this province.

Are we not wise to consider carefully the consequences of abandoning the present flexible borough system? One of the features of our present Metro system which does require correction, though, is the power given the Metro chairman of casting a deciding vote. As an appointed official, he should not have any political power. However, I wholeheartedly disagree with the suggestion that he be elected by all the people. The cost and the task of going before an electorate of that size is not even expected of the Prime Minister of this province, nor of the Prime Minister of Canada.

The present system provides an unique and effective way of combining the political power with the administration, and in my view it would be folly to discard it. Removal of the political power of the chairman would correct the democratic principle violated by the present system.

In this matter of housing—providing good housing for the flood of newcomers as well as existing residents in this burgeoning part of the world—is a problem we are all well aware of. I have heard many say that private enterprise has failed and government should now take over, but has private enterprise failed? It is simply, Mr. Speaker, I suggest, that this government has failed. It has so tied the hands of private enterprise that it just cannot do the job private enterprise is capable of doing. To explain this, first, let me say that there are plenty of good, empty houses around today, but they cost $30,000 or more, and that is the same as having Cadillacs and Continentals and Imperials available but who can afford them? In the case of the houses the people who really need them certainly cannot afford this $30,000 to $40,000 price tag. In the southeast corner of Markham township, for example, the houses are listed at $35,000 and are built on building lots that cost $17,000. The cost of land on which to build homes today is 40 to 50 per cent of the total cost instead of 15 to 25 per cent as it used to be until recent years, and municipalities are being forced to offset higher taxes by insisting on a minimum house size far greater than most people need or can afford.

How do we correct the situation? First, we must remove the fear of sharply rising property taxes which usually accompany residential subdivisions by increasing provincial grants in the field of education. Municipal leaders have a responsibility to their existing residents. They have to be sure that they protect them against sharply rising costs in development. But if we increase these grants to all levels where municipalities can approve 800-square-foot homes without fear of a financial crisis similar to that faced by a well known municipality on the east side of Toronto, local councils will not continually delay subdivision agreements and insist on unnecessary and costly conditions in order to protect their existing residents.

The delays and conditions add greatly to subdivision costs in the form of carrying charges and risk factors. The scarcity of lots enable those developers who are fortunate enough to obtain approval to set prices at an absolute maximum for their scarce commodities. Demand is far greater than supply and it should not be so. So although higher

education grants do not mean a lower total of taxes paid, they will reduce building lot scarcity and in turn building lot prices. They will also permit construction of smaller homes that are quite adequate and within the means of those who really need housing.

Another major contributor to the scarcity of building lots and high land prices is the Ontario water resources commission. Although organized over ten years ago it has done pathetically little to provide the integrated programme of water and sewage treatment services that it promised for this province. We know that an $18 million, 48-inch pipeline has been built to the city of London supplying it now with Lake Huron water and that Brampton is getting a major trunk sewer, but surely the record of this commission which was so proudly introduced by the Frost administration as equivalent in the field of water and sewers to the Ontario Hydro in the field of electric power, has been indeed dismal. Oil pipelines on the scale of the Lake Huron pipeline are built in ten months, not ten years, and in the area of a house-hungry Metro Toronto, local wells and sewage treatment plants are still almost all the commission has to show for its efforts.

To begin with, the government should have adopted the recommendations made by the investment community when it announced the OWRC many years ago at its inception. It should do its own borrowing backed by the guarantee of the province in the same way as the Hydro. It has a service to sell and with that it has its own credit base and it can greatly expand its scope of financial resources if it does follow this plan. In co-operation with The Department of Municipal Affairs it could then develop regional plans in broad outline to direct development into areas that are considered perhaps unsuitable for agricultural development, but are particularly attractive for residential development—such areas as the Caledon Hills and the Dagmar Hills.

Would it not be a boon to farmers and other rural dwellers to see an end to the lowering of their water tables in these areas around Toronto served by municipal water wells? These municipal wells are not only lowering the water table and drying up creeks, but they are also not satisfying a demand—Richmond Hill and other areas are continually having to search for new sources of water and finding great difficulty and they are having to impose water restrictions. The Ontario water resources commission has so far failed to play the major role in solving the water and sewage needs of our areas, particularly those where we need new housing, and this government knows that lesson well, for it took it 14 years to come to some agreement near Malvern over nothing more than service agreement with the municipality for water and sewage, and it is certainly in no position to say that private enterprise has failed in providing housing. Certainly the Malvern experience is about the worst of any.

The third contributor to high building prices around Metro is the lack of ready commuter access from the suburbs and beyond. The Don Valley parkway and the Highway 401 widening have helped but the problem is becoming increasingly acute, not better. The government deserves great credit for working out GO transit but why leave it to the lakeshore? Only those down along the lake and those who have reasonable access to those stations there have any opportunity to take advantage of it. It is now satisfying 15,000 people a day but I am sure it could quickly satisfy double that number if it were instituted to the northeast, the northwest, the north, where 42 per cent of the people have moved into in the last ten years in the development of this city and where they continually are going to want to move.

The Don Valley parkway is now frequently jammed in morning rush hours from York Mills Road to Bloor Street viaduct, causing not only delay but great air pollution and danger to the motorists. We have a remarkable network of railways and an even more remarkable lack of use of them when compared with similar facilities in London, England. Why the delay in expanding GO transit? If those who value the wide-open spaces and yet work in the city can commute easily, the desirability of housing in areas far removed from Metro Toronto would be increased. GO transit can reduce the demand pushing up land prices here and help preserve the green belt which would be desirable around Metro Toronto. It could have additional benefits, because scientific research has indicated possible serious dangers in increasing residential density through construction of a major proportion of high rise apartments. High rise apartments are not the panacea to the ills of housing in big cities and big metropolitan areas.

To summarize my recommendations on the housing crisis, I suggest three important steps that must be taken:

First of all, we must reduce the resistance to low-cost residential developments on the part of local government by higher educational grants.

Second, we must produce water pipelines and sewage treatment facilities to areas where residential development is desirable and do it on a regional rather than a municipal basis by a revitalized Ontario water resources commission.

Third, we must immediately provide GO transit facilities to all localities now served by rail within a 40-mile radius of this city.

Implementation of these steps would place the supply of building lots in this area well in excess of demand and would quickly bring about a correction in land prices; and the home-buyer would at least know that a far greater proportion of the money he is paying for houses is going toward the essential services and not reimbursing developers for needless carrying and other costs.

The financial resources of government can be far more effectively employed in untying the hands of private enterprise than in buying land for a repetition of the Malvern disgrace.

I express my support for the government's proposal to advance the availability and use of the French language in this province. I am glad its programme for instruction includes courses available for members of this Legislature.

Je ne parle pas bien, ni comprend pas bien la langue française.

I have many stories that I can tell about that, but I will never forget that my understanding of the word "tout droit" in my French classes in high school was "all right" —keep to the right. But "tout droit" does not mean that—

Mr. J. H. White (London South): A la gauche pour les Liberals.

Mr. Deacon: I found that to my embarrassment one day when I asked directions to a certain place.

As far as teaching methods are concerned, the other night there was a meeting in my home and several people I had asked—and they were not just Liberals—I wanted to get an opinion of the community as to what they thought of interest in the Throne debate, and what should be the Throne Speech, and what comments they would make. They were quite interested in this matter of French and the way it could be taught in a more interesting manner.

One man came up with a suggestion that we ask Quebec to send us 2,000 high school students of the opposite sex to work with us in teaching us the language. And those of us who have spent any time on the ski tows of Quebec will certainly verify the fact that you learn a lot more with someone who is interesting and lively than we do in an ordinary classroom, and I hope the government will keep this in mind in adopting the teaching methods.

An hon. member: But you do not have to know the language.

Mr. Deacon: In summary, this government must do its share to improve the climate for investment in this province. It must increase the means available for the protection of minority shareholders, the small investors. With increasing competence of the Ontario securities commission in ferreting out deliberate ambiguity and misleading statements we can be assured that the maxim of the free market—let the buyer beware—can continue to reign without fear of more fiascos of misrepresentation such as that of the Prudential Finance.

The climate for investment must be favourable in order that securities can be readily marketable, and a basic requirement is that a company must be of substantial size. So continually attacking corporations because of bigness is defeating our objective. I am as ready as anyone in this House, and I have done it plenty of times in the past, to attack poor corporate citizens. But the freedom for individual initiative, the high standard of living of our free enterprise system is to be cherished, not irresponsibly attacked.

By using the franchise approach we can place the power at the public level. This is where accountability should be because it is here that government meets the man in the street.

Let us use all the remarkable new techniques of business to advance local government to a high degree of effectiveness, then our people can continue to feel they are in touch with government operations and decisions.

The Department of Municipal Affairs must not abdicate its role of leadership in updating municipal organizations and boundaries on a provincewide basis.

It should not be just doing Ottawa-Carleton; it should be studying and working on a simultaneous basis all across the province, otherwise a continuation of introducing legislation similar to that clause in Bill 81 that I described will cause further distortion of the power pattern of our developing cities.

In housing, let us have 800 square-foot homes and green belts around our cities. We can do it by alleviating the education burden

now carried by the local property owner, by revitalizing the Ontario water resources commission on a self-financing programme of servicing new areas around the big cities and by expanding GO transit into all the areas within commuting distance of big cities.

It is the cosy home, not an overcrowded slum or a concentrated high rise development, that is the basis for a mentally and physically healthy population. Tomorrow challenges today.

We cannot stop forward pressures. We must continually remind ourselves that what is right today is not necessarily right tomorrow. We must never sit back in our chairs and say we have got the answer. Businesses which do this die and so should governments. The answers, like the problems, are always changing. We have an exciting future in this province and in Canada but only if we approach it with an open mind and instruments of government flexible enough to respond to the challenge of change.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Mr. Speaker, I wish first of all to express what a great privilege it is to be here in this House representing the riding of Wentworth.

In order that all are aware of the importance of this riding I would point out that it acts as the southeastern shield to the city of Hamilton and does, in fact, provide for the metropolitan Hamilton area the only means of expansion. Within the confines of the riding of Wentworth lie the townships of Binbrook, Glanford and Saltfleet, the town of Stoney Creek and the fairly sizeable portion of the city of Hamilton. This, I hope, explains my interest in the farm community and the questions I asked last week about the difficulties confronting the cherry growers of my area.

It brings to mind the few moments I spent on a television programme with one of the hon. members from the government's side. When I was discussing this particular problem he said, "Oh it is only 20 farmers, I do not know what he is complaining about," and this comes from a gentleman who states that the government is concerned about the welfare of the individual.

It also explains, I hope, my concern for the development on the Saltfleet mountain, the satellite city that has been proposed by the government within the past six months. I am sure that with this very brief sketch of the area, you will understand that this riding is the place to be contended with. A place that surely must provide a place for the citizens of the area to grow.

Mr. Speaker, today I witnessed an event which quite frankly disturbs me. Today I stood on the steps of this building and I viewed a demonstration which need not have occurred. I viewed a delegation of students from the Ontario College of Art being forced to demonstrate in order to achieve some measure of democracy; democracy to which this government has long given lip service. The crux of the matter is that two of the faculty with a combined service of some 34 years have been fired. Aba Bayefsky's and Eric Freifeld's services were terminated. And I ask you why? Why, because it is alleged that they indulged in public denunciation of the principal of the college. You might note it is alleged that they did, but they were fired just the same.

While we would agree that the direct intervention of government in a dispute of this kind is regrettable, there are some situations so grievous that not to intervene is to abdicate responsibility.

In this case, it requires more than a ministerial mediator to act between factions. It takes an expression from the Minister of minimum policy guidelines to uphold democratic practices and secondary institutions. Some of the facts that lead me to this conclusion are as follows:

The council of this college, the original five members of which were appointed by the Minister under statute, and thereafter empowered to perpetuate for themselves an entire democratic structure, are by virtue of this appointment responsible to the Legislature and the Minister. He must therefore assume some major responsibility for their actions. The entire history of OCA has been one of non-student and in fact non-faculty participation in all college matters.

As long as the Minister is prepared to tolerate this anti-democratic condition, in all his post-secondary institutions, he is inviting trouble. This situation is not isolated. In fact it is true in most campuses in Ontario. And I would suggest that we keep in mind the travesty of The University of Western Ontario Act last year.

Mr. Speaker, the firing of these two men is an assault on academic autonomy. The lack of tenure, which is not isolated, is deplorable. Without notice, without grounds and, I suspect, without consultation, these men were fired—a total violation of any sense of natural justice.

The New Democratic Party considers this a major issue and we will not rest until the entire structure is revamped to ensure faculty and student rights.

During the past days I have listened and enjoyed greatly the remarks of many of my colleagues in the House as they expressed their desires and beliefs. But I feel quite frankly that I would be neglectful of my duties if I allowed the remarks of the hon. member for Hamilton Mountain (Mr. J. R. Smith) to go unmentioned.

At a time when more and more of the difficulties confronting our citizens are concerned primarily with the family unit, it is not at all surprising to hear the hon. member endorse the woefully inadequate proposals of the Throne Speech. It is not really surprising to hear him suggest that we need more nursery schools close to the industrial plants. For quite frankly, unless the hon. member can use whatever influence he is able to muster, to convince his colleagues on the government side of the House that a dollar an hour is not an adequate wage, we are going to see a lot more mothers who should be at home minding their children having to get them up at a time when they should be in bed and dragging them down to the polluted atmospheres of our industrial plants. I cannot help thinking that perhaps it is time we had a better means of access from the mountain to the bay front, so that the hon. member can get down and see and smell the odorous and grime-laden atmosphere, which he suggests would be a suitable place to raise children. Maybe I am doing him an injustice, perhaps he is just trying to get them away from the odorous mountain dump, of which I also have some reasonable experience.

I feel that only by being a part of this house-hunting family, raised in a maternally concerned community can one clearly see the inadequacies of the government's legislative programme, if it can be called that.

Mr. Speaker, in an all-too-committed manner the government has attempted to gloss over the real problems of our society and has attempted to plant in the minds of all citizens the idea that with a few minor changes the Conservative Utopia so long promised will finally have arrived.

The people of Ontario are being brainwashed. They are being brainwashed by a combination of a lack of government action on the one hand, and big business advertising on the other, into believing that we are presently going through a period of inflation. I think even with a very basic knowledge of economics, one could quite easily say that this is just not true. If we took a look at what inflation really is, we would see that it is brought about by the fact that when the money available exceeds in quantity the purchasable goods available. This just is not the case in Ontario today. In fact, many of of the stores are full; I say most of the stores are full; I can even go so far as to say all of the stores are full. But the citizens just do not have enough money in their pockets to purchase the goods therein.

Part of the solution to this problem lies within the scope of this government. We in Ontario must take steps now to ensure that each and every person employed in the province earns enough to provide him or her with a decent standard of living regardless of the geographic area in which he resides.

We must establish social priorities. We must ensure that each and every citizen in our province is able to enjoy good health, adequate shelter and have sufficient purchasing power to provide for his or her family. We, by our actions here must ensure that every segment of our community is availed of these very, very basic needs.

Mr. Speaker, the first step towards this must surely be the establishment of a realistic minimum wage. The government indicated in its Throne Speech that this was going to receive attention. How much attention it is very difficult to imagine, but I would doubt, if the past experiences are any criteria it would be enough, quite frankly.

On behalf of hundreds of thousands of citizens, who are presently earning at the rate of less than $2 an hour—$2 an hour is $4,000 a year, which in the majority of urban communities would not be sufficient to sustain life for a family, quite frankly, but on behalf of them I would call upon this government to establish a minimum wage of no less than $2 per hour.

Having done this, we have still only begun to solve some of the social problems. And having done this, we must now turn to the area of adequate shelter. We must by our actions ensure that adequate shelter is recognized as a basic right of every citizen.

Since the beginning of time, shelter has been uppermost in the minds of men. No person can deny that additional funds from the federal government would assist immeasurably in resolving our housing crisis, but the full value of any additional funds will not be realized until we revise our thinking in the areas of land acquisition, of

land development, of housing design, and last, but by no means least, of mortgage money availability.

Much of what can be said about land acquisition is old hat. The need to assemble land in large tracts, under public ownership has long been recognized as a sensible approach to ensuring its availability in time of need. It is unfortunate indeed, that this government feels the compelling need to ensure that the land speculators, so long a drain on our financial resources should be protected. Some may question this statement. The truth lies in the action taken late last year, when land at Bramalea was purchased under the HOME programme for a sum just in excess of $6,000 by this government and sold for over $9,000. And why? So that we could protect the market value of the land. I have never heard of a more unreasonable reason for raising the price of a product in all my life.

I certainly think it shows the concern, or perhaps the lack of concern that this government feels for the people of Ontario.

Land for housing must receive priority rating alongside the air that we breathe and the water we drink. And its value must be related to productive capacity rather than to its urban proximity. The cost of land has risen in the last ten years by 41.3 per cent. When taken into consideration alongside the other component parts in housing—the carrying charges and the material costs plus labour—this is by far the greatest increase of any of the parts. The fact that material costs and labour rose only 13.7 per cent, should burst once and for all the commonly held myth that increased wages are the culprit in this housing crisis. The fact is that labour and materials show the lowest percentage change of the components.

Increased carrying charges account for 34.8 per cent of the increased cost of the accommodation. It appears obvious to me that if the total increase of labour and materials is 13.7 per cent, most of which goes back into the economy as purchasing power, while the remaining 86.3 per cent is increased land and carrying charges, most of which fall into the category of capital gain and is therefore unearned income, a great portion of which goes back into land speculation, eventually resulting in even higher land costs, this would be the obvious place for any government to look in order to curb the cost spiral—within this 86.3 per cent.

We must not allow to go unchecked the avarice of the moneylenders, who extract their usury at rates that would make Shylock look like a philanthropist. I said that we must look, but frankly, just looking is not enough. This province has long been plagued with looking governments. We just heard today how we are going to look over the next ten years, and perhaps at the end we will look back and see what happened.

I think that we have enough of looking government, what we need is action now. Action to ensure that good productive farmland will not fall into the hands of the land speculators. Action to ensure that land costs will bear some relationship to their actual productive value, to enlist municipalities to service the land presently available for housing.

In the city of Hamilton, there are approximately 800 acres owned or under option to OHC, or GMHC. Land available for housing now, if only the municipality would provide the primary servicing. Now surely between the two single levels of government money could be found to provide this servicing and thereby assist immeasurably, in relieving this crisis in that city.

But most of all, we need a different approach to mortgage money assimilation. I suggest that each and every money handling institution holding a provincial charter should be required to invest, by law, a portion of their investment capital in government secured mortgages, and further; that this government of Ontario should make representation to the federal government to have this practice applied to similar companies holding federal charters.

This money should be made available to the low income families purchasing homes at or below a predetermined price, at an interest rate of no more than 6 per cent. I call upon this government to make representation to the federal government to make sure that this step is taken.

I feel that by such an action we would provide the necessary funds, and thereby open the door for thousands of Ontario families who at the present time have little or no hope of ever purchasing a home.

Not only this, but the removal of the sales tax on building materials, and perhaps in order to ensure that the saving would fall into the proper hands, a scheme that would refund an amount equal to this tax to the home purchaser to be deducted from the mortgage, and assist in reducing the overall cost.

With these measures, the cost of a home could have been drastically reduced, and it still can. If it had been enacted last year,

the cost of a 960 square foot figure home in the city of Hamilton would have been $15,748 including land. Assuming six lots to each acre, this would have been a saving of approximately $4,000 per home, with no down-payment required and repayments of $90 per month over 35 years, instead of the present $112 per month over 35 years.

I think every member would agree that this would be of some assistance in combatting accommodation costs not only at the ownership level but also at the apartment-renting level. The increased number of families who could afford homes would alleviate the apartment shortage, thereby removing some of the restrictive leases, reducing the rents, and generally creating a much more acceptable environment for those still unable to move, or desirous of apartment living. No more would we see rents being increased every month and leases of the type which force a young, expectant wife to move while still having to give her landlord a $50 cheque just for his trouble.

You know, 2,000 years ago a mother was told "there just is no room" and I ask you, is the expectant mother today to be told at a time when she should be enjoying the atmosphere, and at a time which should be a joyous moment of her life, abortion or eviction? And this is just about what it amounts to in some apartments today.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Deans: If we, sitting here, permit our young people to be subjected to this kind of treatment, to such a cruel condition of tenancy, then quite frankly our names will go down in history among those who are famous, or perhaps we should say "infamous" for their wrong and shameful deeds.

You know, perhaps the next step will be that the landlord will incorporate the passing out of birth control pills in order to ensure that he will be held blameless in the event that he has to have someone evicted.

I said "alleviate the problem" because without implementation of a dwellers' bill of rights, I am quite sure that some of these obnoxious practices would still occur on occasion.

But even with homes at a price that many more could afford, the burden of municipal taxes would still exist.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey Bruce): What homes?

Mr. Deans: I trust the hon. member was listening to what I said, that if we had followed the programme that I am suggesting, the homes that he is asking for would have been available but still municipal taxes would exist.

It is doubtful if any more discriminatory tax than municipal taxation exists. This and sales tax are two of the taxes—not the only two, but two of the major taxes—which apply without any consideration whatever of the citizen's ability to pay. Realty taxes apply without any consideration for income and varies considerably from municipality to municipality. In my riding, the tax on property appears to acquire an inverse ratio with the services provided but this I would say is not completely the fault of the councils involved. The largest proportion of the property tax is used to pay for the cost of education. And until the fact is recognized by this government, that owning a home is in no way related to providing an education, this penalty for purchasing a home will continue to be inflicted on those who can least afford it.

Surely education, like justice, is a responsibility of the province, and the costs should be borne out of provincial funds. Of course, I recognize that the province must raise this additional money. There is no doubt that we cannot just transfer it without raising some additional funds. But I suggest that with the much broader tax base that is available at the provincial level, we could at least eliminate this drain on the people who are presently attempting to buy a home. And I feel that we would probably improve the home ownership level in most of the municipalities.

I know of no citizen who objects to paying for the services that are related to property. But the relationship between education and housing, as far as I can see, exists only in the Throne Speech where both just happen to be mentioned in the same paragraph.

Unfortunately, not even the steps outlined of raising the minimum wage to $2 per hour, and the suggestions related to home building and land acquisition will enable those earning less than $5,000 per year to move into the area of home ownership. And therefore a comprehensive public housing programme, both geared to income and direct subsidy will be required to provide for this group which includes pensioners.

However, there remains one area that I feel we should discuss. At the start I mentioned three priorities: earning capacity, adequate shelter and health. And I feel quite frankly that without the last, the first two would be of little consequence. Because of this, I was deeply concerned when the

Premier (Mr. Robarts) announced—or perhaps it is the Prime Minister; I am not sure if the hon. member for Grey-Bruce was able to determine this—announced that Ontario would not participate in the national medicare scheme.

If ever the people of Ontario were betrayed, the people of Ontario certainly were on that fateful day. To claim that we in Ontario could not afford medicare was a gross exaggeration. To claim that Ontario could not afford to be its brother's keeper, as was suggested by many people, that mighty Conservative Ontario will deny the less privileged across this country the opportunity for health care, on the pretext of the lack of funds, is no different from denying this to your own family.

Even if the most outlandish figure quoted —that of $1,000,000,000—which the federal Minister of Finance used as the cost of the implementation, were to be accepted, the per capita cost would not exceed $50 per year. Quite frankly this would amount to an amount of $192 for the average Canadian family.

If the generally accepted figure of $40 per capita were used, this would amount to less than $160 per year, or if we can be guided by the experience of Saskatchewan, the per capita cost could be somewhat between the $25.22 of that province and the $40 I mentioned, which would obviously result in reduction for most citizens of Canada and certainly for all citizens of Ontario.

Perhaps the problem of medicare is not one of cost but of political philosophy and—I hesitate to mention it—but of commercial pressure.

Mr. Speaker, the people of Ontario are not receiving the kind of medical coverage one could reasonably expect to be available in an area rich in mineral resources and manufacturing processes. The reason quite frankly rests within the conscience of the Premier of this province. And if I may use a phrase which the Premier used yesterday in relationship to the Confederation problem, the cost we will have to bear falls into insignificance with the benefits we will receive, and I think quite frankly this applies very, very well to medicare.

In conclusion, let me say that the well-being of future generations depends entirely on the kind of action that we take here. We cannot afford to encumber our children by refusing to stop the shameful greed which denies the basics of life to the people of this province.

Do not let it be said that the people stood at the door and knocked and we just did not care.

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I understand we will continue with the debate on the Throne Speech tomorrow. And perhaps we might have the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. L. M. Reilly (Eglinton) moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 5.55 o'clock, p.m.

No. 11

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

First Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Thursday, February 29, 1968

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1968

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Thursday, February 29, 1968

Presenting reports, Mr. Welch 323

Second report, standing committee on private bills, Mr. Carton 323

Questions to Mr. Wishart and Mr. Stewart re the investigation of irregularities in fruit and vegetable marketing, Mr. Paterson 323

Questions to Mr. Stewart re the sugar processing plant in Chatham, Mr. Makarchuk 325

Question to Mr. Simonett re reported statement by Dr. Vance, Mr. Burr 326

Statement re the annual review of The Department of Mines, Mr. A. F. Lawrence 326

Question to Mr. Wishart re a sentence imposed by Magistrate Kenneth Langdon, Mr. Sargent 327

Question to Mr. Wishart re "traffic-alert", Mr. Sargent 327

Question to Mr. Wishart re the legal aid plan, Mrs. M. Renwick 328

Question to Mr. Haskett re issuing of drivers' licences to deaf mutes, Mr. Shulman 328

Question to Mr. Wishart re the death of John Nekrashewicz, Mr. Shulman 328

Question to Mr. Wishart re The Coroners Act, Mr. Shulman 329

Question to Mr. Dymond re the new Toronto Ontario Hospital, Mr. Shulman 329

Resumption of the debate on the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Potter, Mr. T. Reid, Mr. Bullbrook, Mr. White 330

Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. White, agreed to 355

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to 355

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 29, 1968

The House met at 2.30 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are always pleased to have visitors to the Legislature, and today we welcome as guests, students from the following schools: in the east gallery, York Memorial collegiate institute, Toronto; and in the west gallery, St. Mary's separate school, Toronto. Later at 3.30 p.m. in the east gallery there will be pupils from Sheridan technical school all the way from Sudbury. I am sure we all welcome these young people.

Presenting petitions.

Presenting reports.

Hon. R. Welch (Provincial Secretary and Minister of Citizenship) presented the following report:

The annual report of the Ontario energy board for the year ending December 31, 1967.

Mr. G. R. Carton (Armourdale), from the standing committee on private bills, presented the committee's second report which was read as follows and adopted:

Your committee begs to report the following bills without amendment:

Bill Pr16, An Act respecting the county of Ontario.

Bill Pr18, An Act respecting the trustees of the Toronto general burying grounds.

Bill Pr39, An Act respecting the Lutheran Church—Missouri synod.

Your committee begs to report the following bill with certain amendments:

Bill Pr26, An Act respecting the township of Nepean.

Your committee would recommend that the following bill be not reported:

Bill Pr20, An Act respecting Owen Sound Young Men's and Young Women's Christian Association.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Introduction of bills.

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): Mr. Speaker, I have two questions of the Attorney General, notice of which has been given. Possibly I might read these both at the same time and avoid taking up the time of the House.

The first is in two parts:

With the announcement last week of the Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. Stewart) of the appointment of the chairman of the Ontario food council as a one-man commission to investigate supposed payola in the fruit and vegetable industry, first, what is the legal definition of payola in this province; and second, can persons if found guilty be prosecuted under the laws of the province of Ontario or the Dominion of Canada?

The second question is directly related to this: With the announcement of the Minister of Agriculture and Food of the investigation into the possible existence of payola in the fruit and vegetable industry, have officials of The Attorney General's Department conducted investigations in all major fruit and vegetable growing areas and distribution centres in Ontario; and if not, why not?

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I do not see any "if not, why not," on the question as submitted to me but I will try to answer—

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): Anticipated supplementary.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I will try to answer it in those terms in any event.

First question, Mr. Speaker. The order in council under which the Ontario food council has received approval to make this investigation does not use the term payola nor does it appoint a one-man commission, and the question implied that that is the case.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): That is the case.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: The order in council approves of the council, not the chairman, conducting an investigation in the matters relating to producing, distributing, processing and handling of agricultural products or agricultural food products.

The first part of the question is what is the legal definition of payola in this province and

in answer to that I would say that if the term payola was used in reference to this matter I would think it would be used as a colloquial expression indicating the surreptitious payment of money for favours that might not otherwise be received. The term has no legal definition or status in this province.

Second part of the question: Can persons, if found guilty, be prosecuted? In answer to that I would point out that no person can be found guilty by this investigation if the hon. member means that term in its legal sense. If the facts disclosed by the investigation warrant the laying of charges under any statute, then the appropriate steps will be taken at that time as far as possible prosecutions are concerned.

I have before me, Mr. Speaker, a copy of the order in council which was approved by the Honourable, the Lieutenant-Governor on February 22, 1968. I think I might read at least some part of it to give the terms of reference. After reciting the statutes which set up what is known as the consumers' food council, the title of which is the Ontario producers', processors', distributors' and consumers' food council, it gives that council authority to:

> Conduct such investigations as the Lieutenant-Governor in council approves into matters relating to the producing, distributing, processing and handling of agricultural products or agricultural food products, and for the purpose of carrying out such investigation, the chairman or vice-chairman of the Ontario producers', processors', distributors' and consumers' food council has all the powers that may be conferred upon a commissioner under The Public Inquiries Act.

Then follows the appointment, and the terms of reference instructs the food council to conduct investigations and report on the same into matters relating to the producing, distributing, processing and handling of agricultural products or agricultural food products, and particularly into matters relating to:

(a) The sale and distribution of fruits and vegetables from shippers in Essex county.

(b) The purchasing practices of wholesale and retail distributors of fruits and vegetables.

(c) The sale and distribution of fruits and vegetables from any other part of Ontario.

I think that answers the first question which the hon. member read. As to the second question, which inquires as to whether investigations were conducted into other areas of Ontario, I would say that our investigations were directed particularly to the area of Essex county. Other investigations are being followed and may be carried on.

Mr. Paterson: I thank the Attorney General. I have several questions related to this matter to be directed to the Minister of Agriculture and Food.

During the period from January, 1964—when the food council announced its intent to investigate payola, as I read the press release it is "kickbacks" in that term—to the period immediately prior to the Minister's announcement on Thursday of last week, what investigations and in which areas of food distribution have investigations taken place, if any?

Secondly, what findings have been made and what action has the food council taken, for this government, in this regard?

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that an inquiry has been announced into the charges of undesirable trade practices in the fruit and vegetable industry I believe it would be most inappropriate and quite improper for me to comment either on the extent of the investigations or the evidence that these findings have produced. In reply to the second question, this is a matter for the commission to deal with. The commissioner has been appointed for this purpose and I am sure that no one in this Legislature would want me to prejudice this case by dealing with evidence that may be revealed at the appropriate time during the hearing.

Mr. Paterson: Mr. Speaker, a second question to the Minister of Agriculture and Food. What were the names of the members of the Ontario food council and all others present at the special meeting of the Ontario food council held February 20 when the unanimous decision was made to investigate discrimination and undesirable trade practices in the food industry, and what was the exact wording of the motion passed at that meeting?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, the members of the Ontario food council attending this meeting were as follows: chairman, Mr. Douglas Williams; members, Mr. Harvey Beaty of Thamesford, the producer member; J. Douglas Small, president of the Schneider Meat Packing Company, of Kitchener, representing the processors; Ivor Crimp, vice-president, Dominion Stores Limited, the distributor member, food council; Mrs. W. A. Brechin, of Toronto, the Canadian association of consumers, who was acting on behalf of Mrs. W. A. C. Shepherd, of the Canadian

association of consumers, who is really the consumer member of the council but could not be there; R. E. Gooden, secretary of the Ontario food council.

The exact wording of the motion, Mr. Speaker, which was moved by Mr. Beaty, and seconded by Mrs. Brechin, was as follows:

Resolved,

That the chairman, Ontario food council, proceed with investigations as outlined in an endeavour to eliminate discrimination and undesirable trade practices in accordance with section 6 of The Ontario Producers', Processors', Distributors' and Consumers' Food Council Act, 1962-1963, and further as far as press is concerned it is our opinion that statements should not be used which give any impression that such practices are common in the food industry and therefore cast any unfavourable reflection on any segment or members of the industry that are operating legitimately.

The motion was carried unanimously.

Mr. Paterson: I appreciate getting that exact wording, Mr. Speaker.

A third question to the Minister of Agriculture and Food. With the Minister's announcement of an investigation into the supposed existence of payola in the fruit and vegetable industry: 1. Will hearings be held in the various parts of the province, specifically the growing areas of Niagara and Bradford as well as Essex county? 2. Will any growers or grower-dealers be summoned to these hearings?

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the member would also place his other question with respect to this and the Minister might answer both of them.

Mr. Paterson: Okay, Mr. Speaker. The last question in this series: With the Minister's announcement of the investigation of the supposed existence of payola in the fruit and vegetable business: 1. Will the Minister broaden his terms of reference to include (a) the importation of all fruits and vegetables and their distribution in Ontario; (b) importers, distributors, commission merchants, brokers and retailers and (c) the various facets of Ontario's canning industry and the import and distribution of canned fruits and vegetables into Ontario and their practices therein.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, in reply to the first two questions regarding the holding of the hearings in various parts of the province, I suggest that the conduct of this inquiry will rest entirely on the shoulders of the commission, and in consultation with their counsellor decisions would be made as to where and when the various hearings would be held and who will be summoned to appear before the hearings.

As the Attorney General pointed out earlier this afternoon, the investigation is broad enough to cover the situation reasonably well in that regard.

With regard to the second series of questions concerning the broadening of the terms of reference, I felt that the terms of reference that had been drawn were fairly broad. But since the hon. member raises the point, I must admit that the importations of agriculture and food products from outside of Ontario is a matter of very great concern to all of us and, I am sure, to the producers of those same products in Ontario.

Now whether or not we should go into that particular aspect in this kind of an inquiry, is something I think to which we want to give some consideration. I find the hon. member's quite interesting and the commission with their counsel might feel that it was wise to request a broadening of the terms of reference to include those people dealing with imported products. I would like to take a good look at that one if we could. If it is not broad enough now, we might take a look to see if it is necessary to broaden.

Mr. M. Makarchuk (Brantford): I have a question for the Minister of Agriculture and Food. In view of the fact that reports have been received that the sugar processing plant in Chatham is being dismantled, is the Minister prepared to take unilateral action to prevent such dismantling from proceeding for the time being?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, in the first place, all that we have are rumours. I do not think anybody knows whether the sugar beet plant is being dismantled or whether it is not.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Does the Minister?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: No, I do not.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, should he not find out?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: As I said, I do not think anybody does. I admit that this was the case. In discussions that we have had with the company, they told us that there were certain pieces of equipment that had to be replaced. Whether or not this is the equipment that is being moved, we do not know. I do want to

say, in connection with this whole matter, we had hoped to have a meeting in Ottawa last week, but the parliamentary crisis that developed there precluded the meeting. It was called off.

The crisis having been resolved as of yesterday, we immediately got on the phone this morning to try to re-establish the meeting that had been postponed from last Tuesday. As yet we have not got confirmation of it. We have asked for it to take place as soon as we can possibly get it arranged. We hope that it will be held on Monday.

This proposed meeting will be between the federal government officials, various Ministers involved, our government representatives and the sugar beet growers marketing board and company officials. The policy to which we subscribe is that at least a percentage of the sugar that is used in Canada should be produced in Canada. I believe that if the federal government adopts that principle, and I can see no reason why the people of Canada would not support it, then I think our problem will be solved. This is our objective.

Mr. Makarchuk: A supplementary question for the Minister. Will he accept a supplementary question?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: If the Speaker will allow it.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the member would state his supplementary question.

Mr. Makarchuk: In view that there may be some truth to these particular rumours, and if there is going to be a meeting on Monday and there is no plant by Tuesday, is the Minister prepared to take some action to ensure that there is a plant on Tuesday in existence?

Mr. Speaker: I would think that that question is so highly theoretical that it is not one the Minister could properly answer.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. F. A. Burr (Sandwich-Riverside): I have a question for the Minister of Energy and Resources Management. Did Dr. Vance, the chairman of the Ontario water resources commission, state government policy when he remarked, as reported in the Windsor *Daily Star* of February 24, 1968, that American boat owners who have no holding tanks for sewage disposal will not be allowed in our waters? If so, would this policy apply to the Detroit River and how would it be enforced?

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Mr. Speaker, I am advised by Dr. Vance that he never made the statement attributed to him in the Windsor *Star*.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence (Minister of Mines): Mr. Speaker, you have very courteously permitted me to have copies of the annual review of The Department of Mines placed on the members' desks, and I feel that this book would be well worth careful study by the members, and indeed anyone who is interested in the well-being of our nation and of our province.

Last year Ontario's mineral production registered a spectacular jump of nearly 25 per cent over the 1966 total to reach a value of more than $1,192 million.

Mr. Speaker, that surely is something that should be reported early and in some depth, and this review is designed to achieve both of these purposes. My predecessors for several years past have boasted, and I think with good reason, on the achievement of their staff in producing so comprehensive a report so early. The year under review is only two months old, yet already this is a factual report of the major developments which have made the year so memorable.

The title of the 1967 review is "Through the Billion Dollar Barrier". To achieve the billion dollar production figure has been the ambition of the mining industry in Ontario for several years, and each year since 1959 the achievement has appeared to be almost within reach.

As a matter of interest, I am told that the cover design for this year's review was prepared for use in 1959 and has been brought forward hopefully each year since.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely commend the book for study by all hon. members, and I think it will help to give them a better grasp of the importance of mining to our economy and to our whole way of life. I think, too, that the information it contains will be of value to the industry, to schools, and to the public generally.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I rise on a point of order. I remind myself that one of the responsibilities with which you are charged is to keep a record of what is said in this chamber and, indeed, that is one of the first authorities given to you by the House. Therefore, in the light of that, I wonder, sir, if in the interest of economy, whether it is necessary to reduplicate the

recordings of this House by the delivery of what my hon. friend from Huron-Bruce (Mr. Gaunt) tells me, is five-eighths of an inch of material, that purports to reproduce what most of us heard, and indeed most of us who are not under the "Reilly directive" heard in this House.

Apart from that, I question you, sir, most courteously and respectfully, that where the record is different, is what is in this material delivered to us then may we take it that the record is considered to be the accurate source? Furthermore, I submit that I am entitled to have my equanimity kept in balance by not being reminded of the contentious history in the part described as the "Conservative quarter century".

I am wondering whether the rules of this House permit any person, even if it is the first citizen himself, to reproduce at public expense five-eighths of an inch of material, which amounts to a partial speech, and lay it on our desks with great abandon. I would ask you to protect us from that in the future.

May I add one thing. I noted that when he was making the speech, I counted five of his own staff in the gallery at the end who apparently have nothing useful to do but to come in and listen to the head man's speech.

Mr. Speaker: Unfortunately, my desk has not been favoured with a copy of the article, and I therefore have no knowledge other than that which the hon. member has given me. I will be most pleased to look into the matter, and I can assure him that the official record of the House is the official version, and that he will never go wrong in relying on that.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Attorney General. Does the Attorney General intend to appeal against the sentence imposed by Magistrate Kenneth Langdon of Halton county, re the suspended sentence of the accused convicted of driving 160 miles per hour on the Macdonald-Cartier freeway? I have since learned that he has been sentenced again. Two days later he was found guilty of an infraction of the law. What does the Attorney General intend to do with a magistrate of this type?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, the question that I have is whether we intend to appeal against the sentence. I would say that the sentence is under review at the present time, to determine whether or not we will launch an appeal. Until I have completed that, I would not want to comment on the case. The question on the magistrate comes without any warning, and I think that I would like to take that under advisory notice.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, do you have a question from me about Viola MacMillan this morning? I just asked if the Attorney General would advise if he plans to intervene in the move to parole Miss Viola MacMillan?

Mr. Speaker: The member has not had a copy sent up to my office, so that the Attorney General—

An hon. member: Maybe it went to Viola's—

Mr. Sargent: That is my supplementary question!

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, I did receive a question from the hon. member for Grey-Bruce on February 23, but it was on a different subject altogether, and I agreed to take it as notice at that time and to provide an answer. The question is:

Is the Attorney General aware of a new procedure in the United States of America called "traffic-alert", which will work to cut the time in half that a policeman spends in court? Does the Attorney General intend that the Ontario police commission put this into effect in Ontario?

I would reply that we are aware of the procedure known as traffic-alert, which is used in some of the states, the police commission is aware of it, and the commissioner of the Ontario Provincial Police is aware of it. It is designed primarily to obtain information and knowledge of traffic and of traffic arteries, and roads which are leading into these traffic routes. It is not designed to save the time of a policeman in court. It may have some small—

Mr. Sargent: It is all part of the programme.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: —effect in this way. I would say that we use procedures somewhat similar—to this extent, that we ask an officer serving a number of summonses to serve them returnable on the same day if possible, so that his time is concentrated on that day, and also where adjournments are requested. The officer is notified and this enables him to spend more time in actual police work in the field.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might, I had a question the same day from the member for Wentworth (Mr. Deans), but I think that he is not in the House. I wonder if it would be permissible to give an answer and get it on the record? His question was:

Has the Attorney General received a request from any group to add to the exemptions from the bargaining units of professional firefighters, as defined by The Fire Departments Act?

The answer is that the legislative counsel's office has received notice that the corporation of the city of Toronto will petition for a private Act which will exempt from the bargaining unit of the professional firefighters, the additional rank of assistant deputy chief. Section 5 of The Fire Departments Act exempts the chief and the deputy chief from the bargaining unit, and the proposed amendment is to add the assistant deputy chief. I would think that the bill will come before the House and be dealt with in the usual way.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister—

Mr. Speaker: The member for Scarborough Centre has the floor.

Mr. Shulman: I am sorry.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Scarborough Centre.

Mrs. M. Renwick (Scarborough Centre): Mr. Speaker, a question of the Attorney General. To what extent is information regarding the Ontario legal aid plan available in other languages, what are those languages, and where is information in other languages available?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: The brochure or pamphlet on the legal aid plan is printed extensively in English and French. We have had discussions and meetings with the Provincial Secretary about reproducing a brochure in other languages, and also with The Department of Social and Family Services. Some of the languages considered are Finnish, German, Greek, Hungarian, Italian, Polish, Portuguese and Ukrainian. At the moment, no decision has been reached as to what languages will be selected for further distribution and printing, but I would think that a decision will be reached shortly as we are studying the matter.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Transport. Will the Minister consider enacting new legislation regarding the issuing of licences to deaf mutes in light of the fatal accident on December 14, 1967, in Toronto, when a car driven by a deaf mute driver struck another car, causing the death of the driver of that car, and injuries to the passenger, a three-year-old boy?

Hon. I. Haskett (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, it appears that driver licensing is adequately provided for in part 3 of The Highway Traffic Act. Our provincial Minister's council is deeply concerned with establishing uniform licensing standards, and is even now awaiting a report on its referral in this matter to the Canadian conference of motor transport authorities.

Mr. Shulman: Did the Minister say yes or no? I am sorry, I did not quite understand his answer.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: The Minister did not say yes or no.

Mr. Shulman: I have a question for the Attorney General. Has the death of Mr. John Nekrashewicz, 1907 Gerrard Street East, been reported to the coroner's office?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: No, the death of this person, John Nekrashewicz has not been reported to the coroner's office.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to comment on the style of this question. The question is simply, as the hon. member read it, "Has the death of John Nekraschewicz at 1907 Gerrard Street East been reported to the coroner's office?" We are unable to find, from the directory at least, and have not had an opportunity to make a personal inspection, what institution, building or edifice exists at that address. The directory does not indicate anything—that is, Might's Directories.

There is no date given as to the time of that death. We are not sure the man has died. It could have been last week if he died, yesterday, or five years ago and it is not very helpful to ask a question, I may say, in this manner. I might be asked if the death of John Doe has been reported.

Mr. Shulman: That was to save time.

An hon. member: Throw up another balloon.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, I really sincerely mean this, if the hon. member wishes information, wishes to be helpful, I think he might give us, if he knows that this person died recently, the date of death and

we would be able to direct our inquiries to this.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Let me just finish! Mr. Speaker, this question implies a knowledge of a death which occurred in some suspicious circumstances, the way I take it. Section 7 of the Coroners Act says:

> Every person who has reason to believe that a deceased person died as a result of violence, misadventure, negligence, misconduct, malpractice, by unfair means, suddenly and unexpectedly from disease or sickness for which he was not treated by a legally qualified medical practitioner, or any cause other than disease or under such circumstances as may require investigation every person having knowledge of that or has reason to believe those things, shall immediately notify a coroner of the facts and circumstances relating to the death.

Apart from my comment as to the—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: What is the penalty for non-compliance?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: —form of the question, I would suggest to the hon. member—I am sure he is aware of the section of the Act—we would appreciate that if he has that knowledge, he follow that section and let us have the information.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, on a point of personal privilege I would like to reply to the Minister. This death occurred within the last 24 hours. I hope his office was informed of such matters. The death occurred in a hospital in this city. I trust he will look into it.

Mr. Speaker: I am sure that the member in future will include necessary particulars in such a question. The Attorney General now has that information.

Mr. Sopha: If he will ask tomorrow—

Mr. Shulman: I am sorry I overestimated the knowledge of the Attorney General. I have another question for the Attorney General.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: May I just say that the death having occurred within the last 24 hours, I must say the question was pretty prompt.

Mr. Shulman: We try to keep the hon. Minister on his toes.

I have another question for the Attorney General. Is the section of The Coroners Act passed in 1966, which requires coroners' retirement at age 70 being followed at the Toronto coroner's office?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I have got so many questions here, Mr. Speaker, I cannot find this one, but I can answer it.

Every section of The Coroners Act is being observed. No section is not being observed. I think the implication in this question has reference to Dr. Cruickshank, perhaps, who reached age 70 recently. He is not acting as a coroner. He has not been re-appointed as a coroner. He has been appointed as a consultant to the coroner's office and for a short time as set forth in the order making his appointment—he has a very vast medical knowledge achieved over a period of years—he has been most helpful, and can be most helpful with advice and counsel to coroners' Crown attorneys and in the conduct of coroners' inquests generally. So we have not transgressed any section of The Coroners Act.

Mr. Shulman: Will the Minister allow a supplementary question? Is someone being appointed to replace Dr. Cruickshank?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: That is not really supplementary; that is a matter of policy which I have not yet discussed with my colleagues or decided.

Mr. Sopha: Are you considering the member for High Park?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I think he could answer that one right away.

Mr. Shulman: I have a question for the Minister of Health. How many floors at the new Toronto Ontario Hospital have been shut down because of lack of fire exits? And why have new fire escapes not been built?

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, the third floor, that is the top floor of three cottages, were closed down some years ago, not only because there were no fire escapes or fire exits, but because the structure of the building was such that it did not lend itself to modern programming.

The fire escapes have not been built because the floors are not being used. It is contemplated that the buildings will come down and the patient load has been reduced to the point where we do not need this space, so there is no fire hazard existing now.

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Provincial Treasurer. I see he is not in his chair. Could I just hold it until tomorrow?

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. Minister of Economics and Development about a question I asked two weeks ago concerning the Chapel Glen village project? I wonder if he has the answer?

Hon. S. J. Randall (Minister of Economics and Development): Mr. Speaker, I have no further information on it as yet.

Mr. Young: Might I ask when we might expect an answer, sir?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I would say in the fullness of time.

Mr. Young: When the job is done, eh?

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: Resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the amendment to the motion for an address in reply to the speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor at the opening of the session.

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

Mr. R. T. Potter (Quinte): Mr. Speaker, may I first of all take this opportunity to congratulate you on your election as Speaker of the 28th parliament of this provincial Legislature. You have established an enviable reputation of service to this province, not only on many commissions, but as an hon. Minister of several government departments.

I know the people of Grenville-Dundas are justly proud of your past record and your new position, and speak glowingly of the representation you have given them since they first elected you to be their representative at Queen's Park in 1955. I know, Mr. Speaker, you will bring to this position, your customary dignity, integrity and astuteness.

I would also like to say how honoured I am to be sitting in this Legislature as a member of the "Robarts" team.

Our government, under the hon. John Robarts, has established an enviable record of good government. Our government's policies of protecting the rights of the individual, providing assistance to those in need of such assistance and of assuring that every change is in fact a change for the better—in other words, Mr. Speaker, the policies of the Progressive Conservative Party have given me cause to admire and respect this government and has inspired me to seek and win a seat in this Legislature.

I am proud to be a member of a team that I am confident will continue their established practice of giving to the people of Ontario, the best possible government and at the same time continuing their policy of protecting individual freedom.

I appreciate the privilege of addressing this House, as the first member to represent the new riding of Quinte. Quinte was formed from Sidney township—which was formerly part of the old West Hastings riding, with a small addition from East Hastings and Northumberland, where the city of Belleville and the town of Trenton extend into those areas.

The greatest part of this new riding was formerly represented by one of the most respected members of the Ontario Legislature —one who commanded the respect and the friendship of members of all political parties —the man who represented his constituents so ably for more than 18 years before ill-health forced his retirement in 1967—my friend Elmer Sandercock. I trust he will enjoy many years of improved health and happiness now that he has been relieved of his responsibilities.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I particularly want to speak to you on two main topics in which I have long held a deep concern. They are hospital and related care of the sick and the injured, and the future of this great country of ours. Hospital and related care is one area in which I am thoroughly familiar, and with which I must contend every working day of my life.

In the past 40 years or so, we in Ontario have witnessed tremendous growth and development in industry, commerce and population. Few of us would complain, or criticize about this, but we must realize that this surging growth and prosperity has brought with it many problems, not the least of these problems, is the continuing problem of providing the best possible medical care, with the greatest benefit to all, in the most practical and economical way.

In the process of working out such a programme, one must consider how to make the most effective use of every medical man, and of all persons involved in the paramedical fields. This, in its broad sense, implies the provision of the proper facilities, personnel and services that most adequately meet the

needs of the patient at the time they are required.

As the concept of patient care has evolved in the province of Ontario, two distinct groups have emerged. The first consists of those for whom the chief concern is the recovery from an accident or disease process, and return to a useful place in society.

The second group, we have are those who are suffering from a chronic progressive illness and those, who, while not suffering with a disease of either an acute or chronic nature, do have a disability which requires a type of care which they are unable to receive at home.

The first group then, requires treatment for an acute condition and this treatment must be received in an active treatment hospital. When they have passed the acute stage of their illness, I believe that these patients should be transferred to a rehabilitation wing, where the emphasis is on the restoration of function, in the hope of a quicker return to a full competitive life. In this unit, the patient will receive the physiotherapy, the occupational therapy, the speech therapy and even psychotherapy that is so necessary to teach him to walk again after a fractured hip, to speak after a head injury or a stroke, and to exercise after a heart attack.

In the other group, we have the patient who is suffering with a chronic illness, and who requires the supervised treatment and therapy, necessary to control, and limit as far as possible, disease processes which cannot be cured.

And last, but by no means least, are those severely incapacitated individuals who are permanently disabled, and the elderly who, because of some minor illness, are unable to look after themselves, but are not suffering from any acute or chronic disease process. These people are not ill enough to require the highly technical services and built-in laboratory facilities of a general hospital any longer. They now need to de-emphasize illness and to stress living. These are the patients who need more care than they can receive at home, but they do not need the facilities of either an active treatment, or a chronic treatment hospital, and to accomplish this, substantial facilities are required.

The health survey of 1946-1947 was very thorough and extensive, and as a result, our Ontario government became more extensively involved than ever before in the development of hospital facilities.

In 1948 there were fewer than 25,000 hospital beds in the province of Ontario, and many of these beds were old and quite inadequate. Our government has assisted the local municipalities by increasing construction grants from $1,000 per bed in 1948, to an amount equal to between 55 per cent and 58 per cent of the total cost of construction, and equipping active treatment hospitals. Included to this we have the 8 per cent to 10 per cent of the total cost offered by the federal government, and we have an aggregate government support of two-thirds of the total cost of construction and equipping of active treatment hospitals in the province. This, however, is only the cost of construction of the hospital and we must remember that it takes another $11,000 per year to maintain each bed in an active treatment hospital.

As a result of this programme, we now have in Ontario more than 46,000 active, chronic and convalescent beds, just over 6.5 beds per 1,000 population, and on the basis of various formulae, this ratio is believed to be adequate to properly serve the needs of our people. The fact remains though, Mr. Speaker, that there are still areas in our province where there are not sufficient beds for the chronically ill, or for what has formerly been referred to as convalescent patients, which I believe should be referred to as the patients requiring rehabilitation.

In my district alone, and I am sure there are others like it, development and expansion of the latter two critical areas has lagged behind the provisions for active treatment beds. As a result, many of these patients are now occupying active treatment hospital beds.

A building programme now under way in our area will provide ample accommodation for both active treatment and chronically ill patients, but so far no plans have been made for rehabilitation beds on a purely local level.

In the majority of cases, severely disabled patients are discharged to their homes to convalesce without receiving any rehabilitation treatment, with a resultant loss of weeks, or in some cases months, of productivity. Of course, workmen's compensation cases are a noteworthy exception to this rule.

Today, an active treatment bed costs approximately $30,000 to construct, and $11,000 yearly to maintain. Opposed to this, the construction of chronically ill or rehabilitation wings cost approximately one-third that figure to construct and approximately half as much to maintain.

Now that we are approaching the stage where we have a sufficient number of active

treatment beds, providing of course these beds are used strictly for patients who require active treatment, I believe we can improve our medical care and rehabilitate more individuals in a shorter period of time, at a reduced cost to the taxpayer, if we consider the construction of rehabilitation and chronically ill units. Our provincial government, on the advice of the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond), has already instituted a programme along these lines, but, I believe, to be effective, this must be expanded so that we will have one associated with every general active treatment hospital in the province.

We as legislators, Mr. Speaker, must give more consideration to these less costly and yet more efficient forms of medical care. We must lend all possible support to the development of rehabilitation and chronically ill units.

The last group, I have mentioned, are those that require some other type of institutional care. These are the individuals who, until recently, have been cared for almost entirely in the private nursing home.

This whole area of need has been of great concern to government. The Department of Health, through its control and supervision of The Nursing Homes Act and The Homes for Special Care Act, has set up uniform standards of accommodation, safety and care; and licensing of these homes is now mandatory. In the main, nursing homes are operated by private enterprise and many of them have done an outstanding job. Some, unfortunately, have not done so well and occasionally these have damaged the reputation of the entire industry. With licensing, then, the less desirable homes can either be upgraded, or put out of business.

More recently, The Department of Social and Family Services amended The Homes for the Aged Act by providing capital grants to municipalities wishing to establish "rest homes" where anyone over the age of 21 years can be admitted for treatment. These grants are substantial and the Act also provides for some maintenance support.

Of course, anyone who qualifies under a needs test can get maintenance support in an approved nursing home. It is this needs test which causes me some concern. This needs test may be quite relevant when determining the requirements for relatively normal living, but, Mr. Speaker, when one has to be admitted to a nursing home, the circumstances are often entirely different. Let us take a hypothetical case.

Suppose a man earning $5,000 per year has two dependent children going to school; his wife must be admitted to a nursing home. The cost would be at least $8.50 per day or $3,000 per year—and the average per patient stay in chronic care hospitals is now almost 300 days. That man could not qualify for public assistance on the basis of any needs test presently used, yet he could not possibly afford to maintain his wife in the nursing home, support his home and children, and supply their everyday needs.

Here is the area of great need—the one big gap in the spectrum of our services, and I seriously commend this to the attention of The Departments of Health and Social and Family Services. I am sure that a reappraisal of this area of need will be very worthwhile, and I am equally sure that in these tragic cases, a valid case can be made for applying a realistic needs test. I still believe that the better method would be to extend the provisions of The Hospital Insurance Act and The Diagnostic Services Act to include nursing home care as an insured benefit. I firmly believe the federal government might better have applied itself to assisting in improvements of this nature rather than forcing upon an unwilling population their medicare programme which offers nothing more than assistance to residents of Ontario, who do not need that assistance, and a tremendous increase in taxation.

There is one other method which I think would be of great help in the support of more and better nursing homes, that is on the same basis as offered in the incentive to industry programme, announced recently. I can think of nothing that would give greater encouragement to the good nursing home operators who have shown they have the capacity and ability to do a good job. In spite of the extravagant claims often heard, these operators are not in a lucrative field, but they do provide a much needed service and one that few appear anxious to give.

If these measures were to be instituted, Mr. Speaker, I am sure the result will be better patient care; a more rapid and complete recovery and return to productive living. All this will be had in shorter time for the patient and less cost to all concerned.

This, then, Mr. Speaker, is just one of our problems.

Now that our great centennial birthday party is over, and we have said goodbye to our first 100 years of Confederation, it is time for us to pause and take stock of ourselves and to give careful thought as to what

direction our country is about to take in the next 100 years.

The past century found us to be numbered among the few remaining "free peoples" of the world. By "free" I mean we are still, as of today at least, free to decide most of the things we want to do—where and how we want to live, what kind of work we want to do, what particular amenities of life we want to have, and where we shall buy them.

The great majority of the people in this province are doing very well and such things as cars, refrigerators, television sets, and so on—it seems to me even snowmobiles—have come to be accepted as everyday necessities. We are living in the most prosperous country of its size in the world with the second highest standard of living. So far, our problems would appear to be minor, but I am afraid we are coming closer and closer to one very large problem, one which we must clearly recognize and examine before it is too late.

In Canada today, as in every other country in the world, there is a group of people, ever increasing in size, who unwittingly perhaps and without sinister intent, are determined to destroy all individuality and to establish a state-controlled society.

More and more we see our governments being influenced by this group to offer us increasingly socialistic policies. By "socialistic policies", I refer to services rendered by the state and controlled by the state to everyone, regardless of need, ability to pay, or the individual's own wishes. Few of us are willing to refuse something that is being given to us for nothing and so we close our eyes and allow ourselves to be deluded into supporting these policies. It is time we all realized that we are not in fact getting something for nothing. We are merely paying the government by means of our taxes to provide these services for us, and thereby allowing our freedom of choice to pass from our hands to those of the government.

Premier Robarts has warned repeatedly, and I quote: "Each time the state assumes a function or makes a decision for the individual, he must lose some of his freedom, which he can never recover."

What actually happens then, is this—we are still paying for each service provided, only now we pay in taxes instead of by direct payment, and we have turned control over to the state. We no longer have the freedom to decide for ourselves, whether or not we actually want this particular service, or where we prefer to buy it if we do. We witnessed the first step of this with baby bonuses. The next step was old age pensions which everyone, regardless of need, receives.

In other words, in a society such as ours we are given a little with one hand and relieved of a lot by the other; relieved not only of money but of our freedom of choice, and ironically, this is all being done very gradually of our own free will. The most recent and most dangerous step is medicare. In Ontario today over 90 per cent of the population is covered with medical care insurance. Those who buy their own insurance are at liberty to choose a plan from several competitive insurance companies and those whose incomes are too low are subsidized by the Ontario government. Every person is well protected from the threat of medical bills but still we hear the cry of a group insisting that we must have compulsory government-operated medicare insurance.

The federal government has forced medicare through legislation and is actually attempting to blackmail our province into co-operation. Blackmail is a harsh term, but this is in fact what is happening. Ontario contributes approximately 50 per cent of all federal taxes, and Ontario's grant from the medicare scheme would amount to roughly $150 million. In effect then, since the federal government in Ottawa is going to tax Ontario residents $250 to $500 million, or approximately half of the proposed cost of medicare, then the Ontario government must agree to adopt medicare or forfeit its grant from Ottawa which is estimated in excess of $150 million. This is very good business and I wish the federal government would say to me "I will give you $400 million if you will give me $150 million back".

In other words, no matter what the government of a province the size of Ontario believes, it must accept the policy of compulsory state-operated medicare, or suffer from excessive taxation. If this plan is instituted, it means that all private insurance companies will no longer be able to sell medical care insurance in this province.

I cannot help wondering what country behind the iron curtain would not gladly buy their freedom back, for much more than the $150 million we are being pressured to accept for ours.

In Canada, few of us can appreciate what it means to lose our freedom. During the war, the occupied countries—Holland, Belgium, France and others—learned the real meaning. We have new Canadians who left their homes and countries because of that loss

of freedom and came to Canada. These people saw many of their friends and families killed and many Canadians gave their lives to help them win back their freedom and defend it for us. Must we sit idly by and watch it being eroded bit by bit without doing anything to stop it? We do not want this to happen, but it will happen unless we make ourselves heard much louder than the minority whose plan it is to steal our freedom from us.

We, as individuals, must strive as never before to defend our birthright against these insidious forces which are seeking to destroy our individuality, as well as our freedom.

Socialism is by no means a new thing. Back in 1620, two centuries before Karl Marx wrote his manifesto, it was tried in the Plymouth colony, in the United States of America. It was tried and found very much wanting.

I quote from the diary of Governor Bradford of that time:

> The experience that was had in this common course and condition, tried sundrie years amongst godly and sober men, may well evince the vanity of the conceit of Plato—that the taking away of property and bringing community into a common wealth would make them happy and flourishing; as if they were wiser than God. For this community was found to breed much confusion and discontent, and to retard much employment, that would have been to their benefit and comfort.

In this morning's *Globe and Mail* there was a letter to the editor, written by the editor and publisher of the Cobourg *Sentinel*. In this he states:

> The time has come to halt sinful expenditures. The time has come to put teeth into work legislation. The time has come to stop compromising on every single issue of contention. The time has come to discipline. Each citizen needs to be told the facts of economy. These facts must be brought home in terms of responsibility. The young man who is looking askance at an amoral society has no prerogative to thumb his nose at adults who have caused this condition but should pressure himself into being a better person, otherwise he becomes part of the problem, too.
>
> The student who wants to run the affairs of universities, without one hour of labour or one personal penny spent in taxation on behalf of the construction of these edifices, has small right to dictate what should transpire in curricula within the walls. He has not earned it. Unless we get back to the fundamentals of work and pay, to earning our keep, we are lost as a human race.

Mr. L. C. Henderson (Lambton): Down with socialism.

Mr. Potter: I continue to quote:

> Why is affluence so false in the structure of society? It perpetuates money as the chief god of man. It dictates that man should have a guaranteed income, that major things in life should be his without striving for them; that government should be his beneficent father.
>
> In this concept, no one should have to suffer a doctor's bill, no one should have to pay for a toothache. Everyone should be cradled and loved and looked after from the first diaper to the last earthly cough.

This is the way Dr. Ross intimates that society is going, but he does not add that this is also the way society is going to hell.

An hon. member: Down with socialism!

Mr. Potter: This, Mr. Speaker, is the choice we are facing today—socialism or free enterprise. We must make a choice. Let us be sure that we continue to control our own destiny.

Mr. T. Reid (Scarborough East): Mr. Speaker, if my remarks today are not warmly expressed, it is because half of my jaw is still frozen from having gone to a dentist to have a crown put on a tooth.

I listened, with great interest, to the remarks of the last speaker when he said that no one should have to pay for a toothache. Well, right now, Mr. Speaker, after seeing the bill for having a crown put on a tooth, I am very sympathetic to free toothaches.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to say that since the Legislature opened I have admired the way that you have conducted the affairs of this House and I look forward to a long association in this Legislature with you, sir.

I have the privilege of representing the east end riding of Toronto, the eastern riding of Metropolitan Toronto, and I have great pleasure in being here as a Liberal member. Unforunately I do not have the knowledge that the former member had in this Legislature about such things as horses. I will try to refer any member on the other side of the House who ask me questions in this regard to an authoritative source.

I hope that 25 years from now, after continuously representing the Scarborough East riding in this Legislature, I, sir, might have the sense to realize that I was getting old and outdated and be willing to turn the reins over to younger men. I would like to see the members on the other side of the House, who spill over on this side of the House to the left of the NDP, remember this point; that after a quarter of a century you do get very old and should move out, if not for younger men in your own party, certainly for the dynamic leader of my party, on this side of the House.

Interjections by hon members.

Mr. T. Reid: I would like to refer to a couple of points in the Speech from the Throne. On page 5 I draw your attention, sir, to the following quotation:

> The Ontario of 1968 is far more numerous in people, far richer in capital assets and natural resources and has far greater potential than the Ontario guided by the government of the hon. John Sandfield Macdonald as he took Ontario into the first years of Confederation.

I would like to comment on that statement, Mr. Speaker, on two points. It is very interesting because on page 6 there is another statement, and I quote: "Programmes will be accelerated to improve the purity of the air we breathe [and] the water we drink." Sir, I find this a bit inconsistent with the previous statement. I do not think that the air of Ontario and the water of Ontario in 1968 are richer than the air in Ontario and the water of Ontario back in the first years of Confederation and I would point out to the people who are responsible for producing this document that consistency is at least a minor virtue, if not a major one.

The second point I would like to make about the Speech from the Throne, sir—

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): He is referring to the Lieutenant-Governor.

An hon. member: That will fit him too.

Mr. T. Reid: I am referring perhaps to the unwritten constitution at this point. Consider the statement that Ontario is far more numerous in people. Sir, this is true and I asked the reference library in the very well endowed library in this building to provide me with the population statistics for Ontario and Canada for the years 1867 and 1967. It is true that the population of Ontario over the first 100 years of Confederation increased from 1,525,000 to 7,217,000, a very good rate of growth in population. But I would remind the members of the House that if they look at the relative position of Ontario in Confederation, in terms of the population of Ontario, in 1867 Ontario had about 45 per cent of the people of Canada and today Ontario only has 36 per cent of the people of Canada. That, sir, I think is very bad.

Mr. Speaker, I would like today to bring to the attention of the members of this House a single issue. This single issue is a marriage that is taking place in education in the province of Ontario. The marriage partners are power and authority. It is the marriage of television—which is power—and education, which is authority. It is educational television. And they say it will instruct millions of residents of Ontario, including a family of children numbering more than 2,000,000.

Educational television will shortly become one of the cornerstones of the learning process of our schools. It will become a full third partner in the classrooms across this province. The interaction of teacher, educational television and pupil will create an entirely new learning climate in each classroom. The promise of educational television is an opportunity for students to see and hear the sights and sounds that time and space will simply deny them without this medium.

I agree completely with the present Minister of Education (Mr. Davis) and I quote here that: "It is essential that this powerful educational aid be released now to make its full contribution to the people of Ontario." The Minister of Education made these remarks in Ottawa the other day.

We must, as the Minister stated then, and again I quote: "Give a priority position in our province to educational television." I also, sir, share the concern of the present Minister of Education with the slowness of the federal government in setting out the ground rules whereby we, in Ontario, can have the full advantage of education television, particularly in the classrooms of our schools.

Before I go any further in my remarks, I would like to make one point quite clear. In what follows, I intend to use the general term, Minister of Education in my arguments. This means that what I am talking about applies to any Minister of Education, whether he is Conservative, Liberal, New Democrat or belonging to some party not now represented in this chamber or to some party not yet born in this province.

In the summer of 1966, the Minister of Education in Ontario established a separate

educational television branch within his department. Prior to this, educational television was part of the curriculum branch of the department.

The educational television branch has grown from about a half dozen employees to well over 70 employees today, and has a budget which is in the millions of dollars. Educational television programmes, or if you like, visual lessons or visual textbooks, are produced by The Department of Education in CBC and private TV studios.

Over 300 of these government-produced educational programmes are today being shown in classrooms across Ontario. Many more programmes are now being prepared, written and produced by The Department of Education for future use.

I hope that the members in the House, sir, will think of this development the way an architect friend of mine thinks of his buildings. The architect and workman shape the building for a few months. But the building shapes its occupants for several lifetimes. And there is not a home in this province, sir, where television has not done its share of shaping all of us by its power alone, without the authority of education. With its colour, sound and moving picture, television has the power to present to you an image that has every appearance of truth. But the authority of education can insist that it is true.

Who assumes this power? Who commands this authority? In the next five years this massive medium of educational television will grow, and it must grow, into an agency that will shape the ability, dedication and integrity of millions of maturing citizens of the province. There can be no question that television ranks among the most powerful educational agencies we have so far acquired.

We must remember, however, that the most compelling authority young children can give to a statement of opinion or belief is simply to be able to say, "I was there." Television can take you there. I would like to quote from the present Minister of Education's remarks in Ottawa, to underline this last point. The Minister, speaking to the House of Commons committee on broadcasting, made the following remarks, and I quote directly:

> One of Britain's leaders of educational thought, Sir Alex Flecc, is another who supports the importance of television in education. He stresses children's needs for first-hand experience or the best possible substitute as a stimulus to learning. In a much quoted address given as visiting Commonwealth fellow in October, 1966, he said this: "For the majority of children, this eagerness to learn is much more likely to come from a carefully contrived experience, on the principle of what I hear I forget, what I see I remember, and what I do I understand."

What I am suggesting, sir, is that this is not an image we are discussing, this is a fundamental issue in a democratic society. There are very serious questions to be asked of the government that one would charge with consummating this marriage of the authority of education and the power of television.

Will the Minister of Education of this province of Ontario be allowed to persist in government control of an instrument that combines this power of television and the authority of education, when all the people of Canada demanded in the 1930s that electronic mass media could only be regulated by an agency properly and fully divorced from government.

You must remember, sir, that if the Aird Royal commission on broadcasting had not made the fundamental case for a separate, independent, non-government-controlled agency in the 1930's, you and I would today be watching a CBC national news that was under the control of a federal government department; a CBC national news where a government Minister could buzz for the director of the national news and order him to play up one item or play down another.

Mr. Speaker, some people in this province are not concerned about who controls the programming of educational television. These people argue that all other, or non-TV education is now under control of the Minister of Education. So why should we, the argument goes, seriously question government control of the new educational medium? Mr. Scott Young gave one reason in his column in the *Globe and Mail,* dated October 5, 1967. Mr. Young said:

> There is an obvious difference between the printed word and the television image. Textbooks can be taken home, read by parents, examined by school boards, rejected if they are found to be propagandistic or otherwise objectionable. But educational television programmes now in use in this province, in the classrooms of our schools, are subjected to no such public scrutiny. The images flash on the screen and are gone, leaving their impact where it cannot be examined or repudiated.

To draw this point firmly in our minds, Mr. Speaker, I would also like to quote from a statement in a submission submitted to the House of Commons broadcasting committee in Ottawa by Mr. Howard Mountain. The topic of his brief to the committee was entitled, "Criteria for the Establishment of Mass Media in a Democratic Society", and here is one quote which I think is highly relevant to the point I am trying to make now. Mr. Mountain says this:

> For the first time we have in television a recording device which has by its nature the near reality of coloured moving picture with sound—the capacity to influence instantaneously millions of people with a communicator which at the same time is capable of the most faithful reproduction of reality or the most artful distortion of it. In the cognative, intuitive, or mechanical selection, rearrangement or distortion of its elements that is possible, it places in the hands of the few who must create its programmes, a professional responsibility and public obligation second to none.

Mr. Speaker, every parent knows the subtle, suggestive powers of television. Mr. Scott Young in his article put the following question, a question with which I agree:

> If a government in power, in making films for educational TV, as The Ontario Department of Education now does, had a policy that touched on a subject being taught by television, do you think for a moment that government would okay programmes that [fundamentally] opposed party policy?

Let me be very specific on this point. Let me be specific in what is at stake. Last Friday I asked the Premier (Mr. Robarts) in this chamber whether the wonderfully artistic film "A Place to Stand" was being shown in the classrooms of Ontario. The Premier replied on page 185 in Hansard, February 23, 1968:

> I would be able to tell you that it has been reduced to a 16 mm. film. It was made originally as a 70 mm. film, which in itself is a very large technical achievement. With that technical achievement having been made, it would now be available in schools most of which are equipped with 16 mm. projectors.

The argument about film can be seen in the context of being on educational television.

Now, what Mr. Scott Young says about this film "A Place to Stand" and its possible use on educational television in this province is as follows—he says:

> Would Ontario educational TV be inclined to show this euphoric film "A Place to Stand" only in proper balance against films of city slums where there is no place to stand in peace, let alone lie down?

That, sir, is the crux of the problem. It is very interesting that some young people in this city saw "A Place to Stand", admired its artistic perfection, then went out and produced an underground film which mocked it—which showed the slums and the Indian reservations in this province.

The point is that we are involved in a question of thought in a democratic society. I think we must realize that right now we need an educational television service that will be free from any possible partisan political domination, or influence. Regardless of what political party forms the government of this province in the years ahead, this is the kind of political control of the mass media that we fought against in the 1930s and must fight against now.

Surely we do not need another Royal commission to tell us what negates a fundamental principle in a democratic society.

Whichever political party in the years ahead forms the government of this province, therefore, control of educational television must be removed from the Minister of Education. Some sort of an independent commission must interpose an effective barrier, a safeguard, between his views and those of his civil servants and what actually is carried on television to assist in education in this province.

We need an educational television service that is based on the continuous independent surveys of the needs of the people it serves and not on the unchecked biases of the people it must employ. As a fundamental principle the men who are charged with the programming of this educational mass medium must have as their guide a continuous mass survey to determine real educational needs.

I think we must have an educational television service where independent public examination of the effects of its power and authority must be compiled regularly and be available to everyone, not in the pile of secret hidden documents. As a fundamental democratic principle, sir, the men who are charged with the programming must have as their guide a continuous mass assessment to determine the fallout effects of this explosion in education.

We need an educational television service in the province of Ontario where every region, every city, every area or municipality

should have access to the service according to their need. We must have an educational television service where continuous involvement of the audience as individuals in its planning and evaluation will ensure justification of its enormous expense.

Ignorance, Mr. Speaker, is an excuse for the man who has been misinformed.

We must look, and we must look hard, at this present educational television system in Ontario. We must examine the government which created it.

When you talk about educational television, please do not talk of the judgment of the people when you are speaking of an instrument that affects their ability to judge.

In today's world, each day we become more interdependent on each other for security, for our safety and for our prosperity. Each day, governments controlling and shaping the laws that regulate and implement this interdependence find an opportunity to seize a portion of the freedom we gladly surrender for the common good. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that our only defence against this erosion of our rights is information and education. In a democracy educational television will not simply defend the will of the people, it will shape the will of the people.

For better or worse, all of us will be children of this marriage of the authority of education and the power of television. But all of us in this chamber, sir, must remember that if the Aird Royal commission on broadcasting had not made the fundamental case for a separate independent non-government agency in the 1930s, you and I could have been the children of a similar marriage between the CBC national news submitting to its partner, the federal government. Government-managed news is complete anathema to a democratic way of life.

I always try to remember that educational television is not just enticing an audience for 30 minutes but it is shaping a province for at least the next 30 years, for its subject is the minds of our children.

I would like, then, to look at the question of an authority or a board, that will stand between The Department of Education, which is headed by a Minister, who is a member of a particular political party—whatever party that might be—and educational television in this province. And to try to underline once again the tremendous importance of this fundamental point I would like to quote two brief statements from the submission that Mr. Howard Mountain made to the House of Commons committee on broadcasting in Ottawa.

Mr. Mountain said this, and I quote directly:

> The responsibility of any authority charged with the control of educational mass media is to ensure that any and all programmes provided by these media have as their *raison d'etre* the product of a most broad-based, deductive, impartial organization with equal capacity for a continuous assessment of its effect and perfection of its technique, as well as justification for its offering, not only as education but as mass media itself.

The second quote from Mr. Mountain's brief, underlines another fundamental point we must remember when we are discussing who should control educational television and who should command the authority that education puts into television programmes. Mr. Mountain says this:

> In much education today, it is the dilemma that truth and bias are separated by authority alone. If education is to be used in a medium in the situation where truth and authority cannot be separated by the vast majority of the audience, most deliberate and considered safeguards are required.

The hon. Minister is, of course, not unaware of this problem, and his recent statements have been much better than the statements he made even two months ago.

I would like to quote from the Minister of Education's statement in this House several days ago. He stated the following:

> As a result of our experience, we will establish an authority for educational broadcasting in Ontario. This authority would be a board responsible to the Minister and through him to the Legislature for the direction and administration of educational broadcasting in Ontario. The board's membership will include representation appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor in council from groups such as school board trustees, universities, teachers, adult education and associations linking schools to parents in homes.

The following questions are key to an examination of this general statement of policy by the government of this province. This is where we are getting into the "guts of decision-making" if you like. The key questions are the following; the first one is this: What is the authority of this authority? What is it to control?

As the present Minister of Education stated in his Ottawa submission, page 7, "The extent and nature of that control should be clearly defined." Mr. Speaker, I agree completely with this statement. The forthcoming legislation to be approved by this Legislature, establishing the authority or the board for

educational broadcasting in Ontario, must be most explicit concerning the authority and control of this board, particularly with respect to its relationship to the ETV branch of The Department of Education, the government and this Legislature.

The Minister of Education's statement to this Legislature on February 26 included this, and I repeat it: "The board's membership will include representation appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor in council." I am very pleased that the Minister has left the door open for some members of the board to get on that board without being appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor in council. The question of how people get on that educational television board is critical to a clear understanding of the degree of autonomy and responsibility of the ETV board in this province. And I will have some suggestions to make, sir, on this shortly.

Another question, which must be answered before this board is established, is: How does the chairman of the ETV board get to be chairman? Another question: Who is to be the executive secretary of this ETV board? How is he to be appointed? Is it to be the Deputy Minister of Education, or should it be a person who does not report to the Minister of Education as well as reporting to the ETV board?

Another question, sir: Who forms the secretariat of this ETV board? Is it to be the ETV branch of The Department of Education? If this is to be the case, the ETV authority will, in effect, in terms of effective decision-making, be very much a creature of The Department of Education and not a separate, independent authority. It will be an ETV authority with very little *de facto* authority or power.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to make a number of suggestions concerning the authority of this ETV board, and particularly suggestions regarding appointments to it and its infrastructure. I would like to see the following recommendations referred to the education committee of this Legislature. And here are some of my thoughts on this, sir.

There might be 20 members of this ETV board. Why not have 15 of these members elected by various educational groups in this province, elected by non-government groups in this province? For example, the classroom teachers in various regional groupings of school districts in Ontario might directly elect, not just nominate to the Minister of Education, ten members of the board. This might help to achieve the objective that the Minister of Education is concerned with—or one of the objectives he is concerned with—of having adequate regional representation on this board. Another five members of the board might be elected from other non-government groups, for example, the universities.

But what I wish to underline here in this particular recommendation, sir, is that the most important thing is the direct election of persons to the ETV board by the classroom teachers of our elementary and secondary schools. Of course the people elected by the classroom teachers in our schools need not themselves be teachers. Some of them might well be. This direct and responsible participation of our classroom teachers in a democratic way, as opposed to a paternalistic way—for example, the ministerial laying on of hands—in saying who are to be members of the ETV board, would cut through the non-teaching, bureaucratic, red tape so prevalent in our school system, and by doing so would help to restore some of the proper balance of decision-making power in our educational system.

I would suggest that the board should elect its own chairman. The board should be given explicit power in the legislation setting up the ETV board so that the chairman should be elected by the people on that board from amongst their numbers.

I can also see that there should be some members of the board chosen for their particular competence in this field of educational television. These might be appointed by the Minister of Education. I would like to see this number very small in comparison to the total number of members on the board. I would also prefer to have the Minister recommend perhaps five people to the education committee of the Legislature for appointment to the board. I would fully expect that the committee members would have some effect on the decisions made.

I do not think that the chairman of the ETV board should be appointed by the government, and above all, I do not think the chairman should be a civil servant, or even a former civil servant. Another suggestion that I would make—and I would like to have these suggestions referred to the education committee—is this: That the ETV board submit an annual report, with a detailed financial statement, to ensure public accountability for public funds, to the Legislature via the education committee of the Legislature. I would fully expect that the Minister of Education

would be the chairman of this most important politically balanced committee.

I would expect that the committee would meet regularly with the chairman of the ETV board, perhaps once a month. It is this type of regular public examination which is the strongest safeguard of public responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, it is not sufficient to say that there will simply be an authority for educational television in Ontario. The authority of the ETV authority must be clearly spelled out in this chamber, and I think that the education committee could be of great assistance in this. As the Minister of Education himself said in Ottawa just the other day, and I quote: "The extent and nature of control of policy should be clearly defined."

We must clearly define the authority of the ETV board in this province. Anyone who has experienced or studied the exercise of power and the control of power, knows that an ill-defined, or only half thought-out authority, is often an excuse for hiding the real and exercised centre of power and decision-making. I think that it would be interesting for me to quote a statement by Dr. Lewis Miller, associate professor of philosophy at Scarborough College of the University of Toronto, concerning the necessity of a clear, unmuddled definition of the authority of the ETV authorities. Professor Miller points out in a book entitled "Educational Television", which was the report of the educational television conference in Newfoundland and Labrador, September 6 to 9, 1966:

> The federal government, we have been told, is preparing to give immediate consideration to the creation of a new federal organization, licensed to operate public service broadcasting facilities. The text of the federal government white paper reads as follows:
>
> "This organization would be empowered to enter into an agreement with any province, to make such facilities available for the broadcasting within the province, during appropriate periods of the day, programmes designed to meet the needs of the provincial education system as defined by the responsible provincial authorities."
>
> And while one ponders what might be meant by the phrase "responsible provincial authorities," we might recall that in the first paragraph on educational broadcasting, we are told that the policy that has been followed for the past 20 years is that broadcasting licences should not be granted to other governments, or to agencies under their direct control.
>
> The view supporting this practice, spelled out in every Royal commission that has ever been held on broadcasting in Canada, is reiterated in the white paper in the following passage entitled "On Public Control of Broadcasting":
>
> "It is almost universally recognized that the regulation of programming must be entirely and demonstratively free from improper influences and pressures, and can therefore be best delegated to an independently constituted authority which is not subject to any form of direction in that regard."

When you get at the guts of decision-making and power and authority in this area, you must ask yourself some very simple questions, and they have to do with the veto power of a Minister. It is reported in the *Globe and Mail* dated Wednesday, February 28, 1968, page 3, that:

> Mr. Davis was questioned closely by Mr. Jamieson about political control over the representative authority planned by Ontario for running the provincial educational TV programme. The Minister did not directly meet the question about the Minister's veto over the authority, suggesting that this is only a problem that could be worked out in time.

I would submit, sir, that we must be very clear now. The Minister has stated that we must be clear now about the authority of this board, we cannot leave it as something to be worked out in the future.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would like to shed a fairly broad light on the experiences in western Europe regarding the control of writing and producing and programming television series for use in the classrooms of schools particularly. I would refer members who are interested to a book entitled "Radio and Television Broadcasting on the European Continent", by Burton Paulu, the University of Minneapolis Press, 1967. This is what this book says about the control of educational programming in western Europe:

> In most countries on the European continent, the broadcasting organization, rather than the state education authorities, is responsible for producing in-school servicing. The broadcasting organizations in democratic countries such as France, West Germany and Belgium normally are not subject to direct government supervision. In these countries the broadcasting organ-

ization has the initiative and freedom to produce these programmes. This means that in these democratic countries, the school programmes are not produced by a government department or by an agent—which is a façade, as a barrier between a government department or any Minister who belongs to a particular political party, and the production of programmes.

The existence in Ontario of this potential abuse of a fundamental principle of a free society is having a very unfortunate effect on the development of ETV in Ontario. Because The Department of Education is aware of the danger to which ETV is now exposed, its creativity and initiative in educational television is stifled. We must remember that it would take only one clear-cut abuse to blow up in public to set ETV in this province back yet another decade. The inherent conflict of interest between educational television programming—determining what goes into those programmes — and political control must be removed by the imposition of a well-defined barrier in which the people of Ontario have sufficient trust.

I was hoping the Premier would be here because he would say, "You little man of little faith." Sir, I firmly believe in government by laws and not by the discretion of politicians.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): Mr. Speaker I hesitate to rise on this occasion. I do so with a great deal of trepidation, sir, as I imagine was your situation when you first had the honour and privilege of addressing this House. Perhaps my trepidation is a little more significant because of the fact that I for many years have had in view perhaps sitting in this Legislature.

I had the opportunity, sir, of growing up in the city of North Bay, the son of the late William Gladstone Bullbrook, sir, former mayor of the city of North Bay. As you can see, I, unlike others, came to this great party by heritage as well as intelligence—at least I hope the latter, Mr. Speaker.

In any event, sir, we in our household had politics with our corn flakes, and I recall, sir, at the age of 16 being handed $35 by my father, and he said, "Both Houses of Parliament in this province are now in session and I suggest you go and see what goes on." Sir, I took his advice and left and hitch-hiked to Ottawa and approached with great eagerness our Parliament. I walked into the gallery and I saw a distinguished and a distraught gentleman, sir, attempting to make a speech while 200 other members were singing "Show Me the Way to Go Home."

I was almost mortified, but undaunted I hitch-hiked here to Toronto and on approximately June 28 of that year I entered these galleries and looked at the plan and peered down to our then provincial representative from the district of Nipissing, who began at that time this great 25 years of glory in our province. I finally spotted him, sir, and he was fast asleep, with his feet up on the chair of the Minister of Reform Institutions. I want to assure you, sir, that you will never find me in this House asleep. And it will be approximately four years before I am on the right side of the House to get my feet up on the chair of the Minister of Reform Institutions.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bullbrook: I would like to say, as the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) does: Do not mumble; let me hear what you are saying; we have answers.

In any event, Mr. Speaker, the hon. Prime Minister, in his discussion during the course of this Throne Debate, made mention of the election campaign culminating October 17 of last year and I think prior to getting into the substance of my remarks, with your permission and with the indulgence of my colleagues, I would make mention of our election campaign.

As you are aware, sir, I have the good fortune of replacing the former Progressive Conservative then incumbent, and a man, I must say, and I say this in seriousness, most diligent in his desire to represent adequately and well the people of the then Lambton West riding, and a man who did this, in my opinion.

During the course of our campaign, it was done, sir, on a most gentlemanly and relatively objective and truly political plane. We, sir, had the opportunity on many occasions of meeting and debating. He would come, sir, in his uniform—he was apparently a member of a team, I think it was the Robarts team, I am not sure—but we would sit there and look up to the sky and wait for the NDP candidate to descend bringing a copy of the Regina manifesto and we then began our debate. But all in all, it was a most successful campaign for the Liberal Party and I believe the people of the Sarnia riding at large were overjoyed. I did not mean, sir, to be less than humble in saying that.

In any event, there was nothing that caused me too great concern during the course of

the campaign. I know that some of my supporters were at times disturbed as they kept getting letters from the office of the Prime Minister and president of the Cabinet council exhorting them to the election of the incumbent. They felt that this perhaps was not appropriate to that high office during the course of the campaign and that perhaps there was a dual responsibility—one as the leader of the political party and the other as the chief officer of the government at the time. But when we found out that the Progressive Conservative Party, sir, had paid for the postage, it was all right, we accepted it.

The only thing that really ever caused me concern during the course of the campaign was that we in southwestern Ontario, through a gratuitous involvement with CFPL-TV, were given the opportunity of five minutes of free television time. I appeared, I think it was, with some 18 others at 11.15 one evening. They stood us in line and we went into the studios and I said to them, "What about makeup?" and they said, "Well, it is necessary but we do not have time tonight." But I, with my wife, the next day looked at this with no vainglory, I assure you, sir, and I came on and had my five minutes of nervousness and then afterwards on came the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. MacNaughton), and he looked even handsomer than he does in this House, sir.

As he spoke, there were aerial photographs of Huron county, and I thought to myself, what equity and justice. Everybody being treated equally. Now, as my hon. friend says, some are more equal than others.

In any event, Mr. Speaker, as members know, I now have the great fortune of representing the new Sarnia riding, which is composed of the city of Sarnia, the village of Point Edward and Sarnia township, relatively urban in its atmosphere. I think I represent approximately five per cent rural population at the present time.

I feel in a similar position to an adopting parent in that I had the opportunity of choosing. I love the north, but I chose to go to the city of Sarnia and I chose well and happily to raise my family, to practice my profession in that dynamic and vital area that contributes so much to the economic welfare of the province of Ontario.

Mr. Speaker, I must confess that the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Gomme), with his announcement of yesterday removed two-thirds—my colleagues will be happy to hear this—two-thirds of my speech, and 100 per cent of the invective in my speech because I wanted to talk about the great need for a controlled access facility from the Sarnia area to the city of London and/or to the Macdonald-Cartier freeway. I want to express to the hon. Minister, the appreciation of the people of Sarnia for the announcement that was made yesterday in connection with the preliminary design study that his department is now undertaking with respect to this controlled access facility.

Mr. G. Ben (Humber): The hon. member scared them into it!

Mr. Bullbrook: I recognize full well that it was no talent of mine that brought the hon. Minister to this conclusion; it was a question of priority as his department has so well put it. We, on this side of the House, recognize the tremendous burden on the provincial Treasury in connection with highway systems.

But I would ask the hon. Minister to keep this in mind, if I might and most respectfully, that this highway is badly needed. The release by the press in the city of Sarnia yesterday was met with great excitement and enjoyment by the mayor and by the reeves of the various municipalities. As the Minister knows, Damas and Smith, the consulting engineering firm last year completed a study for the Bluewater bridge authority, and I believe this is the firm employed by the department in connection with feasibility studies done with respect to the requirements in our area.

This consulting firm recommended to the Bluewater bridge authority that they must contemplate the twinning of the Bluewater bridge by 1972.

So I take it that the intention of the department integrates with this need the tremendous traffic volume; some two million cars last year passed over that bridge. We had the completion in 1966 of route I-94 of that great interstate system in the state of Michigan.

Frankly, and I say this most respectfully, that when people come off a beautiful controlled access facility such as the "I system" in the state of Michigan, and are faced immediately with what is, in essence, a three-lane death trap—and these are not my words because the first time I heard that highway described in that fashion was by the present Provincial Treasurer, the then Minister of Highways—and then an archaic 40-mile two-lane highway to London, it is obvious there is a need there.

I do appreciate the Minister's acceptance of that need, and I exhort him as best I

might to continue the efforts towards the realization of that need by the implementation of any design study that is undertaken at the present time.

The next matter that I want to refer to is the question of air pollution. I say this, and I ask the record to show it, Mr. Speaker, that the city of Sarnia is unduly synonimized with the word "pollution" and "air pollution" at times. We live, and I live, in a beautiful community, a vital community. I spoke to the House a few moments ago of this.

But we do have an obligation in the Sarnia riding, and we as members of this House all have an extreme and paramount obligation in connection with this question of air pollution. It is something related not only to the city of Sarnia. Perhaps I have a greater obligation than some members because our industrial complex is that of a chemical nature, and the affluxion into the air by the industry of Sarnia is basically a chemical affluxion. It is not a problem of haze and things of that nature.

But I suggest this, and I suggest it most respectfully again. In the Throne Speech as given on January 25, 1967, His Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor, speaking on behalf of the administration, said, and I quote:

> The industrialization of Ontario, coupled with an expanding population, and urbanization, has increased the burden upon the air, soil and water of our province. My government will continue to press its war on pollution. Legislation will be introduced to apply the most modern and progressive concepts to ensure that the air our citizens breathe will be clean and pure.
>
> To effect this, the facilities and staff of the pollution control service will be increased to provide a complete and integrated programme.

I ask you to take cognizance of the words "complete and integrated programme" because my hon. friend has mentioned previously the words in this year's Throne Speech where His Honour said: "programmes will be accelerated to improve the purity of the air we breathe."

We are now going to accelerate a complete and integrated programme because, in point of fact, the programme is far from complete and far from integrated. The Air Pollution Control Act of 1967 is, most respectfully, one of the most "toothless pieces of legislation" that probably has been conceived by this House, as evidenced by the Electro-Reduction Company of Canada problem that the Minister (Mr. Dymond) faced last year.

I do not wish to be romantic or melodramatic in this respect, but we are not talking of an obligation that faces only us now. We are talking of an obligation, Mr. Speaker, towards our children and our grandchildren, because in this urbanized, industrial society of ours, the single most important problem that we have is that of air pollution.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Bullbrook: It causes me concern. Some three months ago, I directed a letter to Mr. W. B. Drowley whom I believed to be the head of the air pollution control service for this province, asking him his opinion and advice in connection with certain matters. I had been given information in confidence by a person who holds a doctorate degree. We have in the city of Sarnia more people with doctorate degrees pro rata than any place in the Dominion of Canada, so we have the talent there to look into these problems.

An hon. member: There are more in Chalk River!

Mr. Bullbrook: Where is Chalk River, sir?

Mr. Speaker, the point I make is this, that we do have the talent available to us, and it is incumbent upon the government to make talent available to them in this connection.

Statistical interpretation can be too self-serving in this field. As I told hon. members, I directed a letter on the basis of information given to me in connection with the omission of sulphur-dioxide from the Lambton generating station when it is under full production. I directed this letter because I have been told that if we have an inversion situation in Sarnia of undue length, or if we have a southwesterly wind for five days when that plant is in full capacity there will be fumigation of all the vegetation in the Sarnia area. This is a question of great concern to us. I received some four weeks later not a reply from Mr. Drowley but a reply from the hon. Minister of Health. I do not know the significance of not getting a reply from Mr. Drowley.

Having been called upon today, prior to the time I thought, I do not have a copy of that letter with me. But I can give members the essence of that letter, and the hon. Minister will have ready opportunity to take issue with my evaluation of it.

Basically, the Minister said this to me, that he could assure me that if there was any evidence of adverse effect on the vegetation in the Sarnia area, this plant had been equipped with low-sulphur content bunkers so that they could immediately go on low-sulphur content fuel. If that is not "locking the door

after the horse is gone" I don't know what is. What good does it do to the alfalfa grower in the county of Lambton if after all his crop is fumigated, the plant then goes onto low-sulphur content of fuel?

I think the time has come that the people of Ontario must demand, and must be told, what the increased cost will be to them per kilowat hour by the Ontario Hydro being compelled to go on low-sulphur content fuel in some locations. This has to be answered. There is no great panacea or solution to the question of air pollution, but we must have a more vigorous attitude.

In this same letter, to which I refer, the Hon. Minister of Health said to me, we must recognize that the Ontario Hydro is just one contributor, or might be one contributor, to any pollution situation that is involved in the area, and that any solution must be an equitable solution.

I suggest again, with the very greatest respect, that that answer is no good to me at all. Certainly we know there must be an equitable solution. I do not care one tittle whether the Ontario Hydro is obliged to clean up, or any industry is obliged to clean up or both of them are obliged. The obligation rests with the hon. Minister of Health and he must accept that obligation, and quickly.

Now, sir, one other point if I may. I pass onto a problem unique to the city of Sarnia, but worthy perhaps of a few minutes of time.

As I said, we are well blessed with a vitality of industry in our tremendous capital involvement in the city of Sarnia. But we do have a problem in connection with the peculiarity of this particular capital involvement, and that is that the petrol-chemical industry has been able because of a provision of The Assessment Act to escape, in my opinion, what is adequate and proper assessment and adequate and proper tax obligation with respect to the municipality of the city of Sarnia.

It was said in the private bills committee, and rightly so, by the hon. member for Sudbury, that there is nothing reprehensible in attempting to avoid tax, and I associate myself entirely with those remarks in making the statement that I am now going to make.

I would like to read to my colleagues the provisions of section 4 of The Assessment Act, being chapter 23 of the Revised Statutes of Ontario, I believe, 1960, Mr. Speaker, and section 4 says that all real property in Ontario is liable to assessment of taxation subject to the following from taxation. And then subsection 17, Mr. Speaker, of that section says that, "All machinery and equipment used for manufacturing or farming purposes, including the foundations on which they rest," and so on and so on. I am going to say that, in effect, that section exempts industries from tax on many of their assets which cannot be construed as real property within the purview of that subsection.

What has happened, in effect, in the Sarnia area is this, by way of example. We have the Dow Chemical Corporation building at a cost in excess of $3 million. A steam generating power plant which is assessed by the city of Sarnia at $50,000. I suggest to you, sir, there is there a degree of inequity to the residential and commercial taxpayers of the city of Sarnia. And the reason for the inequity is this, and this happens in so many instances—that this legislation has not had any real re-evaluation since 1904.

There was a time perhaps in 1904, when there was some relation between real property assets and the person's ability to pay. But with sophistication of design, and with the credit that we have available now, and the type of capital expansion that now takes place, this is archaic legislation and I ask most respectfully that we would have an opportunity of looking at some reassessment of The Assessment Act, because it is not proper as far as my constituents are concerned. In essence I see really no great loss to the industry involved because their real property taxation if elevated would surely in effect lessen their total corporate tax obligation. I am subject to correction—their total tax figure would remain the same—but I am subject to correction in that connection. But I do say this to you, sir, that there is an imbalance there that must be rectified.

Mr. Speaker, those are the two problems, basically parochial in nature, that reflect a need with respect to the people of the city of Sarnia. There are other matters, from time to time, that during the course of the debate of this House I would like to refer to. I would say this, if I might, in connection with general attitudes towards general proposed legislation, before I close. I want to mention the question of the anticipated tax shelter programme. I did mention this during the course of the election campaign and I feel it incumbent upon me to mention it here for the purposes of the record.

One cannot take issue with the intention of the administration in assisting municipalities to lower the burden upon the residential property owner in the province of Ontario. But there is something, sir, that is

inherently wrong—in my point of view—in having the present Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. McKeough) in a quandary wondering how to send out a cheque to every millionaire in the province of Ontario. There is something wrong there. I feel—respectfully to those millionaries who qualify on the NDP benches and on the government benches—that we should not be using public funds to pay monies to people who do not need it, when at the same time, this government through its great munificence, is going to lend $150 a year to old age pensioners who well need it.

There is something radically wrong in the entire concept there, and we are going to have, I hope, the opportunity to debate this question of concept adequately, because you cannot rationalize away from the inequity of using tax monies paid by people earning $4,000 a year to pay real property assessment for somebody who is worth $1 million. There is something wrong there.

Basically, sir, I have the opportunity and the responsibility given by the hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Nixon) to liaison in connection with certain matters involving The Department of the Attorney General. I must say that in that respect I am most fortunate in having the opportunity to deal with a gentleman of high calibre and lawyer of signal repute and ability. So that when, during the course of the deliberations of this House, it is incumbent upon me and I am called upon to make that proper constructive criticism of the department that is sometimes necessary, it will be taken with good grace, I am sure.

I would say this, sir, as a matter of criticism right now, if I might, and this is on this whole question of Royal commissions, that I, as a lawyer practising in this province, am sick to death of people making irresponsible comments about the judiciary. I am sick to death of listening to somebody who should know better say that Judge So-and So is out to whitewash Mr. So-and-So. I do not think this is proper and appropriate, but the thing that bothers me in connection with the function and responsibility of The Attorney General's Department, sir, is this. Times come when he appoints these commissioners and invites these responses. He recognizes that he is the chief officer of the Crown, as well as I do. But the judge, in taking his oath of office, must accept these extra-judicial services that the Attorney General requests of him. Then why in heaven's name appoint a judge—impartial and able, who practiced law in the city of Sudbury with great ability and who, of his own gratuitous involvement, assisted in the operation of the children's aid society in Sudbury—to a commission involving the children's aid society and invite irresponsible comments of that nature? And the same applied, if I might respectfully—

Hon. J. Yaremko (Minister of Social and Family Services): Mr. Speaker, may I just say, on a point of order, that in all fairness to the Attorney General the appointment was not made by the Attorney General.

Mr. Bullbrook: Well, then, I apologize to The Department of the Attorney General and I direct my remarks to The Department of Social and Family Services.

In essence this is what I put. We are going to get these irresponsible remarks made and I suggest that perhaps we might evaluate a little more the appointments that are made at least to minimize the irresponsibility.

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): If the hon. member would allow me, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Bullbrook: Certainly, sir.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Perhaps I might reserve this for some remarks later on but it seems to me that it is appropriate to say now that in my opinion the fact that a judge, when he was practising as a lawyer some several years ago, was a good enough citizen, public spirited enough to serve on the board of a children's aid society and to learn something of the workings of that society in the community, was in no way a disqualification for his appointment several years later as a judge to study matters affecting a children's aid society. If anything, I think it was a qualification.

Mr. Bullbrook: Mr. Speaker, I entirely agree with the hon. Attorney General and obviously I am not able to convey adequately what I am attempting to convey. I am not suggesting for one moment, Mr. Speaker, that the fact that he had some gratuitous involvement with the children's aid society previously disqualifies him—far from it. I agree that perhaps it does qualify him more, although I might take issue with that, but the point is this—and perhaps it is not a point well taken; I can be in error, there is no doubt about that, but the point is this—if we know of this background and we know that there are going to be people who wish to associate less than impartiality and objectivity on the part of a judge, why request this judge to undertake that job? That is the point I am making.

This is the essence of it: That legal axiom that justice must not only be done but it must appear to be done. I close that question unless someone wishes to comment and I will sit down. I close that question, but I thought it worthy of comment because it had come to my mind, and since I am elected to this House and during the course of this debate apparently I have the entitlement to say what I feel and I do feel that. But in essence, sir, I see that the hon. Speaker is not in the House at the present time. I now close. I wish to congratulate the hon. Speaker on his election. I am more than pleased in connection with the conduct that he has exemplified in this office and I wish, sir, prior to closing to convey to you my great desire to perhaps constructively contribute to the deliberations of this House in the future. Thank you very much.

Mr. J. H. White (London South): Mr. Speaker, may I say how very pleased I was at your election as Speaker of this chamber and how this most recent distinction has added to your career as a public servant in war and peace. Your expertise in the law, your experience in this House, and your broad experience in politics make you a perfect choice for this. I join in the remarks of the previous speakers in wishing you every success in this undertaking. I hope I am not breaching the rules when I say that Mr. Speaker's wife is an ornament to this chamber on occasion and I think that some of my friends will agree that she is one of the assets which you bring to your new position.

We have had a quiet afternoon and I have several non-controversial subjects to talk about, starting with the University of Western Ontario bill and the general ineptness of the Liberal Party; the socialistic inclinations of the NDP and their totalitarian instincts, which I will attempt to establish. Before doing that, though, I want to congratulate some of my colleagues on their recent successes.

The Deputy Speaker is a most distinguished member of this chamber—the member for Waterloo South (Mr. Reuter) and I congratulate him; my friend and neighbour here, the Minister of Mines (Mr. A. F. Lawrence) whose appointment proved once again the democratic nature of the Progressive Conservative Party, unlike other parties in this House—

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): They disproved it.

Mr. White: The new Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. McKeough) and my very good friend, the Minister without Portfolio, the member for Stormont (Mr. Guindon). I congratulate all of them. I congratulate the mover (Mr. J. R. Smith) and seconder (Mr. Meen) of the Throne Speech and was glad to have them establish once again the independence of our private members.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): As well as all mothers who had babies yesterday.

Mr. White: I am very interested, Mr. Speaker, in the wrath and indignation that the leader of the Liberal Party and the leader of the NDP levelled at those Progressive Conservative members who had chosen to compliment the Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) on his re-election and his policies and his programmes. I say that because quite frankly, I should have thought in the circumstances under which they found themselves that they would say absolutely nothing.

I should have thought the leader of the NDP would not have chosen to call attention to the fact that his members do not hold him in such high regard that they congratulate him on his accomplishments, and I should have thought that the leader of the Liberal Party would likewise not have wanted to draw attention—

Mr. MacDonald: As specious a form of logic as I ever—

Mr. White: —to draw attention to the vast difference between the support and the affection given to our leader and that given to the leaders opposite. However, the subject has been mentioned and I myself have a word or two to say.

The leader of the NDP a few years ago called the Prime Minister of Ontario the "father of reconfederation". He chose to forget that during the election campaign, in point of fact and to his discredit, he not only chose to forget that previous remark but he levelled the most unfair accusations against the Prime Minister of Ontario when he drew this very valid political point to the attention of the people of this province.

Mr. MacDonald: I lost you there.

Mr. White: That is all right. If you would not stand with your buddies over there you would be able to follow this presentation.

Mr. MacDonald: The member is more confused than usual.

Mr. White: Here we are sir, and we won the election—no question about that.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): No thanks to the hon. member.

Mr. White: Here we are on this side. These very able Ministers back in their places—

Mr. MacDonald: Minus the member.

Mr. White: Sixty-nine members, a very big win indeed. The largest win, I think, in Canadian politics in the last five years when one recollects the very narrow margins in other provinces like Quebec, and Manitoba and the House of Commons. A very, very, big win indeed, and further support for the programmes that we put before the people.

Mr. Speaker, you may recall the vigorous debate we had in this chamber last spring connected with the University of Western Ontario bill. We had debated the principle involved in a private members' hour when we debated a resolution put before the House by the leader of the NDP.

Mr. MacDonald: Is this mending your fences?

Mr. White: On that occasion, sir, the member for Sudbury joined forces with me to condemn the imposition and the intrusion of government on the universities of this province. The member for Sudbury not only spoke for himself but for his party as he reminded us time and time again—and in his very able presentation he joined himself with my remarks—

Mr. MacDonald: Flattery may get you somewhere, I am not sure.

Mr. White: Just a minute. He joined with me in the presentation which I had made—that in only two situations should the government attempt to govern one or a number of universities and that, with those two exceptions agreed upon by the British university presidents, the universities should be free to govern themselves. What happened when the principle was put to the test? What happened when the Liberal Party thought a few votes were at stake?

I remember, about 1949 or 1950, C. D. Howe accused the Conservative Party of adjusting its sails for every gust of public opinion. I did not think that it was quite fair then but I think it is fair now when I level that great Liberal's charge against the Liberal Party of Ontario. Seven medicare policies in seven years; am I correct?

Mr. MacDonald: I have lost count.

Mr. White: Was the member counting?

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): There is one form of consistency —one every year.

Mr. White: The University of Western Ontario bill provided an opportunity for them to flip-flop over on the other side of the issue. Why did they do that? Because three able and attractive young men came down here, closeted themselves with the leader of th Opposition, not once but a number of times, and persuaded him that it was the popular thing to do. Then in the vigorous debate that took place we had the disgraceful spectacle—

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): That is why the member reversed his stand from what he said in the private bills committee.

Mr. White: —of the member for Sudbury attempting to defend a principle, which he himself had condemned only a matter of weeks before.

Mr. MacDonald: He is just trying to rationalize.

Mr. White: In that debate I remember the comments made by the leader of the NDP and by certain Liberals. I made the assertion, which I repeat now, that the majority of the students were in favour of the bill that came to us here and which we ended up by passing.

And the leader of the NDP said not at all, not at all; he had spent five minutes with a half a dozen left wingers from the campus. I myself have spent 35 years in or near that university; as a student, alumnus, lecturer.

Mr. MacDonald: It is a good thing you are saying this.

Mr. White: Mr. Speaker, this is by way of preface, because now the proof is in.

Mr. Sopha: How many voted?

Mr. White: During the elections the chief electoral officer put a revising officer on the campus so that the maximum number of out-of-town students would vote. We gave them every opportunity and on election day there was a double poll on the campus and the turn-out was very good.

Mr. MacDonald: How many voted at the polls?

Mr. White: There were 357 students who voted on the campus in my riding.

Mr. MacDonald: How many voted at home?

Mr. White: The hon. member does his research; let him tell us that.

And of 357 votes, Mr. Speaker, I am very glad to say, I got 213.

Mr. Sargent: That is why the member brought it up.

Mr. White: The Liberals got 111 and the NDP got 33, and now, sir, I think the members opposite might have the good grace to concede that the majority of the students did, in fact, support the bill that we passed here.

Mr. Nixon: What about the majority in the private bills committee? Most of them were Conservatives, including the hon. member.

Mr. White: I did not want to say so then, because I did not want to deflect from the issue at hand, but two of the three young men have been paid agents of the Liberal Party.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. White: Yes, two of the three were paid agents of the Liberal Party. I did not disclose that before, although I knew it. One was employed in Ottawa for Mr. Pearson and the other was employed in Western Ontario as a campaign manager.

Mr. MacDonald: Is that the group that includes the Prime Minister?

Mr. White: And the third one was from the undefined new left, so that I think, establishes—

Mr. MacDonald: He is full of coffee.

Mr. White: —and proves once and for all that the government and I as the sponsors were correct in that very important matter. Now, sir, I do not suppose you remember, but 30 or 40 years ago the great Arthur Meighen delivered a most wonderful speech entitled—

Mr. MacDonald: How far did he get?

Mr. White: —"Socialism." And his words come echoing down to me over the decades; socialism, the socialists are spreading a baccilus, he said, scattering the drug that spells the decay of a nation.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Do you want to talk about that deal in York South?

Mr. White: And now we see the NDP opposite trying to drag us down in this infectious quagmire.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. White: Socialism, my friend, has not succeeded in any place at any time. Do you remember, Mr. Speaker, when you and I were boys in the 30s, the British pound was worth $5 Canadian? Hard as the rock of Gibraltar and now what is it? $2.60, $2.50?—thanks in large measure to the inadequacies of the socialists. This is something that we are determined to prevent in this province. We rededicate ourselves to freedom of the individual and freedom of property, and we make the avowal that the 20 socialists sitting here will once again be the maximum of their strength for a very long time to come.

I have in my hand a speech given by the Right Hon. Prime Minister Wilson and I would like to read some excerpts. It is a recent speech, two or three weeks ago; I have not got the date. Prime Minister Wilson said:

> It has already been decided that family allowances will go up by 7s in April, but it is essential this increase should be confined to families most in need.

A very interesting revelation. One of the consequences of irresponsibility and inability in government.

My friend from Sarnia (Mr. Bullbrook) pointed up the idea of this, too, although his party does not subscribe to the theory of selectivity in public measures of one kind and another. I am going to be dealing with that later in my speech when I talk about medicare.

Prime Minister Wilson said, I should add, that my right hon. friend is examining the possibility, at a later stage, of extending this principle of selectivity.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No more; it is a disease.

Mr. White: He said:

> We have decided we have an alternative to deferring from 1971 to 1973 the raising of the school leaving age.

I think it is now 14; they were going to raise it to 16 but had to defer that, because the nation is in such serious trouble.

Mr. MacDonald: Tories bankrupt them.

Mr. White: To continue:

> We propose to cease to provide milk free; the capitation grants to direct grant

schools will be reduced; some new capital projects in the universities and colleges of further education elsewhere will be held back.

I return to health and welfare with a 1967-68 expenditure of 1,619 million (sterling), an increase at current prices of 45 per cent over the past four years, 45 per cent increase in costs of medicare in the last four years.

Mr. Sargent: What has that got to do with Ontario?

Mr. White: I am going to bring this into medicare; sit still and listen.

The government has, however, decided after most serious consideration with the utmost reluctance to reintroduce a system of charges for prescriptions issued under the national health service at the rate of two shillings and sixpence per item. Oh, a deductible clause now. The maximum charge for dental treatment which has not been changed since 1952 will be increased.

In addition, some reductions in the planned growth of local capital expenditures are being made.

Mr. Sopha: You should run for the House of Commons.

Mr. White: Continuing:

The House ought to know that quite apart from the expenditure review, and for quite other reasons, a further shilling and sixpence for employees—

Mr. Nixon: The member will never make Minister of Revenue!

Mr. White: To resume:

—sixpence for employees, will be needed to prevent the national insurance fund from going into defiicit.

Mr. MacDonald: If this is preaching for a call, I do not think that he will get one.

Mr. White: I am interested in that interjection. In fact, I do not share the member's concern for my future, but I do reciprocate it. I thought to myself the day after election what a very sad thing this is for those chaps on the front row, whose hopes were so high, mostly by their own propaganda. Expectations of victory seemed so solid, and I thought of the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Spence), and how he had expected just 24 hours before, to be the new Minister of Agriculture and Food. I thought of the hon. member for Wellington South (Mr. Worton)—

Mr. Nixon: A good man!

Mr. White: —who pictured himself as the new Minister of Lands and Forests—

Mr. MacDonald: Like you they are still waiting.

Mr. White: —the member for Grey-Bruce, who saw himself the Treasurer of Ontario, and the hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville (Mr. B. Newman), who saw himself the Minister of University Affairs and Education too! I thought of the member for Sudbury and a tear trickled down my cheek when I thought of how he had aspired to be Attorney General of Ontario.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. White: But worst of all I thought of the member for Brant, whose thoughts in the sleepless evenings previously had been whether he would be known as—

Mr. MacDonald: You are like an iron butterfly.

Mr. White: —Premier Nixon, or Prime Minister Nixon. I pictured him the Sunday before at the dinner table, saying, now we will put this to a vote and decide now, whether I will be Premier or Prime Minister. I think that this explains his preoccupation with this.

Mr. Nixon: I would have been wrong either way.

Mr. White: In a moment of wandering, as a matter of fact—

Mr. Sargent: Over to the member!

Mr. White: —I heard one of his youngsters saying: "Daddy, can we call you Prime Minister?" And in my daydream, I saw the leader of the Opposition saying: "No, not unless we have company. You may call me PM."

But there was never any doubt in my mind what would have happened if the day dreams of the member for York South had come true. Never any doubt about that. He would not have been Premier. He saw himself in the line of Prime Minister Sir John A. Macdonald, and Prime Minister Sir John Sandfield Macdonald, and Prime Minister Donald C. MacDonald. There was never any doubt about that.

Mr. MacDonald: The member ought to go to Yorkville more often.

Mr. White: The member for High Park (Mr. Shulman) saw himself as the Minister for everything.

I was interested in a little incident yesterday in the private bills committee, which I would like to report to you.

Mr. Sargent: Telling tales yet!

Mr. White: For the first time in my nine years' experience, one member of the NDP took a slightly different tack from the other member of the NDP.

Mr. MacDonald: That is nonsense!

Mr. White: Yes he did. Never, never, never, not once in nine years have any two members of the NDP disagreed anywhere.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: They did it once in 12 years.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

Mr. White: Never!

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I can give the member so many instances, but I will give him one—Ken Bryden. Ken Bryden voted against the increase in indemnities.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That was the once.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. White: No sir, not once in nine years has that happened. I would like to think that it was some sign of a crack in the totalitarian monolith, but in point of fact it was not. He is a very young, new man, and he will now have been read the lessons of the NDP by the dictator *pro tem.* I am sure that we will never see that again in the next four years. The member for Sudbury, and myself will be watching for it.

Mr. Sopha: The member can bet we will.

Mr. White: I took a few minutes of the House to describe the Western bill, and at the risk of being considered immodest, I am going to read a letter which I received just an hour ago.

I quote:

"Dear John, you have been chosen to receive a special achievement award for the contribution you have made to the YCPs"—and so on.

I will not be able to receive that award from the Prime Minister on Saturday, but perhaps he will extend my greetings, and my thanks. I think that it is revealing, because I have had occasion to speak very candidly to this and other groups of young people. Unlike the Liberals who have chased those winds of fancy, I have stuck to my guns, and while the Liberal candidates did not go near the campus, I did. I told the students that I did not think that the government should be in the student housing business and that I did not think that there was any prospect of lowering tuition fees, and so on.

They were completely astonished to hear this from a politician after the Opposition leaders had been dancing around the campus for some months promising everything that a group of three students tried to impose on them. Anyway, we have gone into that pretty thoroughly. Now I would like to speak on medicare.

Mr. MacDonald: That is what the YPCs favour.

Mr. White: In my first speech in this Legislature after the 1959 election and after certain salutations and congratulations—

Mr. Nixon: He is going to read that again!

Mr. White: —the first words that I spoke here were: "Socialized medicine is inevitable."

I proceeded to describe how I thought we could offer complete health care to everyone in the province without invading the medical profession, and without interfering with the lives of our citizens. Now, I am glad to say that the four criteria which I described at that time have found their way into OMSIP so we now have a plan enabling every human being in this province to get health insurance coverage at reasonable prices, or if that person is in straits of financial circumstances, his premium is paid for him from general tax revenues.

Now, in the group end of the business, and one of the reasons that I am against the plan —and members should be too—is because these group policies have been hammered out over the bargaining tables between the unions and management in this country. Hon. members would force 4.3 million people to extract themselves from these contract obligations. In many cases the employer pays all. The hon. members would do that, of course?

I hope the NDP will take a position on that, and tell the unions clearly what it means to them.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. W. G. Pitman (Peterborough): What does the member know about it?

Mr. White: The leader of the NDP went through the most remarkable recitation of inappropriate and irrelevant statistics a day or two ago that I have ever heard. I am not going to say that he deceived this House deliberately, in fact I do not think that he did. It is one of the difficulties of having been trained as an historian rather than as an economist that revealed itself to me.

To change several variables in a very complicated equation, and then to come up with a different product is not what one would consider fair game in any scientific pursuit. All other things being equal, *centeris parabus* is the phrase we use, Mr. Speaker. *Centeris parabus* medicare is going to cost Canadians $1 billion by Mr. Sharp's own estimate.

Mr. MacDonald: His colleagues have done it.

Mr. White: But, we thought a few years ago that OMSIP was going to cost $30 million, I think that was the initial expectation. Now we think it is costing $70 million. That is how indefinite and how difficult these forecasts and projections are. The $1 billion cited by Mr. Sharp is an amount equivalent to $200 per family. I say to the federal government, let them release these resources to the provinces so that the provinces can decrease municipal taxes by $200 per household right now. Let us do that right now. Let us do that as an alternative to medicare. Let me hear the Liberal position on that.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. White: Decrease municipal taxes for every household in Ontario by $200, that is the alternative. And, of course, politics is a matter of priorities; government is a matter of priorities. Let us have these reduced municipal taxes now.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. White: By the way, members will recall I read a few excerpts from Mr. Wilson's recent speech. He mentioned that their costs had gone up 45 per cent in four years. There is no reason to think that the $1 billion will not be $1.5 billion in five years' time, and perhaps double that within a decade. So we are now considering what I believe to be the most inappropriate legislation imaginable for this country at this time.

All of our people can get medicare. To inflict a compulsory scheme on them with these astronomical attendant costs is completely irresponsible, and for the leader of the Opposition to bind himself slavishly into the federal policy in this respect I think is not worthy of him or of the Liberal Party of Ontario.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. White: Why, I have not had a letter seeking universal medicare for years, and neither have you, neither have you.

There is no public demand for it now; OMSIP is taking care of all that. My hon. friend in his speech, in the section dealing with medicare, mentioned the high salaries in Saskatchewan. Why is that? Why are the salaries in Saskatchewan so much higher for doctors? Because they have got to pay them a very large premium to offset the disadvantages of having their profession bureaucratized, bureaucratized—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. White: That is the way the socialists do it, as a matter of fact. In order to minimize—

Mr. Sargent: Will the member accept a question? Will he explain to the House how he can reduce everybody's taxes $200 a year please?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: He just did.

Mr. Sargent: I did not get that very clearly.

Mr. White: That question came from the man who might have been the Treasurer of Ontario. There are 20 million people in Canada; there are approximately four people per household; there are axpproximately 5,000,000 households and 5,000,000 divided into $1 billion is $200. That is how I made that computation. So, as an alternative to universal medicare, if the same resources were released by the federal government, as indeed they should be, municipal taxes could be decreased by $200 per household.

Mr. Speaker, the member for Sarnia has described the freeway running from Sarnia into the London area. The line through London has yet to be decided. I want to spend five minutes making a special plea to the councilmen of the city of London who did vote about a year ago 18 to 1 that that line should travel through residential areas in north London and through residential and industrial areas in east London. Through the media of the press, Mr. Speaker, I am asking that the councilmen sit down and reconsider this very important expenditure.

The cost of this freeway is thought to be approximately $60 million. If the freeway is built through the city of London, the city of London must pay 25 per cent, which is $15 million. My guess is that that portion will increase before the freeway is finished, and my guess is that the $15 million will turn into $20 million. But taking the more conservative figure, when one considers the cost of debenturing this enormous expenditure, we are faced with an increase in mill rate of nearly four mills for a period of a generation. For 20 years London's mill rate will go up by that amount, and people who live in my riding, almost without exception, will be paying for that facility although in point of fact it does not benefit them at all.

I do not want to get into the philosophical aspect of this. Even the people who live in the areas that would be benefited are against it. The alternative seems to me to be a very sensible one, and that is to run the freeway around the outskirts of the city of London. It would be cheaper for the citizens of London and, Mr. Speaker, I now have the assurance of The Department of Highways it would be cheaper for the province.

The industrial development can take place where there is now empty land. At some appropriate future date—if that area and its industrial development should be amalgamated with the city of London—an annexation could take place. And the increased assessment could be realized in the same way as if the freeway cut through the north part and the eastern part of the city. So that variable, which I think has been used to distract the decision in this matter, really is not appropriate.

The city of London taxes have risen very substantially in recent years as they have in other municipalities. The city is contemplating the erection of a city hall. That obviously is the responsibility of London's council. The expenditure for that $3 million or $4 million, however, will go before the municipal board and a ruling will be made.

Here we are contemplating an expenditure four times as large as that, and London city council has the authority to draw the line, followed by the approval which is more or less automatic, I would judge, of The Depart- of Highways. So I do hope, and I make the plea on behalf of the 80,000 people in my riding, that London's city council will sit down and give citizens an opportunity to voice their views on both sides of this important issue.

I congratulate the government on the announcement made some months ago that it was assuming the cost of the administration of justice. His Worship, Gordon Stronach, who was mayor of London for six or seven years, felt very strongly that that should be a provincial responsibility. I, myself, thought that the province could very appropriately assume that expense, although I must say that I felt as long as the responsibility was at the local level that it was not forgiveable to postpone the erection of appropriate facilities by way of court house, regional jail and so on. And the illustration I used then had to do with the universities of Ontario.

It may be that the federal government should contribute very substantial amounts of money. It may be that some substantial portion of the responsibility should rest with the federal government. But would not we here be irresponsible if we used that as an excuse not to build any more universities? It would be unthinkable. For that reason, I have always contended that the city of London should proceed with those facilities, even though I held the view that the expense could well be borne at a senior level of government.

Well, at any rate the decision has been made and I would like to say that the late Gordon Stronach, on this and other issues, represented the interests of the citizens of London and he did so with courage and ability. His death on January 1 came as a very great shock to the citizens of London and I think I speak for men on both sides of this House when I send his widow from this place our sincere condolences and sympathies.

The court house in London was built starting in 1826, and strangely enough, a great-grand-grandfather, Benjamin Higgins by name, came over as—

Mr. Sopha: How is the law suit coming along?

Mr. White: I will tell you about that. He came over as an Irish lad and walked from Port Stanley across 30 miles of fields and was one of the labourers on that court house, built starting in 1826.

Mr. Sopha: It looks like it too.

Mr. White: Our family tradition, Mr. Speaker, is that he built the third log cabin in London. I think we would find that hard to prove, but at any rate it is one of a number of reasons that this subject is of interest to me.

That court house, Mr. Speaker, in 1826 must have loomed the largest building in the

world, because you see, there was no city of London there then. There was not even a village. The court house was the first building in London. And now, 140 years later, it serves this enormous cosmopolitan area.

I use the word cosmopolitan deliberately because London, unlike most other cities in Ontario is a cosmopolis, a unified economic area, with balanced commercial, industrial, financial and agricultural pursuits.

So now in this cosmopolis, the same building attempts to serve several hundred thousand people and it just will not work. It just is not good enough. The reason that the great court house was built was not because they had enormous numbers of law suits, or huge numbers of prisoners. That court house was built, starting in 1826, as a symbol of British justice and as a symbol of an orderly society. It was there to mete out quick and prompt justice, yes, but it was there to inspire the citizenry.

Mr. Sopha: How is the law suit going?

Mr. White: In recent decades we have turned our back on that important principle.

Mr. Sopha: I was asking some advice about that law suit.

Mr. White: The barristers? Your colleague, Mayor Learner, Q.C., is a very great supporter of your party. He has provided me with a wealth of detail and I am going to give you some of it, because Mr. Learner is the lawyer who is bringing the suit on behalf of the Middlesex bar association against the city and the county.

Mr. Sopha: Are you a member?

Mr. White: The county, Mr. Speaker, has been willing for quite some time to proceed with a new court house. The city of London has not been willing. The county has been willing to go ahead with the court house. The city has not, and so in their frustration a year or two ago, the Middlesex bar association brought legal action to force the city to provide these facilities.

I am going into this in a little bit of detail because it is very, very important that London's need for this facility be number one on the list in this province, as I will attempt to prove to the Attorney General.

Mr. Sopha: Has the member talked to the Premier about it?

Mr. White: I went on a tour of this court house a week ago last Friday. I found in the sheriff's office that there were eight or ten clerks and secretaries occupying a space that would hold two persons efficiently.

Mr. T. Reid (Scarborough East): Like our office downstairs.

Mr. White: I saw the rudimentary lounge areas in which lawyers and citizens were crowding. I must say, sir, and I do so at the risk of offending some members of this House, I am not concerned about the creature comforts of the legal profession in London. But I am concerned that a citizen charged with an offence can confer with his lawyer in private. That is now impossible in our facilities, and I am concerned that citizens arraigned for grand jury duty and such-like are put in an environment of decency, cleanliness, healthfulness, so that they can deliberate properly important questions put before them. I am concerned, when the jury retires from a makeshift court room, that their deliberations cannot be heard—as they are now—by anybody passing the door of the small jury room.

Do you agree with me that this is not appropriate for a large and wealthy city in a large and wealthy province? And do you agree with me that having reached the stage with this law suit in process, do you agree with me that London should be given top priority? Is there anybody that would deny that?

Mr. Speaker, I observe that there is not a member of this House—on the other side of this House—that denies that London should be given top priority.

Mr. Sopha: Has the law suit been heard?

Mr. White: I would like to make some brief remarks about the workmen's compensation board. I want to pay credit first of all to Mr. Jack Colley, the vice-chairman, who was very helpful to me time and time again, and indeed the members of his staff and other employees of the board. My remarks in no way detract from their service to the public of this province. I put a plea to the Minister of Labour (Mr. Bales), as I did a couple of years ago, to open a small one-man office in London to serve hundreds of thousands of working men in that part of Ontario.

Mr. G. Bukator (Niagara Falls): That is part of my speech.

Mr. White: These injured workmen must come to Toronto for all kinds of rudimentary investigations, medical treatment, but not only that, for simple information. It is not

appropriate and it is very expensive and it is not fair to the injured workman that he should have to cart himself down with his leg in a cast.

Mr. Sargent: That is the first thing I have heard that makes sense.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): It is the first thing the member has understood.

Mr. White: It is his support that worries me. I would ask the Minister of Labour, sir, not to do anything until I really think this through. I put a plea to the Minister of Labour to consider an external appeal step. I was one of a number of members some years ago—I am sure there were many others—I am not trying to take a lot of credit for this—just my share—that urged the workmen's compensation board to improve its appeal provisions. That improvement has been made, so that now we have the review committee and the appeal tribunal and one or two other further appeals up to the board itself.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): There is no appeal from the tribunal.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Where do you want to go? How many appeals do you want?

Mr. White: I think that the members of the review committee and the appeal tribunal act in good faith and I have an idea that they are usually right. The trouble is they are being called upon to judge their fellows and their subordinates. They are being called upon to review their own decisions, my friend from Haliburton said. I think in the interests of justice, and to prove even more definitely that justice is being done, we must have an external appeal provision at some point.

Mr. Sargent: Not getting any support from there.

Mr. White: Alderman Andy Grant, who was an NDP candidate and who is a well respected member of our city council now, called a meeting ten days ago in London which was attended by our two federal members. It was attended by the head of the unemployment insurance commission. It was attended by a half a dozen labour leaders and myself. At that meeting it was explained to us that sometimes a workman falls between compensation and unemployment insurance.

This is the way it happens. A man is injured, or alleges that he was injured. He places a claim with the workmen's compensation board. After some length of time has gone by, he is informed that his claim cannot be honoured; that he does not qualify. I have one now. The man, in making his application said, "I hurt my knee dancing," and of course they turned him down. But now he assures me, and I am prepared to believe him, that the original injury was at his place of work and arose out of employment and that the dancing simply aggravated that pre-existing condition.

At any rate after some time a number of the claims are rejected. At that point the workman goes to the unemployment insurance commission and attempts to claim on the commission and he finds that they will only ante-date, I think, in the regular course of events by one week.

Now, if the decision from the workmen's compensation board has taken six weeks this chap may be out five weeks' unemployment insurance. I think the workmen's compensation board might consider putting a notice on the application form saying: Your application to the workmen's compensation board in no way nullifies your right to unemployment insurance, and you have the right to apply concurrently for unemployment insurance.

Mind you, there is an appeal provision there—the board of referees—but the workman's appeal to that board is not always recognized, depending on the jury so to speak, that has been chosen for those particular hearings. I think it is a source of injustice, and I think it is one that could very easily be remedied.

I want to mention, although it is a little off the track, that the disability pension system remains as inadequate as when I complained about it a year or two ago.

Really, if you can flutter an eyelash, if you can sort of go from your bed of pain, you cannot get a disabled person's allowance. Time and time again, men and women come to us—as they do to other members—with heart conditions and so on that are so severe, that they cannot do any work, and they—

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): That is Ottawa's fault.

Mr. White: You are quite right—Ottawa's fault it is. But we have the obligation to take this to Ottawa, and I would hope that our Liberal friends here, at the very great events that are going to take place in six

weeks' time, I would hope that they might try to remedy this injustice.

As a matter of fact, it is a constant source of amazement to me that the Liberal Party here fall in so abjectly behind every policy announced by the Liberals in Ottawa, and are so completely unwilling to assist us on this side, and remedy some of the deficiencies and inadequacies of the federal programmes.

Well Mr. Speaker, I have one or two other matters that I would like to talk about—

Mr. Nixon: Let us call it six o'clock.

Mr. White: —but with your permission, sir, I will not embark on those at the moment. Perhaps I will have an opportunity when this debate resumes.

Mr. Sopha: The member should make sure he is here tomorrow on time.

Mr. White moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we will resume this debate and the private members' hour will be from 12 until 1 o'clock.

I would like to sit Tuesday and Thursday evenings of next week, and the Budget, according to present plans, will be presented in this House on Tuesday, March 12. Perhaps on Monday we can deal with some of the second readings that are on the order paper.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 6 o'clock, p.m.

No. 12



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

First Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Friday, March 1, 1968

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1968

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Friday, March 1, 1968

Questions to Mr. Wishart re Mrs. Viola MacMillan, Mr. Sargent 359

Question to Mr. Gomme re road signs, Mr. Pilkey 360

Question to Mr. A. F. Lawrence re the closing of Hollinger mine, Mr. Ferrier 360

Questions to Mr. Dymond re coverage for chiropractors under OMSIP, Mr. Gaunt 361

Resumption of the debate on the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Lawlor 361

On notice of motion No. 5, Mr. Gaunt, Mr. Brown, Mr. J. R. Smith, Mr. Good, Mr. Pitman, Mr. Carruthers, Mr. Sargent 371

Statement re the Ontario College of Art, Mr. Davis 381

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Rowntree, agreed to 382

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

FRIDAY, MARCH 1, 1968

The House met today at 10.30 o'clock a.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are always pleased to have visitors to the Legislature, and today we welcome as guests, students from the following schools: in the east gallery, from Queensborough junior high school, Toronto; the Kingsville district high school, Kingsville; and Thistletown public school in Thistletown. In the west gallery, the John Knox Christian school, Brampton; and Gladstone senior public school, Toronto. Later this morning, in the east gallery, we will have pupils from Roseland public school, Windsor.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

Mr. H. J. Price (St. David): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, as a representative of St. David's riding I should like to inform the House that today, March 1, is St. David's day.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): And we are all here to congratulate the Welsh.

Mr. Price: On this occasion each year, we might well reflect on the contribution the Welsh people have made to the province of Ontario and to Canada. I feel sure that all hon. members will join with me on this occasion in conveying our very best greetings to all the Welsh people, both here and abroad, on this their national day.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Attorney General. Will the Attorney General advise if he plans to intervene in the move to parole Mrs. Viola MacMillan?

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, no, I certainly would not contemplate intervening—which I would consider interference with the parole board—in the parole of any person who has been convicted. I certainly have no thought of it and would not contemplate it at all. This would be a matter for the parole board and I think it would be most improper if I were to intervene and attempt to colour their judgment.

Mr. Sargent: The Attorney General does not even know if she is going to be paroled?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I understand that the application has been made by her for parole, which is her privilege; and I am not sure what state the consideration of the matter has reached, but I certainly would have no thought of intervening.

Mr. Sargent: Would the Minister accept a supplementary question? It is not anyone's wish to persecute Mrs. MacMillan, but I would like to ask him, or the Minister of Reform Institutions (Mr. Grossman) who lines up such posh treatment? Why does she get special treatment in Inglewood, who would put her in a special set-up like that?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, I would not think that she is receiving special treatment. This woman was convicted by the court; the conviction was appealed; the appeal was dismissed; she was sentenced to prison, in custody.

I think the great—if I may express this opinion—the important thing was that this offence was of wash trading, which is an offence under the criminal code. She went through the process of trial and conviction; she was brought before the court and, as I say, that prosecution carried through and the conviction secured. I think that is perhaps the important thing.

The sentence might have been longer or shorter but it is not for me to be critical of that. I know nothing of the type of custody or the circumstances of the custody in which she is being kept. I understand the place is Ingleside, which comes within, I believe, my colleague's jurisdiction—the Minister of Reform Institutions. But I think the important thing here is not the length of time the woman spends in custody, but the fact that this offence was brought to book, conviction obtained and the parole board as I say, would be free in its deliberations. I

think it would be most improper for me to intervene. I have never done so in any case, nor do I think I should interfere.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Highways. Has the hon. Minister of Highways considered the protest of the residents in the Oldcastle area with regard to Highway No. 3 and Walker road area and intersection, and if so, what steps are to be taken to alleviate the traffic hazard and protect the property owners involved?

Hon. G. E. Gomme (Minister of Highways): Mr. Speaker, I will have to take this as notice; but I have the answer to a question asked by the hon. member for Oshawa.

The question: What formula is being used by The Department of Highways to determine which service clubs may place their signs at the entrance to a town or city?

The answer: To meet the criteria for a place on the service club sign on the King's highway at the entrance to a municipality, the club must be an international service club with branches located in municipalities throughout the province; and it must require, as part of its constitution, that a member have a specified number of attendance credits each year to remain a member in good standing. I could read the list of service clubs which meet our requirements: Rotary, Lions, Kinsmen, Kiwanis, Optimists, Civitan, chamber of commerce, board of trade and the Zonta women's club.

Mr. C. G. Pilkey (Oshawa): Mr. Speaker, could I ask the Minister whether the B'Nai Brith club—

Mr. Speaker: I am sorry. The member, if he wishes to question the Minister, will place a question properly in the Speaker's office before the appropriate time.

Mr. Pilkey: This is a supplementary question, sir.

Mr. Speaker: A supplementary question may be asked by the original questioner so far as I am concerned at the present time.

Mr. Pilkey: I am the original questioner.

Mr. Speaker: On this one?

Mr. Pilkey: Yes.

Mr. Speaker: By all means, if the Minister will accept it. I am sorry.

Mr. Pilkey: Would the B'Nai Brith club not qualify under the formula?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Speaker, I cannot answer that, but I will get the answer for the member.

Mr. Speaker: I now note that we are working on one of the other questions. They are coming back so quickly, these answers, that Mr. Speaker is now losing track.

Mr. J. R. Breithaupt (Kitchener): Mr. Speaker, I have a series of questions for the hon. Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs.

If the Minister prefers, I will read all of the questions and then he may choose to answer them as he may see fit.

First of all: Was it the intention of the Legislature that section 18 of The Consumer Protection Act, 1966, apply to those registered under The Used Car Dealers Act?

Second: what constitutes a regulation as opposed to a term and condition of registration made under section 4(1) of The Used Car Dealers Act, 1964, and what position is a registrant in where he fails to comply with a "regulation" which is subsequently deemed to be unlawful?

Third: Where a registration has been suspended or cancelled under section 5 of The Used Car Dealers Act, 1964, may a registrant continue transacting business in a used motor vehicle until: (a) the time for filing an appeal has lapsed, or, (b) the appeal procedure is exhausted and the registrar's decision is upheld?

Fourth: since all those persons dealing in motor vehicles with the public are registered under The Used Car Dealers Act, 1964, would there be any objection to changing the name of the Act to motor vehicle vendors' and salesmen's Act? This would protect the public in all its motor vehicle purchases and allow dealers to build a better image of their industry.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): We will take the question as notice.

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Mines.

In view of the fact that the Hollinger mine in Timmins has announced that it is closing at the end of March, will the Minister's department take steps with The Federal Department of Manpower to try and locate jobs for miners who are put out of work, and to retrain others who no longer wish to work in the mine?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence (Minister of Mines): Mr. Speaker, this question was handed to me just as I came into the House, but I may say to the hon. member that the government and the department, of course, view the closing down of the Hollinger mine with great concern, in view of the displacement of some of the work force.

This has been the concern of the department and we have been informed that a good proportion of the work force will be able to be relocated in similar employment in the area but, nevertheless, it cannot help the cause of displacement of some of the work force. The Minister of Mines has been in contact with the Minister of Labour (Mr. Bales), under whose jurisdiction and co-operation with the Minister of Education (Mr. Davis) the training of mining personnel should properly take place, and there has been a great deal of co-operation so far.

I am sure there will be more in the future but it is really the jurisdiction of the Minister of Labour to look after this matter and my understanding is that department has the matter well in hand.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Health, notice of which has been given.

In the Speech from the Throne, reference is made to further extensions and benefits including the examination of eyes by refraction when carried out by a physician or an optometrist. Do these extensions of benefits include coverage for chiropractors under the Ontario medical services insurance plan?

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, not at the present time.

Mr. Gaunt: Would the Minister answer a supplementary question?

Is it fair to say, sir, that they will be included in the very near future?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: It would not be fair to say that, sir.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The first order, resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the amendment to the motion for an address in reply to the Speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor at the opening of the session.

Interjections by hon. members.

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Mr. Speaker, *ecce sommiatur venit.*

I begin with the Latin because my French is even worse.

In order to carry out the amenities of the House and to placate the hon. member for London South (Mr. White), I now take this opportunity to extend congratulations to my leader, the member for York South (Mr. MacDonald) and to ourselves, an excellent little band of prophets who will do great service in this House.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lawlor: Second, coming from this side of the fence, this being my maiden speech and wishing to be generous and open-handed in the matter, I wish to extend congratulations to the Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) of this province. I trust this will be the last time it will be necessary so to do.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): The hon. member will not be around to do it.

Mr. Lawlor: As well, may I also extend my congratulations to the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Nixon), and to you, Mr. Speaker.

Last of all, I wish to extend congratulations to myself. I never expected to be here.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Lawlor: Oh, we will be here a long time, I think. Get used to it.

I wish, at this time, to extend by best wishes to the man I replaced in this House, for whom I have a very high regard, Mr. Al Eagleson. If Al Eagleson had stayed around, he too, might be one of the few mavericks left on the other side of the fence, and have been induced to take a Cabinet position in order to keep him quiet.

May I offer a word of advice to the members on the other side of the House; if they wish to attain that high dignity, the way to do so obviously—

Hon. A. F. Lawrence (Minister of Mines): Is this a result of your great experience?

Mr. Lawlor: —as the hon. Minister of Mines can well tell them, is to needle them a bit on the front benches, take an independent stand as he was so well noted for doing—

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: There might be a faster way!

Mr. Lawlor: —and in the fullness of time, as is often said from over there, they shall achieve notoriety and their heart's desire.

Ecce sommiatur venit.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Are we tri-lingual now?

Mr. Lawlor: It means, for those few who are wondering, it means "behold the dreamer cometh". We make no apology. The text is taken from the first book of Kings, and members will all recall that, on the occasion of Saul's spoliation, but with a victory over the Philistines—and there are many Philistines left —with a victory over the Philistines, David, who was to be king, danced before the Ark.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lawlor: And all the Tory-minded individuals of that anceint time, all the greybeards stuck their noses into their beards and said, "behold the dreamer cometh".

This is the chief quality, I suggest, that is lacking in the government, a failure not so much in intelligence—they know what they are up to and can protect their own interests well enough—if intelligence is to do that—but in a sense of imagination, in a sense of decision, in a forthrightness, in a going-ahead and doing things—that is what you are there to govern for, and not to hang back and traduce every measure that is offered to you.

Therefore, I come before members today wearing one hat on this particular occasion; I shall wear others, but today I ask your indulgence, and will indulge myself to the extent of coming as a putative philosopher in this House who shall discuss problems in political philosophy.

This House is far too removed from such discussions and, as a matter of fact, I do not think after reading *Hansard*, remembering a discussion of this kind taking place. You will either be bored to death or you will be regaled, it is up to you. The fact is that this is the nature of the beast on this occasion.

But before going ahead into my analysis of what a political obligation consists of, there are six or seven other matters of, perhaps, more mundane importance which I will be pleased to bring before you.

But before coming to them, may I say that on perusing *Hansard*, I noticed that there are some fledgling philosophers in this House. I cannot help but sometimes revert to the statement made by the hon. member for Sudbury, but I would think that at this time in history, we have had enough of Elmer's "sophisms."

And for that matter, I was also thinking that we have a certain measure or modicum, of Sargent solipsisms. You may, from this point if you please, speak of Lawlor's logicalities or, as I am sure that the member for Downsview (Mr. Singer) would be pleased to add, Lawler's illogicalities.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lawlor: All men, whether they like it or not, and whether they know it or not, are philosophers, and the thing that basically animates members, the thing that caused them to set their policies out as they do, unconsciously to themselves largely, is this philosophy that they hold. This often damnable philosophy, made more so because it is unexamined. As Plato said, "the unexamined life is not worth living," and their unexamined policies, and the presuppositions of those philosophies, are the things that have misled them.

If members opposite me looked back and brought them to light, and were cognizant of what it is that they speak of in terms of their vaunted freedoms, and in terms of their rights, and in terms of human liberty, and in terms of democracy, and in terms of economic democracy, and in any of these large terms, then I suspect that they would know the errors of their ways, and might even revert to this side of the House.

The six or seven, or 15 matters which are of more mundane consequence at this moment, is first with respect to something that the Premier mentioned many times and which goes, and is concomitant with his Conservative position, and that is a deep regard for history. He speaks of the continuity of man and how we are dependent on the past and to some extent the product of the past.

This is a minor matter, perhaps, but it seems significant for all this talk of history, and recounting the achievements of the past. There is no history for the province of Ontario. Centennial year has gone by, and we have no history; there is no single text where you can read the history of this province.

Mr. E. Dunlop (York-Forest Hill): Look around!

Mr. Lawlor: I would not read too much history there, I might get a little geography. I would suggest, while I fear the possibilities of official history, such as the law society of Upper Canada is having written at a cost of $160,000, I believe, at the present time—why, Arnold Toynbee could write the history of civilization for a tenth as much—but nevertheless I would recommend that some con-

sideration and thought be given to trying to stimulate the history of this province.

The second thing I wish to mention was that when I became a member of this House for the first time and almost on the beginning day I asked if there was any list of official publications for the province. There is not. You cannot get a comprehensive and up to date list of what this province publishes through government auspices, and I recommend to The Provincial Secretary's Department, to the library staff, that such be prepared. I said the federal government has such lists. Other governments in other provinces have—we have not, and it would be of great service to the members to know what is available in all departments and in full. There are lists which are incomplete.

The next matter I wish to discuss is the excessive cost, it seems to me, of some of the law commission reports that are coming out. Of recent date we have had the report on family law. For those who have been regaled by this bulky document, three huge volumes, look at them. Do you think the people of Ontario ought to be burdened with the cost of such an academic exercise? No one could be more in favour of scholarships or academic achievement than I am, but this is a *jeu d'esprit*; this is a permitting of the professorial people to take over and to play games with us.

That first volume is a very long thing, over an inch thick, dedicated to the history of family law. I attended the bar convention a week or so ago and Mr. Lou Assaly, Q.C., of Ottawa, summed up the history of family law inside 15 minutes. The people who are going to read this volume are lawyers basically, but the other people would be lost in the volume to start with. The lawyers know this terminology and the anticipations, and whatnot, and what is the point in a lengthy, voluminous, long drawn out piece of writing costing enormous amounts of money?

The second volume is taken up with comparative law. It studies the law of many, many jurisdictions. If it would spend half that amount of time studying other jurisdictions in terms of economic plannings, something might be achieved. But to go through the family law of Switzerland and the Tagalogs in order to constitute family law in this province in this day and age, and to finally emerge with a code that is similar to that of New York and Great Britain, seems to me another excessive waste of public funds. The finger should be pointed and the foot put down on it if this is the way they intend to carry on. It is not necessary and it is not needed.

The last volume is all right. All the recommendations are contained in 50 pages—you can get the heart of the matter there—and I recommend them to you. They are extremely good.

Another thing, and in my mood of generosity—just being a neophyte around here—I want to praise the government for its legal aid scheme. Sometimes for reasons that bemuse me, throughout the history of this government, as with workmen's compensation, as with Hydro, they become ardent and rank socialists. They introduce schemes of social welfare of immediate benefit to the people at large and not just to their rather elite friends.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): They are all socialists at heart.

Mr. Lawlor: The legal aid scheme is working well. It is costing probably a little more than what was anticipated but against the cost, as was pointed out in the press, of a mile of superhighway we can well afford this scheme and it should not be cut back, I suggest, in any of its ramifications. I have attended numerous meetings with the scheme; questioned deeply; looked for lawyers seeking special favours; tried to get under the rug; there is no problem under the rug. It looks as clean as it can be.

I give the Attorney General enormous credit for introducing it. I can only surmise that the more enlightened elements in the benches of the law society, seeing the writing on the wall in other jurisdictions—in the United States with the Escobido case and a hundred other instances—felt that it was better to seize the manacle and put the thing into effect here and now before greater criticism fell upon their heads. I wish the medical profession had half the intelligence and that the medical profession would be as socially conscious as the legal profession has proven itself to be.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Lawyers stick together, that is for sure.

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Be careful, the member will need the medical profession to look after that arm which will be dislocated by patting himself on the back.

Mr. Lawlor: It is better than suffering an amputation through insouciance—go around with artificial limbs and artificial head and an artificial heart.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I thought that was what the member had.

Mr. Lewis: The Minister cannot even understand that repartee.

Mr. Lawlor: I wish to say a word to the Provincial Secretary (Mr. Welch). I am the critic of The Provincial Secretary's Department. I come with no plumes today—no criticisms—I cannot gratify any hope. I am saving up for another day in which philosophy does not so much preoccupy my mind. We can deal with your department very shortly. May I say, Mr. Speaker, that I have the highest regard for the Provincial Secretary. If all members of the Crown had his capability and intelligence his party would stand in good form.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Trying to split us up?

Mr. Lawlor: I have only one little point to make about the department at this time, which has been made many times before in this House, so I will not labour it—the Provincial Secretary is the guardian of a schizoid child. His department is all wrong. What on earth The Department of Citizenship has to do with the Provincial Secretary lies beyond my ken. I am told that at some time in the past the hon. Minister of Social and Family Services (Mr. Yaremko) had particular predilections to cover a lot of ground and garnered to his breast the new immigrants to this province, and then, being Provincial Secretary, felt that he could widen his scope and that this was a proper department to give to him.

Now, while I think that that element should be removed from your department completely and sent over to The Department of Education where it really belongs, we would supply you with innumerable tasks where your great competence could operate freely. So do not feel divested in any way. There is plenty of other work to do which less capable Ministers, if I may say so, should send over to you.

Another point I wish to make, Mr. Speaker —and this may interest the new public accounts committee—has to do with the proliferation of departmental publications. We are inundated with them so far as I am concerned. You come to the House every day and there is a small mountain of them on the side of the desk. The things are done in gloss of high stencil and at great pains. But basically speaking, as far as I can see, except for a few of their House organs they are made for the purpose of buttering each other up within the department and taking each other's pictures. They are of no conceivable use so far as the government of Ontario is concerned and I think it should be cut out. I particularly direct that to the workmen's compensation board.

I should like to say a word about Quebec and again praise and congratulate the Prime Minister of this province on his overall stand on Quebec. For in some ways he is almost curiously contemporary and aware when he, unlike other provincial Premiers, speaks in terms of our very survival in this matter. As usual, the economic dimensions of the problem in Quebec seem to escape him; at least, he very seldom speaks of it. But in a way he has become, with a noticeable stoop, "the great white father" of the new Confederation.

In this regard, the finest thing I have seen in general terms—and not specific terms—setting forth distribution of powers and what not—in this great debate that is going on, is an article contained in the *Canadian Bar Review* of September, 1967, by the new dean of the law school, I would think, of Osgoode or York University, Gerald E. Le Dain.

The dean has a double ancestry, speaks both languages fluently, is from Montreal and a highly cultured man. He says, on page 403:

> Is it possible to reach some consensus on the proper relationship of the French Canadian people to the rest of Canada? French Canada is calling for equality; what does this mean? It is both an individual and collective claim. As an individual claim, it is perhaps understandable enough. The French Canadian seeks equality of opportunity and this necessarily and primarily implies for him, since he is committed by more than two centuries of struggle, to the preservation of his language, the right to live and work in French without being handicapped. But there is also a collective claim on behalf of the French Canadian people. This is a claim for a certain political recognition by the rest of Canada. A political claim for the French Canadian people of Quebec to equal status with the rest of Canada, is more difficult to comprehend. We must, nevertheless, try to understand the forces and reasons behind it.
>
> I believe it is impossible to begin to understand the present constitutional tension in Canada unless one attempts to regard the problem of French Canadian cultural survival as it must appear to French Canadians. It is necessary to accept the fact that it is too late for French

Canada to renounce the struggle to preserve its language. It would have been easier for all of us had it chosen the path of assimilation, but it did not do so, and it is understandable historically why it did not do so. A conquered people is bound, if it is given a chance, to cling to its language as part of its general instinct for self-preservation.

At the same time, as they look out upon this menacing perspective of cultural encirclement, French Canadians are profoundly dissatisfied with their relative position in the social and economic order. The French Canadian middle class does not feel that it has a proper share of power or influence, particularly in the world of business and finance. It certainly has a lot of political power in the province of Quebec but its concentration on this kind of power has, in some ways, been a compensation for its lack of economic power. Perhaps it is putting it too strongly to characterize the present drive for self-determination as a search for power, it is certainly a search for an enhanced sense of personal dignity. The French Canadian has been made to feel inferior.

In fact, a long history of Toryism in this province, has contributed magnificently to that feeling of inferiority. They are redeeming themselves. I say that the Premier should be congratulated. It has been long coming and if the French Canadians have been made to feel inferior, this is partly attributable to causes for which English speaking Canadians bear great responsibility.

Mr. P. J. Yakabuski (Renfrew South): That is not fair.

Mr. Lawlor: To continue:

It is also attributable in significant measure to the formidable difficulty of trying to compete in another language, and to an aspect of cultural prejudice—the unwillingness to entrust responsibility to a member of another cultural group on the general ground that one is not too sure about his outlook, judgment and reactions.

The response to this condition is to try to make Quebec a cultural and economic citadel for the defence of French Canadian interests. What is sought is not merely a place which French Canadians can regard as their homeland but one which actively favours their development as a French speaking people. For this reason, Quebec seeks as much political or constitutional power as possible in order to influence economic conditions and events in such a manner as to open up in increasing measure of vocational opportunity for its people. . . . By the same token the rest of Canada needs Quebec. It needs her economically and it needs her for the cultural and intellectual stimulation she provides.

A country needs challenge to realize its full potential. It needs some tough problems to wrestle with and ultimately solve. This is how it grows in skill and power and insight and in richness of life. The bicultural tension in Canada is like the sand in the oyster. This is the answer to the question which was posed at the outset. Why should French speaking and English speaking Canadians continue to endure the frustrations and the difficulties of trying to live together in a close political association? The answer is, that they need each other to preserve their identity and to realize their full potential as an independent people on the North American continent.

The development of a truly bilingual society growing from the rich heritage of two great civilizations of the western world is the special destiny and enormously difficult task which history has committed to Canada. Success in this task will be its crowning achievement. We do not have the right to lay down this task, to turn aside from this challenge after having lived with it for what, in historical terms, is really a comparatively short period of time. But we must work at it a good deal harder. We are now only beginning to tackle the problem in a serious way with provincial policies to provide education in the French language.

At the same time as we require new determination to make Canada a truly bilingual country, we have need of an open minded and flexible attitude towards proposals for fundamental revision of our federal relationships, however startling they may appear at first sight. All our constitutional assumptions are being challenged. Indeed, we are living a dramatic and strenuous moment of mutual confrontation by what James Conant has called the two modes of thought: the theoretical deductive and the empirical inductive. These two approaches reflect the genius of the French speaking and the English speaking worlds and their combination in direction in this country is what constitutes a promise of an intellectual stature in richness that will make all the struggle worthwhile.

> The French speaking community is now throwing out large and sweeping ideas deduced from general principles that are said to be implicit in modern experience with a variety of federal relationships. French Canada is trying to find a theoretical or ideal accommodation between what it conceives to be its own constitutional requirements for self-determination, and what it assumes that English-speaking Canada considers to be the minimal degree of central government power required for a viable federal state. Although English-speaking Canada has said comparatively little so far, I would judge that it is by no means indifferent, but is reacting warily out of traditional distrust of theoretical constructs and ideal blueprints in the field of government—an area in which its reliance on the pragmatic approach must be conceded to have met with an impressive measure of success. A typical reaction might be expected to be somewhat as follows:
>
> Why replace what we are familiar with and have learned to operate fairly well, by something new, unknown and untried, which is bound to give rise to a whole host of problems and difficulties to take the place of those we think we have resolved? Any federal relationship or political association however attenuated will have its particular difficulties and frustrations and it will require a spirit of compromise and accommodation if it is to have any chance of success. If we cannot continue to apply this spirit successfully to our present relationship why should we think that we should be able to apply it to another?

Mr. Le Dain goes on and gives you the solution. I recommend page 407 of this issue of the *Bar Review* for what he says should be the remedies to be applied in this regard.

There is one final matter—of the mundane kind, I suppose—on which I wish to speak and I am very pleased to see the Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Randall) in the House. As the member for Lakeshore, and in deep rapport with my constituents, I note that there are lands in my riding, belonging to the Mimico reformatory. There are 135 acres there. The government goes about the province buying land at excessive prices. Yet the government already owns these lands; it does not have to buy them. I am not claiming in this House that these lands are necessarily ideal for the purpose of public housing, for high-rise, for row housing, or for that sort of development. Even with some mixed industrial development, it is not necessarily ideal. Nevertheless, it is the nicest piece of ground around and within the confines of the city. To neglect them, to overlook them, and not to bring them within the scheme of Ontario housing development, is a shame. And it is a shame from many regards.

What is happening in my riding is this: At about the central portion there is a string of factories. It is called a ring of steel, dividing the riding across the middle, dividing the north from the south end. There is a considerable sense of community down on the Lakeshore road, but it has been starving for a long time. There has been a draining away of the commercial life. With the establishment there of a concentration of housing, they would revivify the Lakeshore road and put both Brown's line and Highway No. 27 on that road back into operating condition, rather than bringing more pollutants into an area that already suffers from the Hydro, from Goodyear, and from a host of others who burn bulk oil.

I say again to the Minister: One cannot find out how these things proceed. Who says this should be used for industrial land? Does it emanate from the township itself? It seems to be so, but when you ask the township you are told, no, it emanates from the Minister. Well who does it come from?

Who has made these studies? Who has given this any great thought? The position you place municipalities in, with respect to your taxation structures, forces them to turn to industrial usage lands which, in any other circumstances, they would use for public housing and to put roofs over the heads of our people.

I intend, so far as Lakeshore road is concerned, to carry out a fight to have a revision of this policy. True, it can be done at the local level obviously more than it can be done here, but there can be little question that that land should be used for public housing purposes.

Lastly, Mr. Speaker, I would like to mention a family connection, of which I am not unproud. On my mother's side—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Lawlor: Has the member something to say to me?

Mr. Lewis: The dinosaurs are aroused, are they?

Mr. Lawlor: They just kind of growl! On my mother's side, a MacDonald married a McDonald and the MacDonalds are related back on the tree of the family to Mr. John Sandfield Macdonald. I mention it as a point of interest that I thought would be acceptable in this sort of speech.

Professor Lower says of him, however, that he was not so much a Liberal as an anti-Tory. I think there are an awful lot of Liberals just like that, including the member who made the last interjection, Mr. Speaker.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: We are giving them a chance to regroup; they can regroup at this point.

Mr. Lawlor: Hang on to your hats, because the speech really begins.

The hon. member for Scarborough East (Mr. T. Reid) the other day made a tiny essay into the question of rights. He distinguished between the position of the Tory party and his party on the basis that the Tories lay an emphasis upon duties and obligations—too much of an emphasis he seemed to think—and that the Liberal Party was typified by its insistence or stress upon human rights, over against obligations.

As usual, I think that both parties are partially right and partially wrong and as far as the Liberal position, as it is historically set up, is concerned, that is as Liberalism coming down through John Locke and John Stuart Mill. By the way, here is an interesting example. The Liberals often cite him, but you know that fellow ended up a socialist?

An hon. member: He saw the light.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I notice the member used the expression "ended up".

Mr. W. G. Pitman (Peterborough): We all end up somewhere.

Mr. Lawlor: It is better than being carried out, you know.

Mr. Pitman: We are all socialists in the end —we are equal six feet under anyway!

Mr. Lawlor: The difficulty with the Liberal position, Mr. Speaker, in this regard is, that they do emphasize rights, whether natural, artificial, acquired or however you may find them, and I intend to discuss that at some length in the next few hours.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Lawlor: No, I will spare him. It will not go on too much longer. The trouble with emphasis on rights of this kind, Mr. Speaker, is that they tend to stress rights without responsibility, and they tend to disregard, to have privileges without duties, a free choice without obligations.

This is the fallacy in the Liberal stand. Most Liberals probably do not hold to that fallacy, but to that extent, so far as Liberal traditional thinking has been concerned, they depart from the cause.

The Tories, on the other side of the fence, traditionalists to the core, are taken up with the sense of history, so lost in the past that they move backwards into the 20th century and are not aware, and particularly are undesirous, of being aware of the problems of our time. These people stress duties.

They talk more—if they follow Burke, and Burke should be their great hero, why do they not quote him more often? He is glorious, his arguments are sound as—

An hon. member: Tell them who he is.

Mr. Lawlor: These people have John Stuart Mill and you have Burke. A pretty fair thing, they are both equally defective, but they have many good things to say.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lawlor: What the Tories tend to stress, or should stress, as true Tories, is the sense of "my station and its duties"; that man occupies a certain role and function in society. The failure in the government's position over against the British position, is that they had some kind of an aristocracy of intellect. As far as this particular country is concerned, the Tory position is founded in an aristocracy of mere money.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Like the member for High Park (Mr. Shulman).

Mr. Lawlor: There is an enlightened fellow for you. The trouble with both positions is that they are individualistic and when I hear the talk about individualism, the fallacy lies right there.

Individualism, if I may use a big word—I very seldom use them—is antinomian, it is against law. It says that my desires and what I wish to do is the way by which I acquire my self-realization. And that law comes in as an enemy. It comes as something from the outside that presses me down and makes me less than I otherwise would be.

And so this antinomianism that constitutes the thinking of both your parties, or, at least, is a vein that runs through the whole thing, is anti-social. Our position is pro-social. It

sees the individual as a whole within a larger whole. And it sees his emancipation.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lawlor: This atomic individualism of the 19th century was a thing that divided man from man and, coming into our own time, it has deeply influenced our youth and they are rebelling against it. It set up, as Marx put it, a sense of anomie, a sense of alienation, instead of an open hand, instead of an openness in human relations, instead of generosity guiding our choices, instead of a co-operative effort binding an age together, instead of making, not only the people of Quebec, but men at large, feel at home in this world.

This is their world that they must fashion, and they become what they are through this fashioning of it. Instead of all that, we have isolated individuals exerting their individual, tiny autonomy, living as sovereigns in their own tiny world, stressing their rights over their duties, forever saying that they must be emancipated from the law. You should be very pleased that I shall come back to this when I discuss the six ends of government in terms of human freedom.

I follow an ancient tradition, the ancient story of the city-state, but the love that people were able to generate from that, we have not been able to bring into being here at all. Aristotle said, "man is a social animal," he is social to his roots, to his very being.

He is born in society, he is nurtured and garnered, and grows and becomes what he is within the embrace of that society. He confers benefits upon it, and it reciprocates back upon him; he is no individual, he is a person.

It is quite a different thing when the stress falls on the wrong thing. It is the continuity of that mistaken stress, particularly into economic terms, that turns many of you people away from all kinds of social measures of the utmost importance and social progress, whereby people will become more truly persons, where they will finally achieve their self-recognition and capability of growth, and become more balanced and sound people.

They will make enormous contributions to the community. The intangible always seems to escape through the net, somehow; everybody tries to place things in terms of dollars and cents. My proposition before this House today—or one of the many propositions, is thank heavens that today we are socialists. We are either creeping socialists, or we are prepared to stand up and walk. Simply to place an aura of dramatic semantic meaning around a term, which you are incapable of defining even if you are asked point blank, and to garner in all the alien associations and to throw the word back, is less than intelligent. The fact is that today we are all socialists.

Because of the genius of industry, the complexity of the social relationships in which we live, the profound relations that Marshall MacLuhan points out in terms of "global village", the world is coming to a convergence, it is coming to a sense of unity, of unification. The Pope issues encyclicals on these things, and they call it socialization that is taking place in mankind. On the hustings, I was very hard put to it, you know, to stay abreast of my Tory opponent, he was to the left of anything I could hope to achieve at any time of the day or night; we had to run very quickly. And I notice that the hon. member for Humber (Mr. Ben) on occasion ran true to form in this regard—this is just one visage, they speak one way on the hustings, but when it comes to votes in the House we can expect a different tune.

An example of this is in the economy that we would envisage; self-interest would not be the norm, we are all socialists to the extent that we live in a mixed economy, and the economy is becoming ever more mixed. Who enjoys the greatest fruits of the socialization that is taking place? Who talks out of the side of their mouths in the greatest opposition to this thing that is the greatest benefit to us all?

The risk is human freedom, but we are as aware of that as our opponents. There is always a risk involved in every departure, in every venture of the human mind, and for good reason, for it always involves some peril for good to be conferred. To say that the peril outweighs the significance of the good is basically what the government seems to be saying day after day in this House. We live in a mixed economy. Franklin Roosevelt was a great initiator of this economy in the United States. He spoke of people whom he called "economic barons". They exist in surfeit to this day. And those are the people who inveighed most against him, who were his chief enemies and whose hand was raised against him. He was their saviour. Today, because of the interrelationship between the government and the aluminum industry, the aircraft industry, or the automobile industries of the North American continent, these industries survive by reason of this interaction. They never had it so good; they exist as a result of the role

in positive functions which government performs.

How can anyone speak in a manner that is completely contrary to that? What is actually happening is that a greater monopolization is going on at the top. Gailbraith's recent book has set out to prove this point. There is free enterprise; but for the barber, and the lawyer and for the doctor, and for the people in lower and middle income brackets. But for the great determining financial structures in this country, for the people who govern oil, or banking, or the aluminum industry, or the automobile industry—you name it—the ones who really count, there is "administered prices".

There is a complete fallacy here, I think that the government realizes it as well as I do, I think that they must puzzle in their sleep, as to just what changes this should mean in terms of the real Legislature introduced in this House. We are all socialists these days. Some of us are willing to stand up and walk. When the Premier spoke of regional government here the day before yesterday—and I understand that he has been speaking in the same terms for many years—I could not help but be delighted because here was a departure from the *ad hoc* type of planning which causes much loss of money, and great inefficiency and causes a failure to govern and administer in a sensible way that is contemporary. When he spoke of regional planning he said that it would involve co-ordination and the interrelationship between various communities, corporate bodies, and that land-use control was an essential part of it. The man was living in awareness, which is right.

But of course he is a lawyer.

He has the occupational disease of that profession; he thinks that by saying something he has already accomplished something, that to some striking measure he has altered the world. In short, he tries to be a little God-like. God said: "Let there be light, and there was light". And the Premier says: "Let there be regional government", and absolutely nothing happens.

Indeed, if the members opposite, and particularly the Treasury bench, would give some attention to the leading Swedish economist in the contemporary world—a man by the name of Gunnar Myrdal, who visited this country, and gave a centennial address last summer in Montreal—they would know that the kind of planning that we have in mind is actually not decentralizing, in many of its functions, against the kind of centralization that the government is bringing to pass; and the failure of co-ordination and reason in your economic theory of planning. Myrdal in the first fifty pages, shows how in Sweden they have been able to divest the central government of a whole host of functions. On some occasion I shall go into that, but now I will spare the members.

I will make this proposition, Mr. Speaker, that so far as I am concerned—and I suggest for any reasonable man who really looks at it for an instant—the welfare state is the finest product of the human mind. It has done more in a short period of time to make men free, to alleviate them from unnecessary misery, to take off shackles which are artificial burdens; to bring them into the full possession of themselves. Material cares and wants can be alleviated. In a modern, affluent society most of them can and ought to be relieved. In this way, and only in this way—and this is the history of civilization—by shucking off material cares, men have entered into themselves and have made the great creative strides and progress that they are capable of.

In another 25 or 50 years all the debates and all the hammering on the table that a person like myself might engage in in this Legislature will be completely passé, and your children and my children will blow their heads in front of a brave new world which will involve a considerable amount of planning and orientation. But I would suggest, except in very key places in the fiscal and economic sphere, that decision be left wholly to the designs and in the lives of the individual. Living in leisure and living free of material care, having even universal medicare, he will be able to assert himself; he will not be under any kind of bane.

We all know of our parents and others who refused to go to doctors because they were afraid of the amount of money it might cost; they allowed themselves to suffer diseases and to get worse over long periods of time. This is a well known thing in most of the homes that came through the depression. And even today there is this spirit that continues to exist—a certain hesitation about seeing the doctor because of the cost. There is no necessity for this any longer and it would be a good thing if it were overcome.

So instead of what I hear from the other side there, particularly yesterday afternoon, Mr. Speaker, instead of the argument that these are handouts and giveaways—people know they have to pay for these things, they are not fools. You seem to speak as though

the "free such and such" meant that they were being taken in somehow. That is not true. What they do want is a greater justice in the distribution of material goods, and a greater role played by those who can well afford to do so, who derive the benefits from the use of this economy.

As I was saying a few moments ago, the chief antagonists of Franklin Roosevelt were the very people who most reaped the benefit from the system as it stands; and the more that the system places purchasing power into the hands of the populace at large, the more these individuals—the captains of industry, people in preferred economic positions, people who enjoy privileges that the rest of us do not, either by birth or, perhaps, in some instances through intelligence, but sometimes by sheer hard work benefit. But largely it is because of other more terrible things: because of the worst potentialities of human nature; because of acquisitiveness; because of the desire to garner into themselves as much as they can; overreach the other fellow. To ride over others shove-through typifies our society which has these particular predilections and perils; and our young people know it, and they think and they call us names under their breath.

Not only are we mythologists in holding up a whole host of positions that are outdated, outmoded, and never really existed at all—this is the myth of free enterprise—but we are also caught up in the business of hypocrisy—of pretending to our children to represent certain interests and certain causes. We are adopting the terminology of the French revolution—*liberté, egalité, fraternité*. There is a little liberty, because of the conformist sentiments abroad you do not even need censorship to get censorship—at least you do not need the official kind. As far as equality is concerned there is precious little of it. It is given lip service, but what you are maintaining is a structured society deliberately oriented upon the benefit of a few, and if a Marxist should rail against you and say that you are cementing classes, and that you are setting up this particular kind of divisiveness within your own midst and are not serving the higher purposes of the common good—and he has some justification I suggest—you come to fraternity, the last ideal, the flower of justice, the thing that all men seek, a mutual interweaving of our lives, a dependence upon each other; the giving of our gifts each to the other, and receiving back; as though we were in some way self-made men.

The greatest myth of them all is that Horatio Alger syndrome or complex which says that we are somehow born full blown and fully clothed from the brow of Zeus; that E. P. Taylor, for instance, is a self-made man —what nonsense.

We all made him; we all support him; he is dependent upon the whole community; he is a product of that community; he should hand back to that community some of the good he gets of it and a good deal of the benefits, because it is a mutually on-going fraternity; and if it is a fraternity, and we were fighting for human brotherhood and for the capability of realizing ourselves in each other, then we reject any isolation and withdrawal.

As Aristotle said, "man is a social animal" and that man who does not live in society is either a beast or a god. I have not seen any gods in the House and the problem is that an acquisitive society does breed all the habits of the beast; these are praised and given accolades and men are given positions in public life because they seem to be particularly adept at this peculiar and this questionable virtue. Therefore, our children call us hypocrites because over against the gospel that we profess, and the prayers that we read in this House every day, and the Our Father addressed to all men as brothers —what do we do every day of our life in the market place, how do we act with one another?

I suggest to you that there is a deep hypocrisy in all this, and that if you framed legislation which ameliorated, that bore the gospels out, then this legislation in conformity with the principles of which I speak, would be very different from the sort of thing that you are doing.

Up to a point, the little gestures made, the crumbs that fall from the tables of the great are well received. Thank heavens there is something. You have been very astute in maintaining yourselves in office for an awfully long time by just giving enough, and just closing the fist as it is handed out.

There is a certain gift in all that, but it is a grudging spirit. It is that unwillingness to move full fledged, honestly, and with generosity into the full life of the times and to live with the people. There is no reason it seems to me that men of good will, as I trust all of you are, could not introduce legislation in any number of cases.

We are introducing on the order paper very shortly, Mr. Speaker, a resolution with respect to landlord and tenant relations—I

shall speak on it shortly and so I will reserve most of my remarks. But in that area, take an area just like that—it does not cost any money; it is not going to burden you; you do not have to say it is a weight on the public purse; the fact of the matter is that a simple amendment and, I suggest, a complete redoing of the Act, might have immediate beneficial consequences.

I think of the law reform commission again and their work on perpetuities. All right, perpetuities legislation is fine. Perhaps in some areas it was outmoded, but who uses perpetuities legislation but the rich? I daresay not one lawyer in 20 has ever been involved with a perpetuities case, but landlords and tenants cases occur every day of the week. The Landlord and Tenant Act is something that is anachronistic and completely out of date. It is the most vicious law, I think, on our books at the present time.

You will not move; you will not even listen. Why do you not take that Landlord and Tenant Act—why do they not give the law reform commission some real work to do, some work that will be of immediate and practical impact? But plan to do it immediately because the problem is pressing.

There are 15,000 on the rolls of this city, and every day of the week I get more calls at my office from people pleading that they are being evicted; that they are being let out of where they live.

The problem is mounting. It is serious now. And what do I say to them? I say that you are going to be the 15,002nd person, and they say, "Put me on anyhow." But just as often they say, "What is the use?" So the actual need is very much greater.

Just before I came here this morning I had a call of this very type, where a woman is being separated from her children, in effect, because she cannot find the proper accommodations. Why does the government not move into areas where it can be of immediate good and munificence? It will win the praise of the people, it will win our praise, it will stay in office, and its members will garner to themselves some little crown that, at the end of the day, their children can look back upon this time and say that the old man did such and such, and that he moved forward in a sense of social awareness and social legislation. Why not?

Mr. Lewis: Right, why not?

An hon. member: No halos over there!

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Speaker, my next portion, I am afraid, goes into the subtleties of human thought a little bit more than I have so far.

I wonder if I might be permitted to adjourn the debate at this point?

Mr. Lawlor moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

NOTICE OF MOTION

Clerk of the House: Notice of motion No. 5, by Mr. Gaunt.

RESOLUTION:

That the Ontario government should take steps immediately to include chiropractors, optometrists, osteopaths, dentists and other paramedical groups, as well as druggists, under the Ontario medical services insurance plan.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Nixon) the private member's motion No. 5 standing in my name.

Mr. Speaker, may I draw to your attention and to the attention of the House that this resolution was drafted and submitted previous to the Speech from the Throne. And this accounts for the fact that the optometrists are included in the resolution. As we all know optometrists have now been taken care of as far as inclusion into OMSIP is concerned, and rightly so.

It is interesting to read the paragraph, actually two paragraphs, that deal with the extension of services under the Ontario medical services insurance plan.

On page 8 of the Speech from the Throne, I note where it says,

> Under the Ontario medical services insurance plan there will be further extensions of benefits, including the examination of eyes by refraction when carried out by a physician or an optometrist.
>
> The health services programme of the government will be further extended through an arrangement which will have a significant and beneficial effect on the cost of prescriptions, drugs and drugs used in hospitals and welfare institutions.

Of course, those two paragraphs, and particularly the first one, motivated my question to the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond) this morning, because I was curious about the phrase "further extensions of benefits", which I am sure you recognize, sir, is plural, so presumably there will be more extensions or

more groups taken in under OMSIP than just the optometrists.

So, I wanted to know from the hon. Minister this morning whether those other people who will presumably be taken in at some future date would include chiropractors.

He indicated to me, at least I got this impression, they would not be taken in, so I want to address myself to this matter for the next few minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this discussion has developed into what one might term a perennial discussion. I can recall that during the last three years I have placed this resolution or one of a similar nature on the order paper and we have discussed it in the private members' hour. It has had support from our friends to the left, qualified support from a number of government members. I can recall the predecessor to the member for Lakeshore (Mr. Lawlor) who just spoke. He was the acting solicitor, I believe, for the Canadian chiropractic association. I feel that this association in no way could be attributed to its political demise, but nonetheless we have a new face from Lakeshore.

It is interesting to note that many of the same compelling arguments apply to both chiropractors and optometrists, insofar as their inclusion into OMSIP is concerned. Yet the government has said yes in the case of the latter and no in the case of the former. It is very difficult to understand why the government stopped at the optometrists without including chiropractors and other paramedical groups.

Let me take chiropractic for an example. Twenty-five per cent of the population in Ontario, at one time or another, has used chiropractic or, speaking in round figures, approximately 1,700,000 people. The feeling is sometimes held by those in authority that it creates no particular hardship on the chiropractor, that he is excluded from OMSIP, because in effect private insurance companies can offer this service and people can purchase this service through private carriers.

Metropolitan Life, Aetna Life, Travelers Insurance—the three biggest insurance companies in North America—do not write individual contracts. The same holds true for London Life, Zurich Insurance, the Mutual Life Assurance Company and many others. The only big company that does provide individual policies for chiropractic care is Mutual of Omaha.

My purpose in mentioning this is simply to point out that the storekeeper, the small business man, the farmer, the man not involved in a group for one reason or another cannot purchase insurance, with one or two exceptions, which includes chiropractic care.

Even if this type of insurance were available through most of the companies, the premium would be out of line when it would be compared with OMSIP.

The value of chiropractic is well established and this is borne out by the number of people who each year seek out a chiropractor for assistance.

However, for the information of the House, it may be beneficial to recite some of the findings of Royal commissions which have issued reports relative to chiropractic in the past number of years.

In total, there have been nine Royal commissions that have dealt with chiropractors, either as a major part of the study or as an incidental part.

The first one was in 1950. It was the Royal commission on The Workmens' Compensation Act of Ontario, conducted by Mr. Justice W. D. Roach. Although it was recommended by the college of physicians and surgeons of Ontario and the Ontario medical association that chiropractors' services be deleted from the Act, the commissioner rejected this proposal and stated as follows and I quote:

> The board is not concerned with any jealousies or conflict in opinion or technique that may exist between physicians and drugless practitioners. The welfare of the injured workman is its main concern.

Chiropractic benefits have continued to be provided under the Act. Chiropractors have a good relationship with the workmens' compensation board and the use of chiropractors' services continues to increase each year.

From 1954 to 1960, the use increased by 308 per cent based upon the yearly payments made by chiropractic care and it has continued to grow since that date.

There was another Royal commission in 1950, to delve into The Workmen's Compensation Act in British Columbia and it was conducted by the late chief justice of British Columbia, his honour Gordon Sloan.

Until 1950, and I am making these comments in reference to this particular report, injured workers in British Columbia were required to obtain permission from a medical practitioner before consulting a chiropractor for treatment under The Workmen's Compensation Act. This was not a very workable arrangement, for obvious reasons. Therefore, lay organizations and the chiropractic asso-

ciation requested that this requirement be deleted from the Act. The commissioner accepted this recommendation and the Act was amended accordingly.

The result has been a substantial increase in beneficial results in the treatment of workers suffering from crippling and painful back and extremity injuries.

In 1961, in British Columbia, the average cost of care for chiropractic treatment under The Workmen's Compensation Act, was $34.73. The percentage of patients who lost no time from work during treatment was 73.8 per cent, Mr. Speaker, and I think that is rather significant.

The next Royal commission inquiry was conducted in 1961 and this commission was to inquire into the provisions of the natural therapists bill in western Australia. It was chaired by one, Mr. Guthrie, who was a member of Parliament at that time.

This commission studied the profession, the chiropractors, the optometrists, and all the other paramedical groups.

The recommendations of the committee with respect to chiropractors was summed up as follows:

> The commission feels that there is a case for legislation in relation to chiropractors and it will give its recommendations in a later part of this report.

In a later reference, the commission also recommended that a college for the training of chiropractors be established in Australia. Subsequent to the issuing of this commission's report, legislation to provide for the licensing and control of chiropractors in western Australia was passed by the Legislature.

Then we come, Mr. Speaker, to 1964, the medical services insurance committee of Ontario. As we all know, that was chaired by Dr. Hagey and this committee was restricted by its terms of reference to consider matters relating directly to the purposes and objectives of Bill 163.

Notwithstanding this, the following statement is found in the introduction to the report:

> In our proposals, we have confined ourselves to a programme of physicians' services, as did Bill 163 itself, but we have suggested continuing studies.

And then on page 10, we read in their report:

> From the beginning of the committee's public hearings, the question constantly arose, "Should a medical services plan offer coverage of costs other than those for the services of physicians?" Compelling arguments can be made, and indeed were made, that a wide variety of health services other than those rendered by physicians should be provided for in a broad health services insurance programme.

The Hagey committee, in effect, went beyond its terms of reference and did this because it felt the so-called other services were important to the total health insurance field.

Then in 1965, we had the Royal commission on health services, conducted by the hon. Mr. Justice Emmett Hall. Initially in this report, a sociological study of the chiropractic professional was planned. However, after the inquiry had been underway for some time, it was realized that a scientific study of the profession was needed. As time did not permit for the launching of the new investigation prior to the publication of the commission's report, it was decided that the scientific inquiry being conducted for the government of Quebec at that time by the hon. Mr. Justice Lacroix, would be accepted by the Hall commission as an extension of its own investigation.

Then we come to the Lacroix commission, Quebec, and Mr. Justice Lacroix said:

> When I first started this study, it came as a surprise to me to learn that much of the opposition by traditional medicine was based on bias, prejudice, ignorance and refusal to learn about the profession of chiropractic. I thought it safer to know and understand before judging.

During his investigation, the commissioner spent 43 days visiting England, Switzerland, Germany, Sweden and France, where he held 27 interviews with chiropractors, physicians and government officials. He also visited chiropractic colleges in Canada and the United States.

The findings of the commission may be briefly summarized as follows:

1. Chiropractic manipulation is a valid method of treatment.

2. The medical profession has erred in rejecting it, and those physicians who oppose it are out of step with medical specialists in other parts of the world who have studied, used and approved of this form of treatment.

There are a number of other recommendations which are set forth in that commission report. Suffice it to say that, in my opinion, there is but one other that should be placed on the record at this time, and that is:

> It is recognized by the commission that the chiropractor must be responsible for

> arriving at a diagnosis of the patient's condition, rather than requiring a medical referral. It is recommended that the internship period is sufficiently thorough to ensure that the graduate has this capability.

Now it should be recalled at this point that the Hall commission agreed to accept the findings of the Lacroix commission, and that if chiropractic therapy was found to be valid, then the training should be carried out in a university setting.

In 1966, a commission to inquire into The Workmen's Compensation Act of British Columbia, was conducted by the hon. Mr. Justice Charles Tysoe. The medical profession in British Columbia, in appearing before the commission, attempted to have chiropractic services deleted from the Act, attempted to show that the chiropractic treatment is harmful and suggested that chiropractors' use of X-ray equipment was unsatisfactory.

Following a thorough study of the matter, during which witnesses of both sides were subjected to cross-examination, the commissioner refused to accept any of these medical recommendations. His findings were that chiropractors' services should remain as a benefit under the legislation, that evidence from the workmen's compensation board indicated that no harm was caused by chiropractic treatment, and that chiropractors should retain the right to use X-ray equipment for diagnostic purposes.

And then we come up to last year, 1967. We had a Royal commission on the matter of The Workmen's Compensation Act in Ontario, conducted by Mr. Justice George McGillivary. Here again the Ontario medical association recommended, with respect to chiropractors, that any request for additional privileges or recognition be refused:

> As it is our considered opinion that chiropractors do not possess sufficient medical knowledge to enable them to make a complete assessment of an injury.

The Ontario chiropractic association presented evidence from safety engineers in the mining industry at Elliot Lake that proves that the chiropractic management of certain spinal injuries in the mines was more effective than medical management.

Our association, and that is in reference to the chiropractic association, presented evidence from the Tysoe inquiry in British Columbia, which showed that the workmen's compensation board's records in that province showed that chiropractors are competent in the diagnosis of spinal disc injuries, and that their claim forms are sometimes of more value to the board than the medical claim forms.

It is interesting to note that in the same report, the commissioner states, and I quote:

> There can be no doubt that greater recognition is being accorded both osteopaths and chiropractors as the time goes on.

Mr. Justice Hall, in his report on medicare, spoke with approval of the favourable report of these people in these professions by Mr. Justice Lacroix in Quebec.

And finally, we come to the other commission inquiry into health and social welfare for the government of Quebec, conducted by Mr. Claude Castinguay. This commission urged that the government pass some chiropractic legislation as recommended by the Lacroix commission, and in addition, that chiropractic services be included in Quebec's medicare programme, once the profession has been granted the necessary legislation and control. So I put the findings of those nine Royal commissions before the House, in reference to the chiropractic profession, and I draw to your attention that every commission without fail has come down on the side of the chiropractor as a professional man. Yet the government stubbornly refused to include the services of chiropractic in OMSIP, despite the large number of people who are using that service, and the obvious value of that service in the health service field.

The horizon is not entirely bleak; major achievements have been won by the chiropractors in other provinces of Canada. For instance, in 1961, the government of Alberta signed an agreement with the Alberta chiropractic association to provide chiropractic care for pensioners under the government's assistance programme. Manitoba also arranged for chiropractic benefits under its Social Allowances Act.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Everybody but Ontario!

Mr. Gaunt: Everybody but Ontario, as my hon. friend from Grey-Bruce says. In 1964, the Canadian memorial college was included in the new legislation, entitled The Canada Students Loan Act. In 1965, the government of British Columbia included chiropractic care in its new medicare programme, under the terms of The Medical Grant Act. In 1966, the government of Alberta added chiropractic treatment to its medicare plan, and the government of Saskatchewan has also passed a

unanimous resolution to consider adding these services to its programme.

The Manitoba Medical Insurances Act of 1967 includes a section which allows the government to include chiropractic services in the plan if the cost can be shared with the federal government. The government of Canada, on December 6, 1966, amended its medicare bill C-227 to provide for the inclusion of chiropractors, optometrists, and other paramedical groups in the federal medicare programme when the provinces request it. So we can see what has been done in the other provinces, but what has been done here? Every time that someone mentions coverages under OMSIP, for the paramedical people, the government squeals loudly, and says, "Look at the added cost". But I point out to you, that the cost of providing chiropractic benefits in the B.C. programme amounts to 3.3 per cent of the total programme. I hasten to point out that this figure does not represent 103 per cent of the cost. It comes closer to 99 per cent of the cost, because this 3.3 per cent does not take into account the transfer of costs.

In other words, if the patient is going to a chiropractor, it is highly unlikely that he is also going to a medical doctor at the same time. What I am saying is that the 3.3 per cent does not represent a new cost; it is a transferral cost. The Ontario government has chosen to ignore completely the value of chiropractic as established by the nine Royal commissions. They have chosen to ignore the public demand for such services, and have distorted the cost of including such services under OMSIP. Even the medical profession, through their actions, not through their official announcements, have come to recognize chiropractic techniques as having validity, because many doctors are now attempting manipulation, for which they are not trained, and as a result, the patient has to go to a chiropractor to correct the injury inflicted by the doctor. The crunch is that the doctor gets paid for throwing the joint out, but the chiropractor does not get paid for putting it back in.

In conclusion, I point out that I have support in this resolution, from no less a body than the Ontario association of rural municipalities. That august body, at its annual convention, on Februray 12 and 13, 1968, passed a resolution as follows:

> Whereas the federal government has included the benefits of chiropractic care in its medicare programme, and whereas the practice of chiropracting is duly licensed in the province of Ontario under The General Practitioners Act, and whereas the Ontario workmen's compensation board has utilized the services of the chiropractic profession continually since 1937, and whereas the majority of the insurance companies provide chiropractic benefits in their health and accident policies—

and that is a reference to group policies, I am sure—

> —and whereas a large percentage of the population of Ontario have availed themselves of chiropractic services, therefore be it resolved that the Ontario association of rural municipalities endorse this resolution, that the government of Ontario uphold the rights of the people of Ontario to enjoy the benefit of the physician of their choice by including the option of the chiropractic benefits in their medicare programme.

Mr. Speaker, I would point out to you that this resolution was passed by 90 per cent of the delegates.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Gaunt: Mr. Speaker, I cannot hear what my friend is saying. If he would like to ask a question I would be happy to try and answer him.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): May I ask the member which resolution he is quoting?

Mr. Gaunt: The Ontario association of rural municipalities passed that resolution.

Mr. N. L. Olde (Middlesex South): I simply asked if they will pay for it too?

Mr. Gaunt: I thought I had dealt with the cost factor, not at length, but certainly sufficiently to enlighten the hon. member.

In view of the arguments which I have presented, and which other hon. members will present, I want to close by saying that I urge all hon. members to lend their unqualified support to this resolution.

Mr. J. L. Brown (Beaches-Woodbine): It is my pleasure to rise to present the support to this resolution from the New Democratic caucus. The member for Huron-Bruce in his resolution spells out specific paramedical and healing arts services that should be included in the medical services insurance plan. I would like to add to that list: psychiatric social workers, clinical psychologists, child-care workers, group psychotherapists and nurses.

In speaking in support of this resolution, I would like to ask a question, and then attempt to answer it myself, because I see in the approach to this particular area a typical pattern on the part of the Minister of Health and The Department of Health of Ontario.

That question must be: Why is the government in this area feeling the need to support the medical profession against the other healing arts that are *bona fide* services in the community of Ontario, and which are being used by the Ontario citizens?

It seems to me that this particular interest in the exclusion of acceptable and invaluable services simply means that the medical profession and the good Minister would like to have the corner of the market to themselves and they would like, in addition, to have absolute authority and control over all the healing arts.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the day has long passed when the medical profession can claim this to themselves.

Mr. Sargent: They are doing a pretty good job of it.

Mr. Brown: We will see.

I would like to say: Who benefits from the exclusion of these organizations in the healing arts? Who in the province of Ontario benefits from the exclusion of these? There is only one single body, the medical profession itself. And how does it benefit? It benefits because it does not have to include in the benefits and payments from the insurance commission, money that would go to other healing arts by choice if they were included.

Now who would benefit if we did include these healing arts services? Who in the province of Ontario would benefit if these services were included? It would be the average, ordinary people of Ontario—those who use these services right now and have no insurance coverage to pay for them and have to pay for them out of pocket.

And once again we see the typical pattern of a Tory government which is ready, always ready, immediately ready to leap to the defence of a select few who do not need that defence, the doctors are doing quite all right as it is. They are not going to suffer if the chiropractors and other people mentioned in this resolution be included, they are not going to suffer. But immediately the government leaps to the defence of these people and excludes the broad mass of the public who could benefit from the inclusion of the healing arts groups that I have mentioned.

Who should be included in a public insurance scheme providing services to people? How can we arrive at some kind of simple solution to determine who are the groups that should be included? I think we can go back to logic and common sense. We should be able to follow this kind of logic, that if an organization is a *bona fide* service organization in the province of Ontario, we have no right to exclude it from the insurance plan.

If there is question about the quality of services offered by any of these organizations, why are they allowed to practice in the province of Ontario? Let us make up our minds. Either they are qualified services and should be supported, or they are not qualified services and they should not be allowed to practice.

I would like to depart for a moment to say we are in a crisis of medical services in Ontario that has not been alleviated. The credibility gap of the Minister of Health is not getting shorter, it is getting longer day by day. We need to do something other than the conventional if we are going to meet the medical crisis in Ontario. It may be that we should include other not as yet formed paramedical services that could move in and help solve the medical problems.

I would like to sum up again by repeating, the resolution is fully supported by the New Democratic caucus, and we support it because we believe that the inclusion of these services in the healing arts could benefit the vast majority of people in Ontario. The exclusion of these services in the healing arts would benefit only one select group—the medical profession. And they do not need that benefit, they are getting along quite all right as it is. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. J. R. Smith (Hamilton Mountain): Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in favour of that portion of the resolution of the hon. member for Huron-Bruce, dealing with the inclusion of chiropractors in the Ontario medical services insurance plan.

As I come from the great industrial city of Hamilton, I can well appreciate the services rendered by this particular profession. There are many citizens, workers in industrial plants who suffer from low back injury.

I think one of the United States' information service departments recently stated that 80 per cent of industrial workers eventually suffer from low back problems of one kind or another before they die and that the problems connected with the spine must really replace the common cold as one of the chief reasons for loss of work.

Mr. Speaker, there are several reasons why I think chiropractors should be covered by OMSIP. The way things presently stand, the fact that the Ontario workmen's compensation board, along with the workmen's compensation boards of British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan, Manitoba and New Brunswick all take advantage of this healing art, speaks for itself.

I think it is also very interesting to note that the Ontario workmen's compensation board pay the flat fee of $3.50 per visit for people—workers—visiting a chiropractor which, I would hasten to say, with all the paper involved is a very, very modest fee indeed.

Nevertheless, the referrals are sent to chiropractors. I think the fact that the chiropractors of this province have been increasing their practice over the years—as each month goes by more and more people are attending and availing themselves of their services—shows that some of the people of this province appreciate their services.

Mr. Speaker, many insurance companies also include chiropractors in their coverage. In the city of Hamilton, Dominion Foundry and Steel Corporation, under their group plan which is covered by the London Life Insurance Company, provides in their coverage chiropractic services. I think likewise; OMSIP should give the same coverage.

I think we in this House this year will be hearing a great deal about the human rights year, 1968. I think this in some ways ties in with human rights.

Under the Ontario human rights code I think there are two aims. One is to make secure, in law, the inalienable rights of every citizen; and two, to create a climate of understanding and mutual respect among our people so that all will be afforded the unhampered opportunity to contribute the maximum to the enrichment of the whole community.

I think therein lies respect for the services of the chiropratic profession and the rights of the thousands of people in this province who are presently availing themselves of their services.

Take the hon. member for Huron-Bruce who stated very clearly the whole situation. He read with interest his resolution of last year as recorded in *Hansard* and he has certainly done a wonderful job of researching the whole subject.

Just one of these states of the union south of us, the state of New Mexico, seems to have solved the insurance problem somewhat by passing a law that states that any company writing a health insurance policy must provide full and unrestricted coverage for all licensed professions in that state. This certainly is a far better step than what we have in Ontario at the present time with respect to chiropractors.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that if we in this province are to license chiropractors and give a charter to their college here in Toronto, we also have an obligation to support their profession in the field of healing arts by giving them coverage under OMSIP.

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the resolution put forth by the hon. member for Huron-Bruce.

And, speaking in support of this resolution, first we should look at the basic concept of any hospital or medical insurance. I believe that the application of technique and facility to relieve human suffering is nothing more than the protection of our country's most valuable asset. I speak, of course, of people themselves.

We speak very frequently of the dignity of man and of human rights, but what, Mr. Speaker, could be more than our paramount duty than to protect these assets of our country? We take a great deal of care to protect our homes against fire and protect our valuables against loss. We protect our families against the sudden loss through death of the bread winner and yet, when we look at all the loopholes in the protection of our OMSIP insurance, I think we must consider that something should be done about this.

Now I grant you that we have come a long way in the past number of years. I personally can remember when the municipalities were paying $1.75 a day or $12.25 a week for indigent hospital care. No one would think with today's costs to be without Ontario hospital insurance when the rate is anywhere from $35 to $40 a day. But let us look at some of these loopholes that are in our OMSIP coverage which should be given a great deal of consideration and priority if we are going to give an individual the proper protection from the devastating costs of long and recurring illness.

Drugs, perhaps, are one of the most commonly and widely used aids in the treatment of disease. I would put the inclusion of drugs as a priority in this resolution. So much so have we come to depend on drugs, that I think most of us would feel somewhat cheated if we went to a doctor and if, after the visit, he did not prescribe something for us.

This is only a minor part of the use of drugs. As the hon. members of the medical profession will know, elderly and chronic

patients run up tremendous bills for drugs in the care and treatment of their illnesses.

Next, I would support the inclusion of optometrists in OMSIP and I would like to point out just a few of the ridiculous things which have existed previously in this regard.

When we read in the OMSIP contract, the OMSIP pamphlets which are put out now, that excluded in that contract are eye examinations by refraction, we must consider that simply means an optometrist has not been allowed to examine eyes and charge for it under OMSIP. But an oculist may do this and conduct an eye examination.

Now, I am given to understand, that documentary proof has been made available to OMSIP that eye examinations by refraction can be done by an oculist simply by referring to the examination as a major eye examination. The bill may be submitted to OMSIP for payment and they are being paid.

While this service of oculist is confined to 160 within the province, and most of these are in large cities, the rural people and the people in smaller communities who have the services of between five and 600 optometrists —and they are usually available in every area —cannot charge their services on their OMSIP account. This, I do not think, is correct and I am glad to see in the Speech from the Throne that measures are being taken to correct this situation.

Now let us look at the services provided by chiropractors. This has been dealt with very thoroughly by the former speaker and included in this group, of course, are your paramedical groups; there are osteopaths, physiotherapists, masseurs, and others of like nature.

These groups all practice under The Drugless Practitioners Act in the province of Ontario and are governed by boards of administration. These governing boards are usually appointed by the Lientenant-Governor in council and enjoy office for either periods of years, or at the pleasure of the Lieutenant-Governor in council. Now they are responsible, in most instances, for the discipline and the licensing and setting up of schools for qualification of those learning the profession.

For some reason, in spite of the fact that these groups operate under Acts of this Legislature and are responsible to the hon. Minister of Health, these groups I am speaking of—chiropractors, osteopaths, masseurs and others—do not appear to enjoy the confidence nor the co-operation of The Department of Health and the medical profession.

There would appear to be little doubt that these groups enjoy the confidence of the public at large. Since they are included in most private group policies in Ontario, as well as provincial schemes in British Columbia and Alberta and, I understand, in other provinces as well, I would recommend the inclusion of chiropractors and the other paramedical groups in OMSIP coverage.

Looking into the activities of some of these other groups, I find that with their dissatisfaction is the delay involved. Of course, all the previous delays can be covered up with the fact that there is a committee on the healing arts at work which, up to now, has had 120 submissions given to it and held hearings.

I understand that its report will not be made available to this Legislature until about next January or February, so it would appear that with a normal waiting period after that, it is still going to be a good long time before these groups are going to have their cases heard in the open.

The last group to be considered is the dental profession. I have no figures as to the amount of money that it would cost to include the dental profession under OMSIP, but I would suppose that it would be a considerable amount. The day has gone, as most members know, when one can say no cavities, no bill.

This ad which we see—"Look mom, no cavities!" Still will mean a bill of some proportion with the automatic X-rays, and scaling and scraping and all the rest that goes along with oral hygiene. But, with this thought in mind I would think that, ideally, dentists could be included in OMSIP, but whether or not this would result in a practical or realistic premium, I do not know.

Mr. Speaker, on general principles I would support this resolution.

Mr. W. G. Pitman (Peterborough): Mr. Speaker, I mean to take only one or two moments today in support of this resolution which the member for Huron-Bruce has put before this House.

My desire to do so is occasioned largely by personal experience. My mother, many years ago, was suffering considerable pain and attempted to secure medical services in many areas. It was only through the intervention of a chiropractor that she received this kind of relief and was enabled to carry out the normal functions of life for many years after.

For that reason, I have always had a very close feeling of affinity with the chiropractic profession, Mr. Speaker, and for that reason, I do hope that this entire House will bring pressure to bear upon the Minister. At the present time, I am happy to see that he is in the House and has noticed that all parties have supported this resolution, and that there has been considerable desire on the part of all members of the House, certainly of those who have spoken so far, to see this important profession recognized.

I think that we have seen this profession —as the member for Huron-Bruce has put so well—we have seen this profession accepted by the Royal commissions; we have seen this profession go out and do its best to be accepted in society. They have improved their educational standards; they now provide, I think, an excellent level of professional training.

I also think they have gone a long way toward providing the kind of training, and the kind of skills which are necessary in this profession. I think it is well they have tried to police their members—and I think that even the profession itself would recognize that there has been, in the past years, a deep concern on the part of some members of the community that there are those in the profession who are not keeping up the standards and the quality which those who are at the top of the profession, desire.

I think they have done a great deal to raise the quality of the profession, but perhaps more than anything else, I think this profession needs the trust of a government and a society which will enable them to make greater strides. I particularly hope that it will enable the profession to begin to deal in the area of research, because I think there is an area of research here which the medical profession itself has too often ignored and which provides a tremendous opportunity to relieve pain and suffering for the people of Ontario.

I think we must begin to look at our society in a different way than we have. We tend to think of our professions as single entities with this high eminence and what we must begin to do is see every profession as a pyramid. All members in this House have considered the whole question of what kind of a society we are moving towards. Are we going to have a few people working and supplying unemployment insurance or a guaranteed annual income to everybody else—is that the kind of society our technological society is creating? I suggest not, Mr. Speaker.

I suggest that the kind of society we must look toward is one in which we see employment in services and medical services as one of the most important services that can be given. Services to the aged—services in education obviously, but we must get rid of the idea that there are those who are somehow called upon by God to give all these services and those who do not have the intelligence to give any services.

We must get a concept of a pyramid in which at the top there are those who have skills and ability and intelligence to give a high degree of service and direction. But that there are places below in this pyramid—I notice the Minister of Education (Mr. Davis) in his seat now—and this surely is the particular role of the college of applied arts and technology, to provide other levels of the pyramid.

I think the chiropractors and the other groups that have been mentioned in this resolution deserve to be a part of that pyramid. I suggest today, Mr. Speaker, that as well we could get rid of many of the silly things which take place in our medical area.

For example, an anaesthetist who goes into a dentist's office—he is called in by a dentist to help restore teeth—he gives an anaesthetic, and if he gives that anaesthetic outside the hospital he is unpaid by the present OMSIP arrangement. If he gives that same anaesthetic in a hospital he is paid through OMSIP. Now these are the kinds of ridiculous situations in which I think we find ourselves. We try to set aside certain people who have certain skills and then leave everybody else out.

So I hope, Mr. Speaker, that something will come of this hour of debate. I hope sincerely the Minister will take upon himself these problems and that he will think long and hard, and that before the end of this session he may very well reverse the answer he gave this morning in the question period when questioned by the member for Huron-Bruce upon whether we might include these professions in our OMSIP arrangements.

Thank you.

Mr. A. Carruthers (Durham): Mr. Speaker, it is very difficult indeed for one to disagree with the resolution presented by the hon. member for Huron-Bruce. The principle is a good one. Nevertheless I feel that there are certain aspects of it that we must consider and consider well. We have this morning been involved in an environment, a philosophical environment, a rosy one, based to a great degree upon theory. We have expressed it so often. Knowing my friend, the member for Huron-Bruce, I know he is

sincere and I know we all cannot help but agree that all these paramedical facilities should be provided. Let us come back to the practical world and the world of responsibility.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): That is the Tory world!

Mr. Carruthers: Not the Tory world but the world of responsibility, and the government has a responsibility in this field and they are moving in the right direction. We have seen in the Speech from the Throne an indication that this government is moving into other fields of health services. You have the optometrists with refraction to be covered; ambulance services and legislation designed to reduce the cost of drugs. I think everyone realizes, and they should realize, Mr. Speaker, that it is very simple to propose things, pass resolutions, and suggest that this should be done and that should be done. We have seen the hon. member for Beaches-Woodbine and a further list of services that should be provided, all of them good, in the neighbourhood. It is really a simple matter to propose these things but it is the responsibility of a government to set priorities and these priorities must be set.

We are all conscious of these additional services and I think the wrong impression has been left here this morning that the government side of this House is opposed to other services being included under OMSIP.

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): Why does it not then?

Mr. Carruthers: My hon. friend from Parkdale—why does it not? Because it is a practical government, it is a government with a sense of responsibility to the taxpayers of this province. The government has been giving careful consideration to all these services and when it is practical these services will be included.

Mr. Lawlor: In the fullness of time.

Mr. Carruthers: It is all right for the Opposition to say this should be done and that should be done but you do not have to assume responsibility and you never will have to assume responsibility.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): We have the majority of the voters now.

Mr. Carruthers: No, they have not, Mr. Speaker. But in the face of the rising costs in all these services I say the Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) of this province is correct when he states that all governments must review their spending programme and be prepared to set priorities. Personally, Mr. Speaker, I feel before these added services are provided there must be some means taken to prevent an overuse of the services and, I might say, an abuse of the services. We have seen what has happened in England; we have seen what has happened in the United States where the cost of medicare is extreme – that is the wealthiest country in the world and is only able to provide a medicare programme for those 65 years of age and over, now they are going to limit that still further. Legislation is being introduced into the New York Legislature to provide that every employer and every employee will be required to take out some type of insurance with a private firm.

We have seen what has happened in Saskatchewan. Those members of the select committee on aging who sat around the table with me and had a very wonderful discussion with the Premier of Saskatchewan, Mr. Thatcher, know what he said about the cost of this type of service. He has now taken steps to limit the abuse and the overuse of these services.

It has to come. Let us be practical people and assume a little responsibility. It is all right to stand up in this House and use big words and with great oratory try to impress the members. Well, let us be practical for once, and you are not a practical group in any shape or form. You live in a dream world.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): We are growing and they are reducing in members and that is factual.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Carruthers: As soon as you fellows get down off cloud nine, maybe we can do something practical in this field.

Mr. Lawlor: We are paying for the services now, we are paying for them now.

Mr. Carruthers: Sure, the people pay for them. But when you translate those costs into taxes with a 12 per cent income tax increase then it does mean something. It does not make it more expensive overall, but does impose a 12 per cent income tax, and the people today have had all the taxes they can take.

Mr. Brown: Who said that?

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): The UAW.

Mr. Carruthers: Mr. Speaker, we could spend a great deal of time on this question.

Interjections by hon. members.

An hon. member: A greater majority supported me.

Mr. Carruthers: But I think that my point has been very well taken, that we must be practical, we must realize, as representatives of the people of our respective ridings, that we have responsibilities to them as taxpayers. Let us assume that responsibility.

The point is simply this. No one, I say, questions the desirability of including these additional services.

An hon. member: The member does.

Mr. Carruthers: I do not. It is essential, it is very essential that we set priorities.

Mr. Lawlor: You never get around to it.

Mr. Lewis: What about the health of the people?

Mr. Brown: It costs too much.

Mr. C. G. Pilkey (Oshawa): Look at the health of the people of the British Isles, in England.

Mr. Carruthers: In England, you have a complete welfare state, and you have several million children living in poverty. And it is a complete welfare state.

Mr. Young: A quarter of our people are below the poverty line.

Mr. Brown: And you have several million children living in poverty?

Mr. Carruthers: Yes, millions of them living in poverty.

Mr. Pilkey: Why do you not do something about it, then?

Mr. Carruthers: It must depend on their ability to pay for those services, and the ability of our government to organize and to administer a programme in a responsible way.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, very briefly, I think that this case has been very ably put by the member for Huron-Bruce, and the member for Scarborough West made some very friendly remarks last year on this case, but I think that it is a very amazing situation where the profession can keep a closed shop in this situation, and that this is, I think, completely and indefensively a discrimination.

Many doctors do refer their patients to chiropractors and, briefly, the point is that when the federal government offered to pay 50 per cent of this so the—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: They never did!

An hon. member: If the Minister refers to his statement in *Hansard* last year, on this debate, he admitted they would.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Definitely, with conditions.

An hon. member: That is it. He had to decide to do it here, that is all.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): That is all, that is the condition.

Mr. Sargent: The onus is on the government.

Mr. B. Newman: We let them decide—

Mr. Sargent: The onus is on you to end entirely this discrimination. One department does acknowledge that these people are worthy. The compensation board spends millions of dollars a year with chiropractors, and they use them to advantage because they are a lot cheaper than the medical profession, and they do a better job in their field, so I think that it is a shame that the government cannot admit that this is really discrimination.

Mr. Speaker: This order is now discharged.

Hon. W. G. Davis (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might have the indulgence of the House and change a few of the rules? I wish to read a statement that I think is quite important. The members' offices have expressed some interest in this matter, and if there is agreement, I would like to do so. It refers to the Ontario College of Art:

The Minister has used his offices in an attempt to bring some kind of solution to the current difficulties in the Ontario College of Art. These discussions have involved members of the council, the administration and the student body. All concerned have kept as their primary thought, the interests of the college. As a result of those discussions, the following matters have been agreed to:

1. That the two instructors who were dismissed, Mr. Aba Bayefsky and Mr. Eric Freifeld, will be reinstated. I would fully expect that they will, upon return, carry out their duties in keeping with the present regulations and in full co-operation with the administration.

2. That the council will recommend that a committee be established composed of representatives from the student body, the faculty, the board of department chairman, and the principal, to consider the whole area of curriculum planning and clarify all points of view.

3. That the Minister will name a person or persons to carry out a study of the present legislation and structure governing the operation and administration of the college in light of the recent problems, with the objective of bringing such matters in line with present-day needs.

With these proposals, which I believe will be satisfactory to all parties concerned, I request that all students and instructors who have been absent from classes return immediately in order that the college can continue its full programme in the spirit of full co-operation among all concerned.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition) Mr. Speaker, if I may just comment on the announcement made by the Minister. I am very glad that he had been able to work out the solution that he has announced. There is one thing that troubles me. I feel that he should be more ready, and prepared, to use the standing committee on education for the sort of investigations that he is announcing will be done by outsiders. Will it be possible for the committee to take part in the development as you describe?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I fully anticipate, because I think it is a detailed and difficult study that is involved, that when the results of the study are available, it will lead to a form of amendment to the present Act which, of course, would involve discussion by the education committee in great length. I think that this would be the right way to deal with it.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): On behalf of our caucus, we too appreciate this announcement but it inspires two observations:

1. The students of the Ontario College of Art are to be congratulated for the most enlightened and effective use of student power that one has ever seen for many months.

2. This is precisely what we, in this caucus, meant by the intervention of the Minister of the Crown, and that he should not be reticent in such matters since they concern such severe matters of academic autonomy and academic freedom.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I do not intend to get into a lengthy philosophical debate. I am sure that the member and I shall have the opportunity later because, during some of the recent events, some of the statements he has made, relevant to academic autonomy, make a very interesting topic for debate here in this Legislature.

Mr. Lewis: By all means.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I say, with the greatest of respect, that I feel that there is a very significant attitude developing on the part of his party that leads me to believe that they would stop at no length to, perhaps, indirectly attack the question of academic autonomy in some of our institutions of higher learning. I think that would make a very excellent discussion in this House.

Mr. Lewis: Were the men reinstated?

Hon. Mr. Davis: They are reinstated.

Mr. Lewis: That is precisely what we meant by academic autonomy.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the members should be prepared for second readings and thereafter we will continue with the Throne debate.

Mr. Rowntree moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 1:05 o'clock, p.m.

No. 13

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

First Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Monday, March 4, 1968

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1968

5

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Monday, March 4, 1968

Question to Mr. Rowntree re the cost of transportation of gasoline, Mr. Martel 385

Questions to Mr. Rowntree re used car dealers and salesmen, Mr. Breithaupt 385

Statement re the parole system, Mr. Grossman 386

Question to Mr. MacNaughton re sales tax on safety equipment, Mr. Good 388

Question to Mr. MacNaughton re sales tax on equipment to control air pollution, Mr. Bullbrook 389

Question to Mr. MacNaughton re payroll deduction facilities, Mr. Pitman 389

Questions to Mr. Grossman re parole, Mr. Brown 390

Question to Mr. Haskett re licence plates, Mr. Young 390

Question to Mr. Gomme re sanding of exit ramps, Mr. Young 390

Questions to Mr. Rowntree re mutual funds, Mr. Deacon 390

Question to Mr. Brunelle re fishing licences, Mr. Ruston 391

Question to Mr. Gomme re Highway 101, Mr. Ferrier 391

Question to Mr. A. F. Lawrence re mining area of northwestern Ontario, Mr. T. P. Reid 392

Question to Mr. Gomme re Highway 3, Mr. Ruston 392

Questions to Mr. A. F. Lawrence re inspection of mines, Mr. Martel 392

Perpetuities Act, 1966, bill to amend, Mr. Wishart, second reading 393

County Judges Act, bill to amend, Mr. Wishart, second reading 393

Extrajudicial Services Act, bill to amend, Mr. Wishart, second reading 393

Wages Act, bill to amend, Mr. Wishart, second reading 399

Religious Institutions Act, bill to amend, Mr. Wishart, second reading 402

Division Courts Act, bill to amend, Mr. Wishart, second reading 402

Prearranged Funeral Services Act, 1961-1962, bill to amend, Mr. Wishart, second reading 402

Minors' Protection Act, bill to amend, Mr. Wishart, second reading 402

Department of Trade and Development, bill to establish, Mr. Randall, on second reading 403

Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Stokes, agreed to 408

On notice of motion No. 19, Mr. Snow, Mr. Deacon, Mr. Young, Mr. White 409

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Rowntree, agreed to 418

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

MONDAY, MARCH 4, 1968

The House met at 2:30 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are always pleased to have visitors to the Legislature, and today we welcome as guests, students from the following schools: in the east gallery St. Andrew's junior high school in Willowdale, and Crowland central public school in Welland; and later at 3:15 p.m., we will be joined in the east gallery by students from the Belle River district high school in Belle River.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Motions.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree moves that Mr. Speaker be authorized to increase the printing of the reports of debates and speeches as authorized on February 15, from 2,000 to 2,500 copies daily.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: Introduction of bills.

Before the orders of the day, I would like to draw to the attention of the members of the House, an unwritten tradition and custom in the hope that it may be followed, perhaps a little more closely in the future, and that is that the courtesy of an uninterrupted speech is always accorded to a member on his maiden speech.

I would hope that we would observe this perhaps a little better than we have done so far this session, and that when the new members rise to take part in the Throne, or subsequent debates, and to make his or her maiden speech, that they will be accorded that courtesy. And I would also hope that we could pursue our debates with enthusiasm and interest but with, perhaps, a little less volubility than was exhibited at some times on Friday in the House, at least not all at the same time.

I am sure that those of you who have been members of the House before, and have had that privilege accorded to you, will be most willing to give that same courtesy to the new members, and I am sure that each new member wishing to have that courtesy extended to him, will be governed accordingly.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree: (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I wish to provide an answer to a question which has been given to me by the hon. member for Sudbury East (Mr. Martel) with respect to the cost of transportation of a gallon of gas from Britt to Sudbury by railway and by truck.

The truck and tank car transportation costs between Britt and Sudbury are quite similar. The transportation cost is 33 cents per barrel, or just under a cent a gallon.

Transportation costs vary with the size of the tank car or the size of the truck. The smaller the vehicle of transportation, of course, the higher the transportation costs. The stated rate corresponds to the most commonly used size of vehicle of transportation.

However, in this area of price, we must ask ourselves whether or not a province can control prices in the market place. Is it proper or desirable for a province in a federal state to move unilaterally into areas having to do with price control, either generally, or in the specific example indicated by the hon. member's question?

I think not, and therefore, I am of the opinion that questions of this nature are not properly within the jurisdiction of this House.

A monetary policy can only be controlled by the central authorities. Anti-inflationary measures, if they are to come, must of necessity be the prerogative of the government in Ottawa, for it is there that such potentially powerful instruments of economic and fiscal regulation exist in the form of the Bank of Canada, central mortgage and housing corporation and other bodies.

Mr. Speaker, I had a question from the hon. member for Kitchener (Mr. Breithaupt) with respect to automobile matters, and here is the answer to the first part of the first question.

Regulations are made by order in council and apply to all dealers and salesmen covered by the Act. A "term and condition" would apply to a specific registrant for a specific

reason, depending on the facts of the situation.

For example, on renewal of registration where there has been previous evidence of a poor business record, the renewal could be dependant upon the condition that performance was improved.

I am unable to fully understand the second part of the first question dealing with a regulation that is "deemed" to be unlawful. Regulations are not deemed to be unlawful, but can only be overturned by a court finding them to be *ultra vires*. In my opinion, no regulation under The Used Car Dealers Act, 1964 would be held to be *ultra vires*.

The answer to the second question is yes, where their operation comes within the provisions of this section of The Consumer Protection Act.

In answer to the third question, where registration has been suspended or cancelled under section 5 of The Used Car Dealers Act: (a) The "registrant" must cease carrying on the business of buying or selling used cars; (b) When the "registrant" files an appeal he may re-commence carrying on the business and selling used cars until the appeal procedure is exhausted and the registrar's decision is upheld. This matter is currently under consideration.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day:

I think it is important, because of the public interest shown in the case of the pending parole of Mrs. Viola MacMillan and the many misconceptions which would appear to exist in relation to the functions of the Ontario parole board, that it is in the public interest to explain in detail the philosophy and procedures of the board and also the classification system of the department.

Insofar as classification procedures regarding Mercer complex are concerned, on admission, an inmate goes first to the reception area for medical examination. She is seen either that day or the next day by the superintendent or deputy superintendent, who normally assign women with sentences of three months or over to the assessment corridor.

The normal procedure is for a woman with a sentence of three months or over to be placed in the assessment corridor where she is interviewed by a social worker, psychologist and, in some cases, a psychiatrist.

Any educational testing may be done at this time.

Every woman admitted to an assessment corridor is considered by the classification committee within three weeks of her admission. The classification committee meets each Wednesday morning. That committee consists of the following: deputy superintendent, two psychometrists, one social worker, one of the three correctional officers assigned to the reception corridor and usually two social work students—that is, master of social work candidates, assigned to the Mercer complex by a university for field work.

The social history and extensive psychological testing are presented at the meeting for consideration.

The department's policy is to provide criteria to assist in this selection process. However, such decisions are complex and we rely on the sound judgment of the treatment team in determining what programme will best meet the individual inmate's need.

Among the criteria are the following:

1. The criminal record: Generally those individuals considered for transfer to Ingleside have few previous convictions.

2. The medical history.

3. The custodial risk: Inmates should be considered to be sufficiently stable to adjust in a setting of minimum security.

4. Sentences: Generally speaking, an applicant would have more than two months left to serve at the time of screening.

5. Academic programme: Generally accessibility to academic upgrading will be a criteria for consideration in the case of a younger inmate.

6. Case conference: The decisions of the classification committee must be ratified at the weekly Wednesday afternoon case conference, which is attended by professional and senior administrative staff.

I am advised, Mr. Speaker, and am satisfied that this was precisely the procedure that was followed in the case of Mrs. Viola MacMillan.

Insofar as the Ontario parole board is concerned, Mr. Speaker, this board has the responsibility of reviewing all sentences, both male and female, where an indeterminate sentence has been awarded.

In sentencing an offender, the court has the responsibility of sentencing him to either a definite period of time, or an indetermined period with a maximum. If the court chooses the indeterminate form of sentence, it is, in fact, deciding that it wishes the board of parole to use its discretion in deciding the

ultimate date of returning the inmate to the community under supervision, having regard for the potential for rehabilitation and the security of the public.

This, in fact, was the original court decision, upheld by the Supreme Court of Ontario in the case of Mrs. Viola MacMillan—

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): It was altered by the court of appeal, was it not?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No, this was the decision which was in fact upheld.

Mr. Sopha: But the Attorney General will tell us otherwise.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, I will explain. Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member will wait until I finish my statement, I will explain to him.

Mr. Sopha: I do not want the Minister to mislead us.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: They altered the wording. I will give him the wording right here. I will not mislead him.

Mr. Sopha: Of course they did. It was altered by the court of appeal.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I will tell him how it was altered. In effect, they made it an indeterminate sentence, although this in fact was, as I say, Mr. Speaker, the original court decision upheld by the Supreme Court of Ontario.

Mr. Sopha: It was not upheld at all.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It was nine months indeterminate.

Mr. Sopha: It was not.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The reasons for the board's decisions are a confidential matter and it is considered most unwise to publish the date of an inmate's release as it might very easily affect his rehabilitation adversely.

However, in view of the publicity which has already attended the interviews of Mrs. Viola MacMillan by the Ontario parole board, it was felt advisable that under these circumstances the board should make public its decision, that is that Mrs. MacMillan should serve the balance of her indefinite sentence on parole in the community, although from a rehabilitative standpoint we cannot change our policy of not giving the exact date.

The board's decisions are based entirely on the policy of the department as indicated in its statement of purpose; that is, on the "rehabilitation of the inmate, coexistent with the safety of the public."

This case was scheduled for hearing at the regular meeting of the parole board and handled in exactly the same way as any other inmate's case when appearing before the board. It should be noted that in the Ontario system, applications for a hearing are unnecessary because all inmates with an indeterminate sentence are automatically interviewed for parole.

The parole board visits each institution on a regular monthly schedule. Each member of the board reviews all the information on file on each individual inmate and then at the board meeting hears and enters into full discussion of the case when the inmate appears personally before the board for consideration at the particular institution. After each member of the board has made personal assessment of the case, the decision is then made as to whether or not an inmate should serve the balance of his or her sentence in the community on parole.

Statistically, parole is granted to the majority of those who appear before the board—keeping in mind of course, Mr. Speaker, that we are referring only to those with indeterminate sentences eligible for parole, because those are the only cases with which the Ontario parole board may deal and it is not unusual for their release to be effected shortly after conviction. For example: a number of cases picked at random show as follows:

Case No. 1—Sentenced to nine months indeterminate, released after two months. Case No. 2—Sentenced to six months, indeterminate, released after 21 days. Case No. 3—Sentenced to 12 months indeterminate, released after one month, 10 days. Case No. 4—Sentenced to seven months indeterminate, released after one month, 15 days. Case No. 5—Sentenced to two years less a day definite plus two years less a day indeterminate, released at the beginning—that is within the first week—of the indeterminate sentence.

Mr. Speaker, while the Minister of Reform Institutions has the responsibility of reporting to the Legislature for the board and must take the responsibility for its actions, his chief concern is to ensure that the board follows the department's policy, as set out in the statement of purpose, and he does not enter into discussion of individual cases.

I am sure, sir, this Legislature, and I am certain those in the correctional field, will

agree that in the matter of the granting of parole, it is much better for the parole board to remain at arm's length—removed from the political arm of government. Thank you.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member would like, and if you will permit me, he mentioned something about the Supreme Court of Ontario changing the sentence. I thought I had it with me, sir; the effect of it really was exactly the same. If I recall, what happened was that the original judge in sentencing Viola MacMillan said that she should serve up to nine months, which means an indeterminate sentence really, plus another sentence I think of up to six months, or a fine of $10,000.

Mr. Sopha: May I ask a question? Is that plus a fine?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No, or a fine.

Mr. Sopha: It is "and a fine of $10,000"; not "or"!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That has nothing to do with my department. Anyway, Mr. Speaker, it has nothing really to do with the case. The fact remains that the Supreme Court of Ontario, in changing it, put in the word "indefinite—shall serve an indefinite sentence of nine months". So there is no point in arguing this anyway because the final result was that Viola MacMillan was put on nine months indeterminate sentence. And the point that I was making here still holds, of course, Mr. Speaker: The Supreme Court of Ontario in its judgment left it to the Ontario parole board as to when would be the best time to release her.

Mr. Sopha: I wonder, could I ask the Minister a question about the parole? Because Mrs. MacMillan is on parole, does that in any way prevent the Attorney General from getting ahead with the other charge against her and her husband?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am sure that the answer to that would be "no" although I am not in the position of giving a legal opinion on this. But I am sure that it has nothing to do with the case, and I am sure they will be able to proceed any time that they like.

Mr. Speaker: I might draw to the attention of the member that that is a proper question for another Minister. The Provincial Treasurer has some answers for questions asked last week.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence (Minister of Mines): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of personal privilege and I think that takes precedence over questions to the Ministry. Up until now, it has not been my practice to complain about misleading press reports as long as my name has been spelled right. But I suppose I am in a different position now, and I draw your attention to the noon edition of today's Toronto *Telegram* in which the heading, in any event, indicates that during the course of a public discussion on Saturday last, I advocated the extension of the physical boundaries of Metropolitan Toronto to the west. I merely wish to rise now in my place, sir, and point out to this House that that report is totally and absolutely incorrect.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): It might make good sense if he had said it.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. J. L. Brown (Beaches-Woodbine): Regarding the Minister of Reform Institutions' statement, is it possible to ask him a question at this time?

Mr. Speaker: I think not, because our statements would be interminable; but I am sure that a question properly directed would be received by the Minister.

Mr. Brown: I had directed one, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Provincial Treasurer): Mr. Speaker, I have answers to three questions submitted to me during my absence from the House, I believe last Friday.

A question from the hon. member for Waterloo North (Mr. Good):

> Does the Minister plan any changes regarding the exemption of sales tax on safety equipment that is ordered taxed to production machines after the initial installation?

And my answer is that the exemption from retail sales tax for what is usually referred to as production machinery, will shortly be under review in connection with recommendations contained in the report of the Ontario committee on taxation.

I am obliged to say to the hon. member that I feel it would be premature for me to comment at this time on the decision that might be reached with respect to any particular class of items.

And in answer to a question from the hon. member for Sarnia (Mr. Bullbrook):

1. Can the Minister advise if the provincial sales tax applies to equipment of a non-productive nature, purchased by manufacturers for the abatement, or attempted control of air-pollution?

2. If the answer to the above is "yes", can the Minister advise if it is the intention of his department to abolish same?

3. If the answer to the latter is "no", will the Minister advise me the reason for such a policy or attitude?

The answer to part one is "yes". The answer to part two is that until such time as I am able to announce the results of a study of the recommendations contained in the report of the Ontario committee on taxation, it would be again premature for me, I believe, to comment on what decision might be reached with respect to any particular class of items. And the answer to part three of the hon. member's question, I believe, is now not applicable.

And to the hon. member for Peterborough (Mr. Pitman), whose question reads:

Would the Minister consider the request of the Ontario credit union league to make available payroll deduction facilities to Ontario civil servants?

As stated in my reply to a similar question on February 15, asked by the hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Jackson), I indicated that one of the principal difficulties standing in the way of implementation of the request to have credit union savings considered as deductions from payroll, was the shifting to bi-weekly payment of wages and salaries which is presently nearing completion.

To implement the request, prior to accomplishing the payroll system shift to which I made reference, would require two sets of payroll administration changes. However, I am now prepared to say that discussions can be undertaken immediately with officials of the Ontario credit union league to consider the possibility of implementing payroll deductions for credit union savings, once the bi-weekly payroll system has been established.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think in fairness, I should point out to you, sir, and to members of the House, that this appears to be a many-sided proposition. I would presume the hon. member for Peterborough is aware of the submission from the credit union of the provincial civil servants of North York to the Ontario credit union league, following resolution No. 1 which was submitted by the Smiths Falls credit union, and which gave rise to the questions that have been placed before this House.

I think it is appropriate that, for the information of the members, I should read this resolution because it is one of several of similar kind.

This letter is dated February 22, addressed, as I have pointed out, to the Ontario Credit Union League Limited, re resolutions to be presented at the annual meeting in March, 1968:

Our credit union irrevocably opposed the contents of resolution No. 1 to be presented at the league's annual meeting, for the following reasons:

1. Government employees have, as their only recognized bargaining agent, the civil service association of Ontario.

And I would remind the hon. member that I made some reference to that in my earlier reply to the member for Timiskaming. This is the credit union again:

2. You could not represent and negotiate for all civil service unions, as you do not represent the Queen's Park credit union, which has more than 5,000 members of the total 20,000 credit union membership of the civil service.

3. The 12 credit unions present on December 9, 1967, in the Ontario credit union building in Toronto, calling for this resolution, can hardly be considered a democratic majority, especially if we take the number of members that they represent.

4. Our credit union, with 1,200 members, has always obtained the fullest co-operation from The Treasury Department for payroll deductions for loans—and I will gladly elaborate on this statement if called upon.

5. It appears the credit unions requesting payroll deductions are not aware of all the facts and privileges available to them from the Treasury.

6. We contend the issue of payroll deductions to be a private matter, between civil servants who are credit union members and their employers, the Ontario government. This can be of no interest or use to any parish or industrial credit unions.

7. If this resolution is ratified at the annual meeting, we will have to reassess the feasibility of our continuing affiliation with the Ontario credit union league.

Mr. Speaker, I have put that on the record for the benefit of yourself and members of

the House, to say that this is not quite as succinct or as clear a position as both the members who have addressed themselves to it, would indicate. Nevertheless, I do suggest that the Ontario credit union league will be invited very shortly for such a discussion.

Mr. Speaker: I have now located the question of the member for Beaches-Woodbine, and it does bear on the previous matter. Perhaps he would direct that question to the Minister?

Mr. Brown: The question to the Minister of Reform Institutions is: Is the intended parole of Mrs. Viola MacMillan, as reported by the CBC and confirmed in private conversation with her chaplain, for medical and psychiatric reasons, and if so, on whose authority was the assessment made? Are there precedents for paroling for medical and psychiatric reasons, and would the Minister cite such cases? Will she be paroled to a psychiatric or medical institution?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: In answer to the hon. member, first as to whether it is intended to parole Mrs. MacMillan as reported by the CBC, I am not aware of such a report on the CBC, as referred to by the hon. member. However, as I stated previously, I do not become involved in individual decisions of the granting of parole, even though I do set general policy.

2. Are there precedents for parole on either psychiatric or medical grounds? Would the Minister cite such cases? The answer is "yes," there are such precedents, and I will take the balance of this question as notice so that I may obtain this information from the parole board, without of course, divulging the identities of the individuals involved.

3. Will she be paroled to a psychiatric or medical institution? I presume that the hon. members means Mrs. MacMillan. The answer is no, she will be paroled in the usual manner, that is the balance of her sentence will be served under the supervision of a rehabilitation officer who will report periodically to the board on her progress and adjustment.

Mr. Brown: Would the Minister allow a supplementary question? Could the Minister assure the House that in all cases before the parole board where there is a psychiatric or medical condition, the prisoners who are poor and without influence would receive the same treatment?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The answer to that is that I am positive that that is the case. As a matter of fact, those who appear to be without means get more attention than do the others.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Transport. Has the Minister taken steps to ascertain why the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions delivered to him two sets of licence plates with number 915 97L on them? And the second part of the question, which is more important, is: Has the Minister taken steps to replace one of these sets of plates without further inconvenience to Mr. Alfred Wood, the recipient?

Hon. I. Haskett (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, The Department of Transport handles some 3.5 million sets of vehicle registration plates per year, and in a full year of issuance there may be up to one hundred sets of incorrectly made plates, that would be an average of perhaps one in 35,000.

In the case mentioned by the member for Yorkview, there was one set of plates numbered 915 97L correctly made and issued, and there was the preceding set, numbered 915 96L the underlying plate of which was the repetition of the previous one that I mentioned, 915 97L. I assume that the correctly numbered plate, 915 96L, was on top, and so legible through the transparent wrapper, and it agreed with the owner's permit. So the error was not apparent to either the issuer or the purchaser at the time of the transaction. A replacement set of plates was delivered to the owner and installed on his car last week.

Mr. Young: The second question is for the Minister of Highways. What authority is responsible for sanding the exit ramps from Highway 401 in Metro Toronto, and specifically, what authority is responsible for sanding the exit ramp leading east from Highway 401 to Yorkdale Road at Dufferin Street?

Hon. G. E. Gomme (Minister of Highways): Mr. Speaker, The Department of Highways is responsible for sanding the exit ramps from Highway 401 to their intersection with the street, which would of course be under the jurisdiction of another road authority. It is our responsibility to sand the exit ramp leading from Highway 401 easterly to its intersection with Yorkdale Road, where our responsibility ends.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs.

Did the Ontario securities commission, in its bulletin for the week ending February 16, 1968, base the ratio of management fees and other expenses of mutual funds on precedents established and adopted in other jurisdictions? And the second question to him: Did the Ontario securities commission consult the Canadian mutual funds committee, or other representatives of mutual funds, before setting the ratios in that schedule?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that the Ontario securities commission issued the schedule in the bulletin for the week ending February 16, 1968, based on its knowledge of this matter in relation to the public interest. I think that I should add that this schedule is not the final word on this matter, in view of the fact that the Canadian committee on mutual funds and investments will, in its report, deal with this very matter, and following the report of that committee, there could be modifications of this schedule.

Mr. Sopha: I have a question for the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. McKeough), who is not here at this time.

Mr. Speaker: The member will remember that the procedure is now that if the Minister is not present, it will not be put until he is in the House.

Mr. Sopha: The trouble is that he will be in the House tomorrow, and I will not.

Mr. Speaker: I presume that if it is important enough for you to be here when he is here, then it will be asked tomorrow. If it is not that important, then I assume that it will have to wait until the next day when both members will be here.

Mr. Sopha: I accept your rebuke. I wonder if, since I will be late tomorrow, you will give me leave to read the question? Just for the record?

Mr. Speaker: No, I will not because that is not the procedure to have it on the record before the Minister has an opportunity of answering it. If the member will wait until the Minister is in the House, I will be most pleased to have him answer.

Mr. Sopha: He may never be here. Is it permissible to get another member to read the question tomorrow if he is here, may I ask most respectfully and courteously?

Mr. Speaker: And I reply most respectfully and courteously that if you wish the question to be resubmitted by another member, it will be quite in order if both he and the Minister are here, yes.

Mr. Sopha: May I ask when these rules were made?

Mr. Speaker: Well, I am not sure if the member has been as assiduous in his—

Mr. Sopha: Now look, never mind all the patronizing lecture, never mind the patronizing lecture—

Mr. Speaker: —attention, as he has been in his remarks to Mr. Speaker. I ruled some time ago—and so far as I know it has been supported by the House, but if necessary, I will have the ruling appealed to the House; and the procedure has been followed by all the other members of the House, I think quite satisfactorily to date—namely, that questions for a Minister would be asked if the Minister were in the House. If he were not in the House, I requested that they be held until the Minister was present. Presumably then the member would also be present.

I think this has worked pretty well. I do not know of any hardship, and if there is something of great importance that requires an answer the first time the Minister is in, I would most certainly be glad to receive it from another member and have it put to him on your behalf, but by the other member.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests.

Has the hon. Minister given any consideration to the matter of having all residents of Ontario over 65 years of age exempt from the proposed new fishing licence charge?

Hon. R. Brunelle (Minister of Lands and Forests): Mr. Speaker, in reply to the hon. member, the answer is that we have considered this matter. Also, may I add that this whole question of angling licences is very much under active review at this time.

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Highways.

What is the reason for the long delay in fixing and repaving Algonquin Boulevard West in Timmins, which is part of Highway 101? Does the Minister foresee that work will be done this year to bring this stretch of road into proper condition?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Speaker, this section of Highway 101 is covered by a connecting link agreement between the town of Timmins and The Department of Highways, wherein the town normally carries out the work and receives a subsidy of 90 per cent of the construction cost.

Originally the town was preparing to build this section of Algonquin Boulevard West and expected to commence construction in 1967. At the request of the town of Timmins, The Department of Highways took over the project early in 1967 and has been preparing the design for the project since that time.

A contract was called by The Department of Highways for the storm sewer portion of the job in November, 1967. Due to exceedingly high prices, this contract was not awarded and has now been incorporated in the road contract. It is felt by including the storm sewer work with the rebuilding of the highway, economies can be effected.

The whole project has now been designed and it is anticipated it will be advertised in early spring of 1968, so that it will be possible to have it completed by the end of this year.

Mr. Brown: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the member for Scarborough West (Mr. Lewis), I would like to put a question.

Mr. Speaker: I have those questions and so far as I can see, neither of them is a question of importance; in fact, I considered placing one of them on the order paper. Therefore I would request that the member refrain from asking the questions. One of them would have to be amended in any event. I would ask that the member refrain from asking them until tomorrow and in the meantime I will speak to the member for Scarborough West about the one question addressed to the Attorney General.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Mines.

Would the Minister inform the House whether he has any current plans for visiting the mining area of northwestern Ontario to discuss the problems they face, and would it be before the proposals of the Smith committee of taxation are dealt with by the government?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, this question was handed to me just as I came into the House, but if the hon. member will permit me to answer it this way, I can say to him, as the new boy in the class I do not have any specific knowledge of when the proposals of the Smith committee on taxation are going to be dealt with by the government. But if I can find an hon. member on the other side of the House with whom to pair, I intend to get up into northwestern Ontario as soon as I possibly can to speak to the people and to listen to their views at a very early opportunity.

Mr. T. P. Reid: I would be glad to accompany you, sir.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Speaker, I have the answer to a question that was asked me by the hon. member for Essex-Kent. The question was:

> Has the hon. Minister of Highways considered the protest of residents in Oldcastle area with regard to Highway 3 and Walker Road area and intersection, and if so what steps are to be taken to alleviate the traffic hazards and protect the property owners involved?

The answer: The redevelopment of Highway 3 in the Oldcastle area is under study by our functional planning division. Discussions will be held with the local municipalities to resolve the problem which has been encountered with the residents of the area.

It is proposed to construct a four lane highway, with a grade separation at the Chesapeake and Ohio Railway crossings and a fully channelized, signalized intersection at Walker Road.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, on two occasions last week, you will remember that the same question was asked of me by the member for Sudbury East (Mr. Martel).

This question, Mr. Speaker, had to do with the question of advance notice of inspection in the mines by the mining engineers of The Department of Mines. My first reaction when the question was asked was that I would be more than disturbed to learn that there were any inspections by departmental officials through the mines in which the management had advance notice. I am now informed that by far the largest majority of inspection trips made by the mining engineers and the other engineers of the safety branch of the department are what they term, surprise visits; no advance knowledge whatsoever is given to management.

However, in the case of a large operation such as INCO in Sudbury, and this question was particularized so far as the operation of that firm is concerned, it must be realized that it is a very large operation. It has been

the view of the staff in Sudbury in the past that they generally indicate to International Nickel Company the day before they plan to make an inspection, in order that provision can be made to have the safety engineer involved accompany them, and so that the members of the supervisory staff at the property who are responsible for safety can be present.

However, if it is thought necessary, surprise visits have been made, of course, and again the majority of visits that are made are surprise visits.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The second order; second reading of bills.

THE PERPETUITIES ACT, 1966

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General) moves second reading of Bill 1, An Act to amend The Perpetuities Act, 1966.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE COUNTY JUDGES ACT

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves second reading of Bill 2, An Act to amend The County Judges Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE EXTRAJUDICIAL SERVICES ACT

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves the second reading of Bill 3, An Act to amend The Extrajudicial Services Act.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words on The Act to amend The Extrajudicial Services Act.

I say it with some trepidation. On occasion one is obliged to go before the Supreme Court judges. Nevertheless, I think that our task in this Legislature is to bring to the attention of the other members, in no spirit of animadversion or otherwise what is happening in passing this particular bill, or this amendment to the Act.

At the present time, the Chief Justices of the Supreme Court of Ontario are paid $30,000. The appeal judges are paid $26,000 and the high court judges, $26,000.

Those payments are made from the federal Treasury. There are other payments made over and above those salaries, and this is part of it, out of the largesse of the province. Please do not misunderstand me. I am taking no deep exception to the matter; I am simply pointing out how it is done.

In this case, the increase is from $4,000 to $6,000. Under section 20, subsection 1 of The Judges Act, as amended, the federal government in the cases where the provinces do not supply this added increment give the judges of the high courts, Supreme Courts, $2,000 a year extra. If they are given this by any of the provinces then that sum of money is not forthcoming to the judges of the high court in the various provinces.

I do not know, Mr. Speaker, precisely how many provinces do as Ontario does, but there are two or three. None of them give this extra increment on the scale that we do. In any event, our judges across the country, as compared with the best paid judges elsewhere, are $2,000 ahead. In other words, the judges of the appeal and the high court are earning at this time, because of this extra $6,000, a salary of $32,000 a year.

I wonder if it is really necessary that they should earn on such a scale the monies that are paid to them as umpires, referees, arbitrators for the province. They get paid this money, Mr. Speaker, whether or not they do any work. I can see no objection to paying for work which is peculiarly within the province of the province, but where nothing is done at all which is of immediate and direct benefit to the people of this province, I would think that we should reconsider allowing these extra sums of money.

I suggest to you $26,000 a year is a pretty good salary for judges to retain.

I am not suggesting that the skill and possibilities of a judge of the high court, the immense erudition or lack of erudition, on occasion that hangs about their mantles, could be duplicated by any members or a great number of members in this House. Nevertheless, judge what we are paid in this House for the services that we render. Many of us are very hard working, working the full 26 hours of every day in order to be of some service to this House. We are paid less than 50 per cent of what the judges of the high court receive. They have as much time off, as much vacation period as any of us do, and perhaps more.

I think that this sort of thing, where we with an open hand give an extra $2,000 without turning a hair, against the rest of the population who have to struggle for every dime they make, is a matter that ought to be

taken under new consideration. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. G. Ben (Humber): Mr. Speaker, I am not surprised at all by the attitude adopted by the hon. member for Lakeshore, because the difference between the Liberals and NDP is that we try to elevate the lowest to the highest and they try to tear the highest down to the level of the lowest.

Mr. Speaker, we always decry decisions made by judges, and we always try to keep the judiciary separated from any stones that may be cast upon it through accusations of partisanship. We want these people to be like Caesar's wife, beyond reproach, but it appears we do not want to follow the English system where we pay the judges a salary sufficient in all regards to enable them to live like Caesar's wife.

With the cost of living continuously increasing, it is becoming more difficult every day to get judges who should have the same character as Caesar's wife, to be beyond reproach.

We want the best but we want to pay them a tinker's salary. I cannot see how you can compromise the two. The hon. member for Lakeshore states that why should they receive $26,000 or $32,000 when the members in this House work 26 hours a day, receive only less than half that, $11,000 or $12,000, depending on where they come from.

If the members of this House work that hard, I would suggest to the hon. member that the Liberal spirit would be to pay them a decent wage, that is, the members of the House should increase their salaries rather than take away from the judiciary. But again I say, the Liberal attitude is that you try to elevate the lowest to the highest and not take them down.

Mr. Speaker, $30,000 may seem like a large sum, and it is a large sum, and $32,000 is higher, but in England, they were paying their judges, the chief justice, £10,000 decades and generations ago.

One hundred years ago, they were paying £10,000 out of the principle that the judiciary must be so independent that nothing would induce them to exercise anything except their judicial function.

I would prefer to see a judiciary that is so independent that even the Conservatives could not sway it, if even I have to pay $50,000 or more to accomplish that.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): It is perfectly proper, in my view, that upon the second reading of a bill such as this, that a comment ought to be made in respect of it and especially in regard to such an important function within our society as the judiciary involves.

I agree wholeheartedly with my friend from Humber in his comments about our endeavours in this democratic society to elevate the judiciary to a position that is beyond reproach and beyond ridicule, and is indeed a position which the ablest members of our legal society should strive to attain.

However, Mr. Speaker, I have always been bothered by the departure from the original intent of the fathers of Confederation in the selection of the words that they used in The British North America Act of 1867, and I think it clear from the language employed in section 96 of that statute, which gives the Governor-General in council the power to appoint all judges of superior and county courts, that the intention of the federal government was that they should be paid by the central government.

I am further fortified in that belief when I recall the memory of the words used during the Confederation debates by some of the leading spokesmen, to wit Alexander Tilloch Galt, George Brown and Sir John A. Macdonald himself.

Implicit in their words was that the provinces would not have the revenue-producing powers to afford the heavy payments that would result from the Confederation of provinces, and major financial responsibilities would be borne by the federal government.

From Confederation on, until we got well into this century, the federal government not only appointed the judges but they also paid them. And, I think it safe to say, that it was Ontario, the province of Ontario, the banner province in the Dominion where everything happens first in the universe, not only including this planet, but Mars and Venus and any other communications from outer space, that led the way in making these gratuitous payments to judges of the high court.

We have seen, during the past few years, that no one is more ready than the Attorney General of this province himself, to tender a bill. I was hastily searching in the statutes, because my memory tells me that it cannot be more than two years ago that the Attorney General was here with a bill which increased the payments to our superior court judges, and I think, in respect, I am almost sure, that at that time, it was in respect of the duties in arbitrations that last year—

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Last year, the county and district judges—

Mr. Sopha: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: —across the province of Ontario—

Mr. Sopha: Yes, and I am one who is prepared to say with assurance that the standard of salaries of judges, Mr. Speaker, are at such a level, that they have no legitimate reason for complaint, that they are at a very high and comfortable figure. Now, I am wondering, because the bill is vacant of any information—and the Attorney General has not taken the time of the House or indulged it in informing the House the reason for this increment that is proposed in this bill—I am just wondering what extrajudicial services the Attorney General, or the government, has in mind.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): He is really agreeing with the member for Lakeshore then.

Mr. Sopha: We are not too far apart.

Mr. MacDonald: I agree.

Mr. Sopha: We are not too far apart at all. And, I suppose, if I may be permitted to guess, that such things as Royal commissions are part and parcel because, as I understand the procedure now, judges no longer tender a bill for their services on Royal commissions.

That is a fairly recent inhibition because it was not too long ago that some judges serving on Royal commissions were extremely facile with the pencil, and were able to put in a quite respectable bill.

This whole thing, of course, must be seen in the light of the injunctions laid down by a courageous Minister of Justice at Ottawa, none other than Hon. Pierre-Elliott Trudeau, the name that appears to be on the lips of a great many Canadians today. It is not too long ago that Mr. Trudeau had the courage to inform Her Majesty's judges, that, in future, they ought not to charge for services rendered off the judicial bench. And, indeed, he went on to say that he hoped the judges would restrict themselves to the performance of their judicial duties.

It may be that the government of Ontario, and the Attorney General, have in mind that judges will be asked to do a good deal more of an extrajudicial nature than they have been accustomed to do. And, if so, we should be the first to hear of it.

I want to add but one further comment, that it has been said in the past that many duties are imposed upon judges by reason of provincial statutes. I have never been quite able to accept that explanation, because surely at the time of Confederation, it was expected that provincial Legislatures would pass legislation—though I hastily add that the fathers of Confederation never dreamed the provincial bodies would spew forth the legislation in the quantities that they now do, something like 180 bills a session in this Legislature alone.

But, bearing in mind that these were sovereign Parliaments, it might have been expected in a retrospective way, on looking back, that it was intended that they would have burdens cast upon them by reason of the activities of provincial Legislature.

So, I do not think that plea in the collective bargaining process by the judges is either logical or acceptable—that they are able to say to the Treasury board, or whoever they say it to when they ask for an increase, that you people are imposing ever more burdens upon us. They may be taken to know the extent of the burdens when they accept the appointment to the bench.

My final plea in summation is this—that one can never, in the modern age, your honour, expect to return to the good old days because the good old days are always fled. But I just wish that in revamping our constitution, which the first citizen says will take ten years—I think it is likely to take longer—that we might return to the original concept of saying to the government of Ottawa, "You appoint the judges, you pay them".

I think that is a fair proposition. Let it be said that I know of no instance, no instance in the history of this country that has ever come to my notice, that the federal government has ever said to any province, and not the least Ontario, that we are unwilling to pay the judges, or we refuse to give them a living salary, or refuse to give them emoluments that will keep them in what my friend from Humber so ably describes as the standard to which judges might expect.

So, if there has been some refusal, I think the Attorney General is bound to tell us of that. And, in its absence, certainly the Treasury board of the province, or the Prime Minister himself or the Provincial Treasurer can say to the government of Ottawa, "We expect that when pleas are made to the province for an increase in the emoluments, we might very deftly turn them in your direction" and have them dealt with up there.

But it now becomes a very comfortable sum, $6,000 each for 23 judges; more than that, he must include the court of appeal, the Attorney General might tell us—yes, he nods his head that it includes the court of appeal—so that would be 23 plus nine, 32, that is $192,000 a year that the province is expected to shell out by way of increment to the judges.

And, of course, one is mindful that this is not all the expense borne by the province. There is a good deal more expense borne in relation to judges under the heading, section 92, The Administration of Justice in the Province, and we pick up the whole tab for that item, the judges getting about the province in their provision of reporters, and all the other incidents and ancillary things involved in judges. But—

Hon. Mr. Wishart: That is our responsibility.

Mr. Sopha: That is our responsibility, our responsibility, and this is $192,000 on top of our responsibility, that is the comment I make. I stand on my feet in this Legislature in no way seeking to impart criticism of our judicial bench, save to call attention to the fact that, in principle, this is a bit of an unfair imposition on Ontario in the light of the constitution about which the Attorney General himself is so terribly sensitive.

It might fairly be said that of all the assembled people at the "taffy pull" at Ottawa just held on the television cameras, no one demonstrated—not even Mr. Johnson himself—demonstrated more sensitivity to the division of powers than the Attorney General for Ontario.

Mr. J. H. White (London South): Quite rightly so!

Mr. Sopha: And more about that later, if I can get any kind of audience to listen to me at all. In a few days' time, I shall have some more comments to make about that score.

An hon. member: We will all be here.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Speaker, paying due attention to the remarks of the member for Humber, and my colleagues from Sudbury and Lakeshore—

Mr. MacDonald: Which one do you agree with?

Mr. Singer: Just be patient, I will tell you in a minute. It would seem to me, Mr. Speaker, that when a bill such as this comes before us, perhaps there should have been a better introduction and explanation of the reason for this type of increment.

I personally would have preferred seeing this bill come forward with a bill which, I understand, is in the process of preparation—at least, there was reference to it in the Speech from the Throne—about the reorganization of the provincial courts.

I would suspect that in that bill, when we see it, there is going to be some provision for salaries for people who used to be called "magistrates" who may henceforth be called something else, Mr. Speaker; people who used to be called juvenile court judges and so on.

And, as I put forward these views in the House over a number of years, I would like to have seen us deal with the whole question of administration of justice, insofar as we can control it, as a lump sum, as a bundle, as a package. Unfortunately, the Attorney General has not seen fit to do this.

It is my understanding that the information put forward by the member for Lakeshore is, perhaps, not quite the way that the situation is. It is my understanding again, perhaps the Attorney General can correct me if my impression is wrong, that this bill would bring the salaries of Ontario Supreme Court judges into line with those judges in the other jurisdictions in Canada, and not give them an extra amount. Am I correct in that?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, in answer to the question, perhaps I should say that the judges in Ontario would be paid more than judges in other provinces.

Mr. Singer: All right, I was wrong in that and the member for Lakeshore was right, and nevertheless my point is this, it would seem to me that if this kind of precedent has been set in Ontario in the past, and since there has been a federal adjustment of salary, and since there is such a large traffic of business before our courts, it is not unreasonable that our judges' salaries in Ontario keep pace with the ratio that was heretofore established.

Judges' salaries should be large and sufficiently in advance of the adjustment of other salaries that there can never be called into question in this Legislature, or in the House of Commons, the question of whether judges are being overpaid. I would think that, in many instances, they are being underpaid. For myself, I will support this bill. I think

that the bill deserves the support of this House, and my regret is that the Attorney General has not seen fit to bring all the bills relating to this and kindred subjects, to us in a package, and in that way we could deal with them together, and get a better idea of the ratios and the balance that has to be maintained. In that way, too, there would be a way or ample form for criticizing certain procedures such as length of sittings, times of sittings and that sort of thing.

The availability of judges on vacations, on which I have had other occasions to address myself, those things could have all been dealt with as a package. It is very difficult within the four walls of this debate of Bill 3 to deal with those subjects. Nevertheless, as I said, I will lend my support to the bill.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Speaker, we are in a quandary. We are likely to oppose the bill unless the Attorney General can convince us otherwise. I would like to make this distinction. The member for Downsview appeared to indicate that because the federal government was not prepared to increase the salaries of the judges in Ontario, that we in some way supplement their salary because of the traditional burden of work in the courts. That, in my mind, is irrelevant.

If the Attorney General is proposing this bill as simply indicating that he wishes to have increases in that component of the judges' salary, referable to work under Ontario statutes, then we will oppose the bill. If, however, the Attorney General can, when he chooses to speak on the bill, give us clearly the burden of work imposed on the judges by the Acts of this Legislature, and when he anticipates an increase in the burden of that work, either by adding additional work to them or by increasing the workload under the present statutes, then we will maintain the open mind on it until that time comes. But unless the Attorney General can so satisfy us, we intend to oppose the bill.

I would ask specifically—the Attorney General may choose to do it now or in committee—that we have a full and exhaustive statement of what the duties of the judges are for which they receive the remuneration.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, I am much indebted to the members who have spoken and contributed to the debate on this bill on second reading when we consider the principle which, simply stated, is "an increase in the salaries of the Supreme Court judges." I should point out that The Extrajudicial Services Act has stood upon our statute book for some time, the purpose of that legislation being to supplement to some degree the salaries which are paid to judges of our Supreme Court, including the court of appeal, and the district and county court judges.

Last year the government at Ottawa brought in a bill, somewhat overdue, I think, with respect to judges' salaries, under the terms of which, the salaries of the Supreme Court judges were increased. I used that term widely, because it was the judges of the high courts in all the provinces of Canada and all the superior courts, which would include our district and county court judges. That Legislature provided for an increase in salary for each level of judges to the amount of $5,000 over and above the salaries as they were before the legislation was brought in at Ottawa.

Curiously enough, and very curiously I think, the federal government in its wisdom said that in any province which paid a judge any remuneration for services rendered—I do not think that they used the term extrajudicial—a judge in that province shall be denied or shall not receive $2,000 of the increase. I think that this is a rather niggardly clause. It affected our county and district courts, the judges of those courts, and the judges of the Supreme Court of Ontario.

Few other provinces pay their judges for extrajudicial services. And the result, for example, is that a judge in Prince Edward Island, and I do not use this example in a disparaging way, who is not nearly so busy with judicial services as a judge of the Supreme Court of Ontario, or as one of our county or district court judges, was getting paid by the federal government—and I agree with my friend from Sudbury it should pay the salaries—$2,000 less than a judge in Ontario.

We protested to the Minister of Justice and, though I cannot be certain, I think that my correspondence was carried on with the hon. Mr. Cardin; I believe that he carried that legislation, perhaps not to completion. But we set forth the view that we did not feel that this was a wise provision but our voice did not carry much weight. I think that the legislation went through in that form.

We were able last year, by legislation presented to this House and carried, to provide that the judges of the county and district courts would not be losers. Because by virtue of the services which they render in our circuit courts they qualified for the

legislation and were able to pick up the $2,000 which would have been denied to them by the federal government This did not cost the province any more money than we were paying to the county and district court judges for extrajudicial services, which was $3,500. They were able to qualify and receive the $2,000 which it was designed that they should not receive unless they were rendering a service of long duration in the province, and we could establish that they were.

This was not so with respect to the Supreme Court judges. Under The Extrajudicial Services Act, we have been paying the Supreme Court judges for a period of years a sum which as of today is $4,000. As the bill indicates, it is our proposal by this legislation to increase that amount to $6,000; in other words, to make it so that the judge in the Supreme Court of Ontario shall not lose the $2,000 which a clause in the federal legislation would deny him receiving.

Now I do not propose to suggest that all judges will work the same level of extra activity, although in the Supreme Court this is nearly the case. They are assigned to their duties and they do serve; and some of them I think perhaps longer and in matters of greater import than others. I think one cannot expect to have the judges rated on a basis of how many days they serve or how long they serve, because as I mentioned in my previous remarks, judges all across Canada under the federal legislation are paid the same salary, and I think the judges in Ontario, where we have extremely heavy court sittings and a great deal of litigation, are busier than judges in any other province in Canada. That I think, is apparent to everyone.

I think this increase does not carry the salary of the judges beyond what is reasonable and proper. I appreciate the words of the hon. members who have pointed out that the salaries of judges in Britain even in past times far exceeded anything we pay today, in a relative way.

We get many services from our district and county court judges—and they are not in question in this bill—in the way of conciliation and arbitration, and one thing which the federal legislation did, was to say that no judge of either court—high court, Supreme Court or the district or county court—may receive any special remuneration for that type of service which used to be paid, as was pointed out by the hon. member for Sudbury. So that if this extrajudicial service payment was justified before the legislation at Ottawa last year, when the judges could be paid in addition for their special services, it is more than ever justified today when they cannot be paid anything extra and we have a great deal of service as I said, particularly, I think, in the county courts in conciliation and arbitration.

They are very generous, very willing to work, very capable, and render a great service to labour organizations, to management and to labour in conciliation and arbitration and in that field particularly. Our Supreme Court judges do serve when asked and serve freely and, I think, ably and capably on commissions and enquiries. I do not feel that I need to say further in support of this bill than to say that I believe a salary of $32,000 is not an extravagant amount in fixing the salary of a high court judge. Perhaps I should make this clearer: A judge would have received from the federal government, $28,000 except for that saving clause, if I may so describe it, and we would have been paying $4,000 without this legislation, which would have made their salaries $32,000. By the federal clause reducing that payment to $26,000, we say we will pick up the slack when we add the $2,000 to the $4,000 we were paying.

Mr. Speaker, that is all I propose to offer on this reading of this bill. The suggestion was made by one of the speakers that this bill should go to legal bills committee and I have no objection to its going there for discussion.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): Mr. Speaker, I intend to be very brief with what I have to say regarding the principle of this bill and I have to differ with my colleague, the hon. member for Riverdale.

I will not listen to any ands, ifs or buts in regard to the principle of this bill, which is a simple one, in voting for an increase in income for one group that I feel has a decent income at the present time. I will not exercise my right in this House with any vote I have, to vote for anyone or any group receiving an income that I think is a decent income until something is done about the miserable minimum wage in this province. I know that people in Hamilton are working for $1 an hour in the laundry and dry-cleaning industry, and working for the investigating and detective agencies for something like $1.35 an hour and paying fees out of that pay for uniform and bonds and licences.

I cannot bring myself to support anything like this and I will vote alone if I cannot encourage my colleagues to vote with me against the bill.

Mr. Speaker: As many as are in favour of this motion will please say "aye".

As many as are opposed will please say "nay".

In my opinion the "ayes" have it.

Call in the members.

The House divided on the motion for second reading, which was agreed on the following division:

Ayes	Nays
Allan	Brown
Auld	Burr
Bales	Davison
Ben	Deans
Boyer	Ferrier
Braithwaite	Gisborn
Brunelle	Jackson
Bukator	Lawlor
Carruthers	MacDonald
Carton	Makarchuk
Connell	Martel
Deacon	Peacock
Demers	Pilkey
De Monte	Pitman
Dunlop	Renwick (Riverdale)
Dymond	Renwick (Mrs.) (Scarborough Centre)
Edighoffer	Shulman
Evans	Stokes
Farquhar	Young—19.
Gaunt	
Gilbertson	
Gomme	
Good	
Grossman	
Guindon	
Haggerty	
Haskett	
Hodgson (Victoria-Haliburton)	
Hodgson (York North)	
Innes	
Jessiman	
Johnston (Parry Sound)	
Johnston (St. Catharines)	
Johnston (Carleton)	
Kennedy	
Kerr	
Knight	
Lawrence (Carleton East)	
MacNaughton	
Morningstar	
McNeil	
Newman (Ontario South)	
Nixon	
Olde	
Potter	
Randall	
Reid (Rainy River)	
Reilly	
Reuter	
Robarts	
Rollins	
Rowe	
Rowntree	
Ruston	
Simonett	
Singer	
Smith (Simcoe East)	
Smith (Hamilton Mountain)	
Smith (Nipissing)	
Snow	
Sopha	
Spence	
Villeneuve	
Welch	
Wells	
White	
Winkler	
Wishart	
Worton	
Yakabuski	
Yaremko—71	

Clerk of the House: Mr. Speaker, the "ayes" are 71, the "nays" 19.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE WAGES ACT

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves second reading of Bill 4, An Act to amend The Wages Act.

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Speaker, it is in no spirit of exultation whatsoever that I rise to say a word on the principle of this bill, but there is an old rule around here, sir, that if you do not take the opportunity to note matters of historic significance for yourself, then no one will do it for you.

I merely want to express my view in accord with the principle that the passage of this bill by this House will mean the removal of the last vestige of the bond servant in our society.

For I was ever of the view that if a man was tied to his creditors by his wages, or an apportionment of a part of them, then he was indeed in the strictest feudal sense a bond servant of the creditor. And of course the necessary corollary of that view was that the first claim upon wages of any individual was the support of his wife and children.

Now under the law as it obtains until the passage of this Act—and indeed it is unfortunate that the bill cannot be made retrospective in its scope—on many occasions within our society, the workman would be left with a niggardly amount to take home in order to provide the necessary goods and services for the support of his family. And I could recite many examples.

It comes to mind that of the individual who reached the very Everest. He must have been the North American champion in wage assignments, who had no fewer than five of them, to various creditors. He worked industriously, and on one occasion—as Oscar Wilde perhaps would have it, it was near Christmas time—he took home the niggardly sum of $5.23—that amount is etched in my memory—for the support of himself, his wife and five children. That was just about something like 70 cents each for a pay period of a fortnight.

Furthermore, sir, in the bill that I tendered in this House last year, I excepted credit unions. I want to say about that, that one of the major reasons that motivated me to except the credit unions from the scope of the Act as this bill does, was that I had been informed reliably by senior executives of that very worthwhile movement in our society, that though the wage assignment is taken from the individual who borrows from the credit union, in the first place it very frequently is the only form of security that is taken—none other than his pledge to pay back and the wage assignment guarantees the repayment of the loan—and in the second place the credit unions have been in the habit of so screening the applicants for loans from among their membership, that very seldom have they ever had to resort to an execution upon the wage assignment.

I hope that will continue, but if that be the case in the future, then of course the wage assignment, so far as it is preserved by this legislation, will be an insignificant incident of the civilized socety.

To review the history a little, my friend from Downsview, my friend from Riverdale and myself tried to get this accepted as part of the consumer credit bill. The Attorney General was reluctant to incorporate it, in the long and tedious deliberations of that committee when the legal bills committee reviewed that bill. Subsequently I tried to get it accepted by this House, but all that is part of life and is a reflection on the process that goes on within this democratic chamber.

My last words must be, sir, that I commend the Attorney General, and I really do sincerely and most respectfully. I commend him through you for his initiative in the earlier part of the session, with one of the very first bills that he introduced in this House, that he should say about this assignment of wages that it will atrophy and become all but obsolete within our society. There is great satisfaction in seeing that and seeing him do something for the people. You will notice I do not say for the little people. There are other members around here, to our left, who refer to people as the "little" people. No such people exist in this country.

There are no "little" people and there is no "small" man. All citizens are equal and entitled to the same mark of dignity.

But in the Attorney General's doing something for the people, I want him to know through you that that gives me more pleasure than it would if he accepted my recommendations for appointment as Queen's counsel, which he does not. I used to have more success with Kelso Roberts, and with yourself, than I have with him. He consistently refuses to appoint my nominees. But that is all right, so long as he continues to demonstrate concern for the people.

Mr. C. G. Pilkey (Oshawa): Mr. Speaker, first of all I would like to commend the Minister for bringing forward this type of bill. I think that it was long overdue, as he mentioned in regard to federal legislation, as far as the judges are concerned, and I think that this type of legislation was long overdue as well.

I might remind the last speaker that when we talk about little people, we do not talk about them in terms of stature or their size; we are talking about them in terms of their dollar income. If you take the judges who are getting $30,000 or $32,000 and the worker who is getting $5,000, I suppose there are some little people, if we describe them in those terms.

I want to say that there are a great many people who are susceptible to this high-pressure advertising, and this kind of wage assignment that they are subject to, hurts those people who least can afford it. I think that this type of legislation will eliminate the unscrupulous high-pressure boys who peddle

their wares in the market place, these people who are gouging the general public.

I want to say that this wage assignment, for some employees in industry who are caught up in this kind of climate, has meant their jobs, or at least threatened their jobs. I know as a leader in my union that I had many, many people during the course of the years who were subject to these wage assignments, and were subject to dismissal and we were able to do something about this.

I am very happy to say that I support again the Minister's contention that within this bill they have eliminated the credit unions in this regard, and the credit unions have done an excellent job. They have done an excellent job in my area on the basis of consolidating these debts and being able to work out something that the employee could live with and still maintain a measure of his standard of living; he has been able to maintain that and still pay off his debts. So I think that the credit unions are doing an excellent job in that area.

I want to remind the Minister that I think that some time in the future, he ought to consider the question of garnishees as well, because these are a burden on the back of the so-called little people that the hon. member mentioned here just a little while ago, and these garnishees are not serving the cause that they are designed to.

What they are doing, is that they are again putting the employee in a very untenable position in terms of his job. And I think that there ought to be some legislation in that regard giving those people the type of protection that is necessary. I want to say again that this is an excellent type of bill and it receives my wholehearted support and, I hope, the wholehearted support of the whole House.

I hope that we are able to move forward in other directions to give those people the kind of relief that is necessary as far as these various bills that can hurt him, and the question of wage assignments, garnishees and other things that might prevail in the future.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, sitting in Opposition, as my colleague from Sudbury and I have done since 1959, it is often a little difficult to realize that we are making any progress. Every now and then, though, something does happen that indicates to us that the many words that we have spoken since 1959 occasionally do not fall on deaf ears.

One of the first projects that my colleague from Sudbury undertook, and I think he has done it pretty well every year since 1959, was the introduction of a bill to amend The Wages Act to this intent and to this purpose. And every now and then, as I say, the Attorney General of the day has addressed himself to some of the recommendations that we have made.

I merely wanted to add as a postscript, Mr. Speaker, and my colleague from Sudbury is perhaps too modest to say this, but it is of some encouragement to us—

An hon. member: The member does not know us.

Mr. Singer: Well, he would not say it for himself so I thought I should say it for him, and I know him reasonably well—it is of some satisfaction to us that progress is being made.

There is no point in gilding the lily and saying this is a good bill. We have put it forward year after year after year, and I would again commend to the Attorney General the many other suggestions that we have put forward year after year after year, and suggest that he take on some of the bigger ones, not just some of the more obvious ones.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, perhaps I might just be permitted a word; I appreciate very much the commendatory remarks of the members who have spoken, and the suggestion from the hon. member for Oshawa with respect to considering the matter of garnishees. I think it is a worthwhile suggestion.

There is, of course, in The Wages Act, an exemption, I believe of 70 per cent, of wages from attachment, but perhaps there is something further to be studied here. I would just say this, that I do not, in presenting this legislation, think of class at all. I really regret to hear a suggestion made on any basis, wage or otherwise, that there is any class distinction. I think this is good legislation; I am not offering any apology for the length of time it has taken in my term as Attorney General to bring this forward.

We have had some legislation which I think was for the people, for instance, legal aid, consumer protection, personal property security, and perhaps even one might say The Securities Act. This was a great deal of major legislation; the platter has been pretty full for the past three years, and we get to this but not just as a matter of delay.

We did a very thorough study in the matter of wages, and the incidence of the assignment, and we found that it was abused, that

it was a nuisance, that it did create confusion, that it did create hardship, and that, as the hon. member for Sudbury has said, with respect to the credit union which is excepted here from the effect of this Act, the wage assignment while taken—and it is almost invariably taken—is seldom, if ever, used. There seems to be no necessity for that.

I would say this, in speaking to this legislation, that if we were to find, in our studies, that it was being used to any great extent by credit unions and creating hardship, I would be very quick, I think, to recommend that we would take further action to protect the wage earner from the use of wage assignment if its effect was the same as has happened with other organizations in using the wage assignments.

I just mention that in passing. I might say that, in our studies, we had spot-checks made of a number of credit unions to see their usage of the wage assignment; we had representations made from financial institutions, from labour unions, from organizations of many kinds, and from merchants' associations.

If we have been slightly dilatory, as the hon. member for Sudbury might suggest, it was only because we were not idle, we were studying the matter so that when we came forward with this legislation we could justify it. I think it is something worthwhile, and I am glad to see that the House accepts it and appreciates it.

Mr. Pilkey: I make one other comment, and while he is considering the question—

Mr. Speaker: Might I point out to the member that in a debate such as this a member speaks but once.

Mr. Pilkey: Well, I just wanted to make a suggestion. I do not want to make a speech.

Mr. Speaker: The member has spoken.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE RELIGIOUS INSTITUTIONS ACT

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves second reading of Bill 5, An Act to amend The Religious Institutions Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE DIVISION COURTS ACT

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves second reading of Bill 6, An Act to amend The Division Courts Act.

Mr. Sopha: I suppose this bill will go to the legal bills committee.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I would have no objection, Mr. Speaker. It is a very minor housekeeping change; administrative is perhaps a better word.

Mr. Sopha: Well, without addressing myself to that principle, may I make this comment about it: it deals, I believe I am correct, with the appointment of a barrister to sit in for a division court judge.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: The hon. member will permit me to say that it does not deal with the appointment of a barrister; that is already provided for—but the Act provides for giving notice of that appointment to the Provincial Secretary. Now, we are simply changing that so it comes more properly, we think, to the inspector of legal offices.

Mr. Sopha: Well, with a bit of flexibility, I merely say this, that at the legal bills committee, and this is by way of notice to the Attorney General that we might have some enlightenment in respect of the necessity throughout the province in making these appointments—he nods in agreement, and he is always a very obliging individual.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I am most agreeable that all my bills go to the committee if there is any question about them.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE PREARRANGED FUNERAL SERVICES ACT, 1961-1962

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves second reading of Bill 8, An Act to amend The Prearranged Funeral Services Act, 1961-1962.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE MINORS' PROTECTION ACT

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves second reading of Bill 9, An Act to amend The Minors' Protection Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

DEPARTMENT OF TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT

Hon. S. J. Randall (Minister of Economics and Development) moves second reading of Bill 11, An Act to establish The Department of Trade and Development.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): Mr. Speaker, may I speak briefly on this bill. Bill 11 is a very important bill inasmuch as it sets out the duties of the renamed department, and I would like to speak on a serious problem which involves the general management of the department. On February 21, the Minister was kind enough to give us some of the results of a survey that was taken of his department, and I quote him: "Generally the survey was very favourable". For the benefit of the members, I would like to read this very brief report which was put out by the Deputy Minister of the department giving the results of that survey. It is signed by S. W. Clarkson, Deputy Minister, survey of trainees in The Department of Economics and Development abstract:

> In order to formulate a planned in-service staff training programme, The Department of Economics and Development asked the personnel research branch of The Department of Civil Service to undertake a survey. The purpose of this study was to determine training needs in that department, particularly of its supervisory staff. Information was collected by means of questionnaires distributed to all the departmental employees.
>
> On the basis of the questionnaire responses, the following problems related to supervisory or management functions were identified:
>
> 1. Employees complain about unclear work objectives, inadequate work methods, and unsatisfactory work assignments.
>
> 2. According to their responses, employees are unable to identify or define work standards appropriate for their jobs. A large group of employees also complained that their department offered no opportunity for further training.
>
> 3. Unclear work instructions present another problem for departmental employees.
>
> 4. Employee morale also presents a problem. Factors which seem to be responsible are the lack of promotional opportunities, insufficient recognition for the contributions of individual employees and low salaries. Still another important factor is the belief of many respondents that management appears unwilling to accept the opinions and suggestions of its staff on common problems.
>
> 5. According to the response of employees, no formal performance appraisal system exists in the department.
>
> 6. Communication between employees and senior management is largely lacking. Upward communication does not seem to be encouraged while downward communication from top management to the employees is frequently inadequate.

This is a survey which the Minister considered very favourable; I would hate to see a survey which he considered unfavourable.

A number of recommendations have been made to help ameliorate these problems, and I would like to read these recommendations. There are five of them, so that I can ask the Minister whether these recommendations have been carried out so that his department is in somewhat better shape than it was a few months ago:

> 1. Departmental supervisors should be encouraged to improve their methods of planning and organizing the work of their staff.
>
> 2. Training for supervisors and how to develop and communicate work standards clearly and efficiently is also suggested.
>
> 3. Similarly, training and formulating communicating work instructions is recommended.
>
> 4. In order to improve morale, it is suggested that management, especially top management, encourage employee participation and suggestions on problems of general concern and recognize and reward the contributions of individual staff members.
>
> 5. Although no formal performance appraisal system seems to exist in the department, a course designed to help supervisors to divide and maintain such a system is not suggested because of the attendance problems. Instead, it is recommended that communication will not only solve existing communication problems, but greater exchange between all levels, along with the recognition of individual contributions, should permit an informal appraisal system. Such informal systems of appraisal would have the advantage of largely eliminating those difficulties to which formal appraisal systems often give rise—for example, perceptions of threat among the appraised employees.

I have read this memorandum in full so that we can see the very favourable survey referred to by the Minister in *Hansard* of February 21, 1968. I would hate the House to think that he misled the House. I would ask the Minister if he intends to carry out the suggestions that have been made?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Speaker, I am sure that if the hon. member had been around last year, he would have also have read the report put out to the press by Mr. Collins, head of the civil service, in which Mr. Collins pointed out that this survey did not particularly pertain to The Department of Economics and Development.

It pertained to about 30 different departments that were under investigation and, as far as I know, as long as I have been in touch with the government and in this responsibility, we have had surveys made about twice a year of all our departments—and will continue to do so.

We also have, in our department, two men who do nothing but check on the activities of the various departments, including the housing department. I would suggest to the hon. member that when Mr. Clarkson put out that letter, he was referring to the entire report of the 30 departments rearranged by the civil service, and it did not, entirely, pertain to my department.

However, we recognize it and any survey. We are not going to have perfection, but if we do not point out the imperfections, we would go on year after year with the kind of things that, perhaps, showed up in this report—not only our department but every department. I would suggest to the hon. member that, as I said the other day when I answered his question, if my department is inefficient, I would suggest that more departments should have it and more governments should have it, because the success stories we have, indicate that we have a successful department.

Many of the things that are recommended have been carried out and will continue to be carried out as long as I run the department. I have no hesitation whatsoever in inviting anybody in to check on what we are doing in our department, how we are doing it and how efficiently it operates. If we turn our eyes to the fact that we think we have perfection, I would just suggest to the hon. member that we are not all in his position.

I would also suggest that when I was in industry, I had consultants call on me every day in the week. I pointed out to them that when I looked out of that factory door there were two things I needed; I needed time and I needed money to fix up the things that required to be done, but the day I looked out that door and if I then said I did not need any help, I would think I was in real deep trouble.

Any time this department, or any other department of the government, does not have these surveys, does not put up with the criticism as well as the compliments, then I think the department is in trouble. As far as I am concerned, the department is meeting all the criteria put down by this report—this survey—and I think we have a very efficient department and will continue to do exactly as we have done in the past.

Mr. H. Peacock (Windsor West): Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak on The Act to establish The Department of Trade and Development, I would like to make a few observations by way of introduction.

First of all, I would like to comment on the way in which business, particularly government business, comes before the House. On Thursday afternoon last, the Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) before adjourning the House announced that on Monday following, the House would take up government bills. At that time, he did not indicate which bills would be put before the House for discussion. I crossed the floor after adjournment and asked him if he could tell me in advance whether bills of the hon. Minister of Economics and Development would be called today, and he said he was not sure, but he very kindly told me that he would probably take them in the order in which they appear on the notice paper.

I think that when a private member approaches the Prime Minister who organizes the business of the House, it is very kind of him to tell him this. But, I do not think, Mr. Speaker, that that is the way that business ought to be put before the House. I think with respect, Mr. Speaker, that some notice of the actual order to be called should be given at least a day or so in advance. I realize that Ministers have other duties.

Mr. Speaker: Might I ask the member who is speaking to the principle of Bill 11 that he speak to the principle of that bill. To date he has not reached that. So would he discontinue with the present line which is out of order and go back to the bill.

Mr. Peacock: Mr. Speaker, while I was not speaking to the principle of the bill, I was speaking about the manner in which the bill

was brought forward and I will address myself to the principle of—

Mr. Speaker: I hope I do not need to point out again, that on second readings the debate is on the principle of the bill being put forward for second reading.

Mr. Peacock: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. That brings me to my second comment on the way in which business is handled in the House, namely—if I might explain to you, Mr. Speaker, what I am about to say and how it relates to the principle of the bill. It is this: The Minister of Economics and Development, to be known as the Minister of Trade and Development, once this Act has been given Royal assent has said not a word about its purpose other than to reply to the remarks of the member for High Park, and that forms my second comment, Mr. Speaker. I think this is more than just a small matter of housekeeping of the sort that the Attorney General referred to earlier when he was placing his bills on the notice paper before the House—an Act to repeal an Act, a little bit of tidying up.

This Act to establish The Department of Trade and Development does not fall into such a category in my belief. If this department is to carry out its functions, some of which appear to be very vaguely defined in Bill 11 which is in front of us, it ought to have a significant role in the economic development of this province.

But, Mr. Speaker, we do not have a clear cut role assigned to The Department of Trade and Development. Instead, we have really a splitting-off of some of the functions of the old Department of Economics and Development, leaving the new Department of Trade and Development as a kind of greater Ontario industrial commission, and a department which will administer equalization of the industrial opportunity programme.

Now both these tag ends that appear to be left with The Department of Trade and Development appear to be at cross purposes with the overall design for development programme that the Prime Minister talked about in the House last Thursday.

The Prime Minister, in his remarks, talked about the reorganization of The Department of Treasury. He did not say when that Act was going to be introduced, so we only know from public pronouncements what has been taken away from the old Department of Economics and Development and what is now in the hands of The Department of the Treasury, itself soon to be split up into two further departments.

But the Prime Minister, on Thursday, made some remarks in the course of the Throne Speech debate, which, I think, bear on this bill. He said that to contribute to the process of policy development, co-ordination and consistency, he had consolidated two Cabinet committees—the Cabinet committees on economics and finance, and on regional development. These have been merged into a Cabinet committee of policy development. This new committee will be concerned with the full range of policy matters.

Undoubtedly, this committee will continue to deal, as it has, with one of the functions of the old Department of Economics and Development, that of regional development. The Prime Minister went on to say that, of course, regional development is a very broad activity on the part of the government; it should not be confused with regional government as such, and that any kind of government project, a highway or some kind of other transportation link, energy, resource and development, all fell into the heading of regional development, he said.

But he also went on to say, Mr. Speaker, that this means that, as never before, we must accept the full implications of planning, and yet, Mr. Speaker, in this bill which we have before us, we see some of the planning functions removed and some of the planning functions left behind in The Department of Trade and Development.

Let us take the subject of regional location of industry, for example. One of the duties and responsibilities of the new department is to promote the establishment, growth, efficiency and improvement of industries in the province; and later in the bill it is empowered to undertake research and make investigations respecting areas of equalization of industrial development.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister has from time to time refused to give any support to the proposition that various regions of this province ought to be favoured over others in the matter of industrial development. He has refused to put the government on record as having a policy to deal with plant shutdowns and mass layoffs. He has declined, with his solid background of business experience, to interfere in any way whatsoever with the private enterprise process.

I recall meeting with the Minister in the fall of 1966 when over 2,000 employees of the General Motors plant at Oshawa were

laid off as a result of the realignment of production facilities under the automotive trade pact between Canada and the United States. At that time, the Minister's interest was simply to see that the Minister of Labour at that time, the present Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs (Mr. Rowntree), undertook a few stabs at on-the-job training for those laid off workers in Oshawa and that the adult retraining facilities in Oshawa would be made available to those workers who could be handled there.

There was no conviction at all, Mr. Speaker, that industries which play such a large role in the economic life of a community, such as General Motors does in Oshawa, ought to be subject to any kind of restraint when it comes to planning their manpower requirements. I think one of the great omissions in this bill is that nowhere is the Minister assigned the task of developing an industry location policy; so that when plants decide to shut down and move away, when they decide to drastically reduce their work forces, his department will have a policy that can be put into action quickly.

To do that, Mr. Speaker, the Minister would have to have advance notice. And again I remind you, that at no time to my knowledge and recollection has the Minister, in answer to questions in this House about such emergency situations where large numbers of workers were laid off, has the Minister ever committed himself to requiring those employers to give adequate notice of the manpower changes they were going to introduce, so that his department, along with The Departments of Labour and of Education, could co-ordinate a programme to deal with those layoffs and with the loss of industry in a particular community.

I think that with all the discussion we have had about underdevelopment in the east of this province, underdevelopment in the north and complete lack of development in some parts of the province, we need a definite policy of directing industry away from the concentrations of urban growth that we have along the shores of Lake Erie and Lake Ontario, away from these centres to other parts of the province that require some industrial development.

In the second part of this bill the Minister is given the responsibility of carrying out the industrial development, or rather the equalization of industrial opportunity programme. It seems that under this programme he is going to give almost every municipality in the province of Ontario the chance to bid for a plan. He has managed to exclude a few. How the Ontario development corporation—and I think that this relates to the principle of the bill, Mr. Speaker—decides that the town of Watford is eligible for designation and the town of Chippawa is not, is a logic that is beyond me.

Some planners have suggested that growth ought to be concentrated. Yet under the programme that the Minister in The Department of Trade and Development is charged with administering, there are already 163 small communities and townships in this province designated for the equalization of industrial opportunity programme—which reaffirms or confirms, I think, the comment I made at the beginning of these remarks, that this Act gives the Minister a department which is really nothing more than a province-wide industrial commission.

Mr. Speaker, in the few minutes that remain I would just like to turn to one other aspect of what should be the Minister's responsibilities. Of all the departments of government the new Department of Trade and Development should surely be the one to deal with the problems of continentalism that face Ontario and Canada. Ontario has the largest concentration of secondary manufacturing in the country, it has one of the largest concentrations of population; and yet with the national average of better than half our secondary manufacturing industry being owned by foreign investors, principally those in the United States, we have no reference whatever in the bill that the Minister as one of his duties, should look into and develop policies about the growing dependence of our Ontario manufacturing economy on foreign ownership. I suggest that this is one of the weaknesses of the bill that the Minister should find time to deal with when he finally does get to make his remarks.

Mr. Speaker, in this same connection secondary manufacturing industry in Ontario faces a very severe challenge from the Kennedy Round tariff cuts negotiated last year, and now being put into effect. I see that under section 3 of the bill the Minister is charged with assisting manufacturing industries in adapting to changing conditions in domestic and export markets and changes in the techniques of production. The Minister has not yet, but perhaps he will say something about the kind of assistance which his department is prepared to offer industries which face some kind of drastic dislocation of their market through the much more

severe competition from abroad as a result of the Kennedy Round tariff cuts. He might also have something to say about the kind of assistance—or he may say there will be no assistance—for those industries which could take advantage of the mutual tariff reductions that Canada and the other GATT partners have negotiated.

In the province of Manitoba the department charged with responsibilities similar to those the Minister has in Ontario, has pledged itself to make up the other 50 per cent of the cost of the technical advice that industries there will need after they have received their federal adjustment assistance to meet these changes that the Kennedy Round tariff cuts will impose on them.

One other point I would just like to raise before concluding, Mr. Speaker, is that under section 3(2) the Minister is called upon to cause his department to acquire a detailed knowledge of industries in the province. I assume, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister already has a considerable knowledge of the industries in this province, but I suggest to you, sir, that there is one large gap in his knowledge. That is in the area of the financial reports and the financial operations of many of our major companies. There is no requirement in this province for the disclosure of the operating accounts, the income statements and the balance sheets of such major corporations as General Electric or General Motors or Westinghouse or Chrysler Canada.

We cannot possibly carry out some of the tasks that are assigned to this department unless we have such financial information made public. I hope the Minister will convince his colleague, the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs, that without this disclosure required by law, perhaps under The Ontario Securities Act, he will not be able to carry out his responsibilities successfully.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I wanted to make one or two comments about the bill before us, if there are still a few moments left in the time allotted. I hope I can do it without it being necessary to adjourn the debate.

I suppose it was in 1944, as a result of the implementation of one of Mr. Drew's 22 points, that the original department dealing with development was brought into being in this province. The responsibility had been undertaken by other departments up until that time.

It appears to me, in looking over the changes in the department since then, that in many ways the statute has had to be changed for each succeeding Minister. In the first instance it was designed, I suppose, to meet the requirements of the Hon. Billy Nickle, a man well known to many people in this Legislature. Under his direction it emerged as a means whereby planning as it was then understood, and not as perhaps as it was implied in the Premier's remarks a few days ago, was brought into being as far as industrial development was concerned.

There were those who said that perhaps the development of the province stagnated in those days, simply because there was not enough initiative shown—with all due respect to the then Minister. But we well remember the changes that took place in that department when Mr. Macaulay became its Minister in the years following, and in some respects it became the catchall for every little bit of responsibility that was not being pushed to the fullest by the various governmental departments.

You may recall, sir, that there were those who used to irreverently refer to the Minister as "the Minister of all departments" because he used to undertake it as his responsibility, even before the Budget was put before the House, to give us his views on the economic development of the province in the past year and what he envisaged for the immediate succeeding year. There was no thought in his mind that the economy of the province and the development of the province could be in fact divorced. So under Mr. Macaulay's leadership the department became very large, very important indeed; it ramified into agriculture, tourism and almost every other department that is now represented specifically on the other side.

We know, of course, that Mr. Macaulay, due to ill health, had to lay down this particularly heavy responsibility, and our friend, the present hon. Minister took up the torch of development.

His *forte*, it appears, is not in the realm of economics in the pure sense, or relating economics to development as fas as industry is concerned. He is generally recognized as a super-salesman, whether he is selling himself to the electors of Don Mills, or his party to the electors of the province, or perhaps even cookies to the consumers of California. And really he is an excellent salesman. He has shown this on many occasions and it seems to me that the bill that

is now before us, which revamps the department once again, is designed with his particular personality in mind.

It seems to me that we have too often fallen into the trap of expanding and restricting alternately the ambit of this department, and it is not in the best interest of the development of the province. It has already been indicated that it is very difficult to determine the criteria and terms of reference used by the recently announced programme of equalization of industrial opportunity which was put before the people of Ontario in the recent election campaign. It has already been put before you, sir, that it is difficult to tell why the town of Watford might be selected for some preferment, while so many others are left off the list. I suppose every one of us on this side has a comparable pair of towns that could be described to you, sir, as perhaps falling by any objective assessment, under the same realm of difficulty and which has not been treated so by the department.

I feel, however, that even in raising this particular matter there might be the assumption by those who are very interested in it that we might be accusing the government of using something other than objective assessment, and I surely believe that we have come far beyond the time when this is so. I believe the only reason why these assessments seem to be, in some instances, unfair is because the programme is new and that any government when it is setting about the selection of certain areas for more assistance than nearby areas is bound to come under severe criticism, and maybe even the implication that their judgments are less than objective. I think this is just part of the growing pains of a fairly new undertaking, but I hope that the Minister will see that he is able to bring more of a sense of fairness into these decisions.

Now, there is just one further point that I would make. The Minister has, under this bill, been restricted, to some extent, in his responsibilities as we understood them previously. And we know the special pressures that are put on all the hon. Ministers, to relate their responsibilities on a horizontal level with their colleagues. I would recall to your mind, sir, that there are a good many jurisdictions already in the government of Ontario which have the right and privilege and responsibility to undertake far reaching economic assessments that might in fact involve decisions associated with trade and development. And there has always been criticism that this government has not made adequate use of a co-ordinated approach.

I think, particularly, of the facilities that the federal government offers through ARDA and administered by The Department of Agriculture and Food, to undertake the sort of assessment on a broad economic level that must surely be closely associated with the kind of decision that the Minister of The Department of Trade and Development must make. And yet these very surveys have been held back, in my view, by the lack of co-operation and initiative on the part of The Department of Agriculture and Food. And it is a very serious matter indeed, when we find that the various departments are so out of touch in this administration that we lose the opportunities that have been put at our disposal by the federal government to pay almost the complete cost of these surveys.

There is one particular case in point that will be put before you, sir, in detail in the near future by the member for Port Arthur (Mr. Knight), and this is an area which requires this sort of assistance. The Minister of Economics and Development, that is still the department he heads, was very flat in his refusal in saying in that part of the country some months ago that if the federal government was not prepared to take action that he, as the Provincial Minister, would have to do something about the economic stagnation in certain areas. And it seems incredible that he would say that when the government at Ottawa has already offered money for an ARDA survey of that area, and this is not restricted by any means to the agricultural areas, but to the economic development of the area.

So I do not want to extend this further. I do want to say, however, that the responsibilities of this Minister should not be considered to be restricted unduly, simply by the fact that he has shucked off the economics part of his department and had it transferred to the Provincial Treasury. He cannot function in a vacuum in this regard; he must be in full contact and participation with all government departments, and this I say has been a failure of this administration in the past.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Mr. Speaker, the provisions of this Bill 11 are of vital importance to the people of northern Ontario, and I would like to address myself to it. But due to the time I would like to adjourn the debate.

Mr. Stokes moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

NOTICE OF MOTION

Clerk of the House: Notice of motion No. 19 by Mr. Snow.

RESOLUTION:

That the government of Ontario should adopt the national building code standardizing building, fire and safety legislation, and that this code should be made applicable to all residential, commercial and industrial buildings in all municipalities of this province.

Mr. J. W. Snow (Halton East): I move, seconded by the member for Peel South (Mr. Kennedy), resolution No. 19, standing in my name, which has just been read.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in support of the resolution standing in my name for the adoption of a national building code by the province of Ontario as a standard building code for all municipalities within this province.

This is one field where this government can assist with little or no expenditure from the provincial purse in the reduction of the cost of building in Ontario, and especially the cost of building homes. By the adoption of the national building code as the standard code for all municipalities, manufacturers and builders could reduce their costs.

It has been reliably estimated that in one municipality in the Toronto area, for example, local regulations that interfere with the efficiency of private enterprise add as much as $500 to the cost of a housing unit.

One very important limitation faced by builders is the multiplicity of conflicting and often outmoded building codes which are still in existence.

The national building code of Canada, in my opinion, is the only existing code which has any chance of universal acceptance. The degree to which it has already been accepted far exceeds that of any other code in Canada. As recently as 1959, only 37.4 per cent of the population of Canada fell within political jurisdictions utilizing the national building code in whole or in part. This percentage had climbed to 74.9 per cent by the end of 1966, with Ontario reporting the highest percentage of 87.5 per cent.

While these figures may appear very impressive, and at first glance one might be led to assume that virtually everybody in this province lives in the political area which has adopted the national building code, closer examination will show that this is not quite true.

At the end of 1966, the figures released by the associate committee on the national building code showed that while some municipalities were using the 1965 issue, which is the latest issue, others still had, as their building bylaw, the 1960, or even the 1953 version of the NBC.

Furthermore, among the municipalities using all issues of the code, the majority had only adopted it in part and had used it only as a basis for their municipal bylaw, or as a general reference.

Of the 344 municipalities in Ontario, only 63 had adopted the latest version of the NBC in whole. Of these 63, only 13 were cities out of a possible 31 cities in Ontario, and only three of the cities were over 45,000 population. This, then, presents a picture of disunity rather than unity, and we will have to examine more closely the reasons for it. During the past year, there have been a series of meetings with building constructors, and with committees, responsible for the building codes in the various boroughs of Metropolitan Toronto, and I must say that despite all efforts to have the national building code adopted in preference to the Toronto area building code, little or no success is yet in sight.

As a result of all these meetings, it appears clear to me that those responsible for the local building codes prefer to reserve a high degree of control over their own codes, since by so doing, they can retain, alter, or remove at will, any sections at any time. It seems they believe that by surrendering this authority and agreeing to adopt the national building code, they will be giving up a right which they wish to retain in their own hands.

Individual sections of the code appear to be unsatisfactory to one or the other of the local building officials. They are certainly not consistent in their objections, one accepting a certain clause but rejecting another, while his compatriot in another area takes just the opposite course.

Not only is this situation prevalent in Metropolitan Toronto, but there is an increasing tendency in other communities across the country to retain or produce local versions. All of this trend is away from the objective of a universal building code.

The manufacturers of building materials are unable to achieve the lowest possible cost through mass production of common articles. What they can sell and what can be used in one community, is prohibited in another. This is often wasteful, as it requires

high inventories, high transportation costs, and often slows up the whole building process through supply difficulties.

As an example of this, I would recite the common concrete building block, which is used so extensively in construction today. The standard modular block which is, for instance, approved in the city of Hamilton and hundreds of other municipalities in Ontario, is not approved, and a special block must be manufactured, for the city of Toronto.

One common reason for not accepting the national building code which is put forward by building officials, is that the fire protection requirements in the national code are insufficient for their particular community. Why is this so, when the national requirements have been carefully prepared by competent authorities in the field—authorities probably better equipped to judge than most people in one individual municipality?

When I hear that greater fire protection must be provided in city X than anywhere else, my first thought is they must have a poor fire department there. If the requirements are adequate for most of the people in other places, why do they think they should be more severe than average for their particular town? Do they not forget that these excessive fire or other requirements are costing new home owners more money than is necessary? I might say that the national building code has been approved and recommended by the association of Canadian fire marshals.

After all, if money is no object, it is possible to build houses that are completely fireproof, completely earthquake-proof, completely everything-proof—but nobody could afford to buy them! I think a more reasonable approach is required on the part of our municipalities.

Antiquated building bylaws frequently prohibit any but traditional methods of building, and little or no machinery exists at the local level whereby they can be effectively brought up-to-date. Nor is it sufficient for a municipality to claim that it has used the national building code as its building bylaw, when, in fact, within the bylaw, there are variations from the national code.

These variations—be they deletions, additions or merely changes—defeat the whole purpose of uniformity across the country. We see an increasing tendency for these variations to become more numerous and often unexplainable. Where it is claimed that the national building code is in use, the variations are sometimes so extensive as to make the similarity virtually unrecognizable.

The national building code is a document prepared under the direction of the associate committee on the national building code of the national research council. Working under its direction is a permanent staff in the division of building research, together with a series of permanent standing committees which constantly review and amend all sections of the code. Submissions made to the associate committee receive due consideration from specialists who serve voluntarily to provide a wealth of technical and expert knowledge which it would be impossible to muster at any local level. The national building code is a document designed to suit every part of the country; carefully thought out, and worded by the best professional and technical brains. It is constantly under revision, and due consideration is given to any and all submissions made for its improvement.

I understand there is a new addition to the code just recently brought out, which covers the Northwest Territories where construction is built on a permafrost condition.

I believe that local building officials have been negligent in not submitting their particular objections to the national building code in the form of proposed amendments simply because they find it easier to amend them in their own code instead. They continue to claim that the national building code is not to their satisfaction, but in many cases they have not taken the trouble to try to have the code amended to their satisfaction.

The associate committee, therefore, is not being kept aware of all the objections which the local building people find in the code, and their point of view is not always being expressed. I believe that this is extremely unfortunate, because certainly the builders, the manufacturers, the architects and engineers are well aware of the problems they have to encounter in having to deal with innumerable, varying and often conflicting building bylaws. Before an architect or an engineer can prepare a design for a building in any particular municipality, great research is required, on his part. He must go to that municipality and search out through their bylaws to find out just what kind of a building he can design for that town.

Despite the fact that the Ontario association of building officials—that is the association of building inspectors basically—endorsed the national building code during its annual meeting in 1966, many of its members have failed

to implement this resolution of their own association.

The national building code has received the endorsement of a great many organizations, including the Ontario federation of construction associations, which includes every construction association in this province; Canadian construction association, the national body; engineering institute of Canada; Royal architectural institute of Canada; Canadian federation of mayors and municipalities; association of consulting engineers of Canada; association of Canadian fire marshals; by the Canadian association of fire chiefs; Canadian underwriters association; Canadian labour congress; Canadian manufacturers association; Ontario electric league; central mortgage and housing corporation, and the national home builders association. In spite of the good efforts of all these groups we appear to be as far away from unity as ever.

The cost to home owners and tenants, the cost to municipal taxpayers, since they in effect are paying for a duplicate code preparation at the municipal level which already exists for their use at the national level, seems inexcusable. If the fault lies at the local level through reluctance to conform because of desire to maintain political sovereignty, it is necessary for our provincial government to introduce legislation to bring all the municipalities into conformity.

If the fault, on the other hand, lies with the national building code itself, the associate committee which is responsible for its administration should acquaint itself with the reasons for the lack of universal response. With this information on hand, amendments might be considered desirable which would promote a genuine acceptance without local change or reservation in order that we might achieve this very desirable goal of uniformity.

Admittedly, home builders and contractors can struggle along in the current building bylaw morass in which far too many of our nearly 2,000 municipalities take it upon themselves as a right to impose ill-thought-out, clumsily expressed building bylaws upon a long-suffering public. The builders can find a way through the bylaw jungle, adjusting their specifications for this locality as against that, thereby accepting the added costs and delays —but that does not mean that they are not aware of the muddled thinking that lies behind it all.

For this reason it is encouraging to learn that there are signs that associations which have long—but too quietly—advocated adoption of the national building code by the municipalities so that we can establish a system of standardization, are now taking up a more militant attitude with a view to increasing the pressure on municipalities to accept the national building code and scrap the local codes.

In a battle for a standardized code across Canada, two provincial associations have made adoption of the national building code by municipalities a major plank in their programme. That these associations are in Ontario and Quebec, which represents the major part of Canada's construction programme, is so much to the good.

Last October the adoption of the national building code by municipalities in Quebec was a major topic at the convention of the Quebec provincial association of home builders. The following week as a result of prompting, primarily by the Toronto Metropolitan home builders' association, the Ontario council of national house builders' association was presented a brief at the special session during the annual convention of the Ontario building officials' association.

This is something well worthwhile. The Ontario building officials' association, through their president, Mr. W. A. Wrightson, chief building inspector for the city of Kitchener, is to be congratulated on their open-mindedness in making arrangements to receive the brief, but I feel here that this approach—commendable though it may be—does not go far enough towards solving this problem of conflicting and confusing bylaws.

Mr. Speaker, it is time that municipalities were directed to discard their own conflicting bylaws in favour of a much superior document, the national building code, which is available to them all. I think it was a mistake after the second world war for Ontario and other provinces to give the municipalities the power to draw up their own building bylaws. The only excuse is that at that time the national building code was then not available.

Here is a document drawn up for application right across Canada, carefully thought-out and worded by the best professional and technical brains in the country, that is being ignored or adjusted in many areas by officials and public representatives who are neither qualified nor competent to do so.

After leaving for years the decision to adopt the national building code generally on a voluntary basis, and after years of futile hope that it will take place, it has been proved without question that it has not done so, and I doubt if it ever will be. A number of municipalities have done so to the credit

of their good sense and the benefit of their electorate. More have only passed over the document by saying they have based their local building code upon it, but in amending it have only piled on confusion where misunderstanding previously existed.

It is for this reason the provincial government of Ontario should bring order out of this chaos by insisting municipalities adopt the national building code in its entirety without amendments. It should refute the claims by cities like Toronto that they need special provisions because of their local situation. The national building code does this for them already, so up-to-date, comprehensive and knowledgeable are its terms.

It would be at least one firm step against the increasing inflation in construction prices, but most of all for the benefit of the country at large it would give the construction industry—Canada's biggest single industry —a standardized basis upon which to work, in which the full benefits of new techniques, now held up by local building bylaws, could be enjoyed by every Canadian whether he is a resident of a great metropolis or a rural area.

Mr. Speaker, virtually all houses in Canada are built according to the requirements of the national building code. Certainly, all the lower-cost homes comply with it in detail because the central mortgage and housing corporation requires that unless you satisfy the CMHC you do not get the NHA loan, but even if a builder is erecting homes financed both by NHA and conventional loans, he will seldom change his specification from the national building code standards because it would involve extra cost and the conventional lenders are quite happy with these standards.

This is why the general adoption by municipalities is so important, when amendments vary from one municipality to another so a builder must change his specification, and up goes the cost of that home. In these days of expensive building and land, when the builder—for the sake of his own livelihood—is trying to maintain the cost line, does this make sense?

To the local municipality, the change may only represent $10 on the cost of a house, but when you multiply that amount by all the houses built in that municipality, and you add in the extra work in specifying and in planning that the builder must pay for as a result, and when you count the extra delays and possibly the different materials that must be bought, the cost becomes substantial. That simple $10 addition has grown to several times its original amount per house.

How much will be saved on the price of homes if every municipality in Ontario adopts the code is impossible to estimate. It could range from $10 to $500 and more per house. Some municipalities require less than the national building code would ask for; a large number ask for more.

There is no saving with the municipalities that ask for less because the builder, to get his NHA loan, still has to conform to the national building code. There is a definite cost increase with the municipalities that ask for more. The size of that cost increase depends upon the extent by which the local requirements vary.

Mr. Speaker, there will also be a saving to the municipality in adopting the code. Their expenses in the building department would immediately decrease. They would not have to employ code writers, train building officials to interpret their own local requirements, or maintain as large a staff as those with their own local building codes presently do.

It simply means this—the national building code is drawn up by experts from all the associated professions from all over the country, and why should this work be duplicated at a municipal level? But, Mr. Speaker, it is not—in my opinion—totally a question of cost at the municipal level. That is not really why I think that all municipalities should be using the standard code adopted by the province of Ontario. If and when this takes place, it will definitely mean savings and overall, these will be substantial.

It will mean the clearing up of this present confusing situation caused by a great many of our municipalities having their own requirements. A removal of this confusion is something that will almost be without a price. When the associations which I have previously mentioned—not only private but municipal associations—have agreed that the standard code would be such an asset, why should we hesitate in implementing this code?

When this takes place, the manufacturers and building industry will be able to get down to the business of supply the much-needed housing units today on an organized and reasonable basis, and at a reduction in cost to the ultimate owner. The large provincial builders—and there are many who are building in many different municipalities at the same time across Ontario—will not have to be adjusting their plans and specifications, and will not have to have staff checking or seeing that one local requirement is met as

against another, and getting the necessary local approval of local requirements.

Mr. Speaker, I honestly cannot understand why every municipality has not adopted this code many years ago. No municipality can hope to produce a code such as the national building code. Even the major cities do not have the facilities which are at the disposal of the Ottawa-based associate committee on the national building code.

When a question arises over a wood structure, or steel reinforcement, or a concrete mix, the associate committee can go to acknowledged experts across the country for a solution. The local municipality can only go to a few industrial representatives locally who would be the first to admit that there are others in the country who know more about the project than they do.

Mr. Speaker, one major breakthrough in the problem of providing economical housing for our citizens may be in the greatly improved system of factory-manufactured homes such as is being carried out in the new Alcan plant at Woodstock recently opened by our hon. Minister of Trade and Development.

There is no doubt, in my mind, that there can be tremendous savings made by the factory assembly line manufacture of component parts or complete homes. This industry is designing and building their units in many varying styles and designs to meet the requirements of the national building code, but their use is being hampered, and their markets limited, because of different local requirements. There is no rational reason for this confusion which effectively inhibits the large-scale builder from introducing the economies of scale that would be possible through standardization of design.

How can he mass-produce and thus reduce costs when he must cater to so many varying standards? Mr. Speaker, it has been reliably estimated that these houses can be mass-produced in factories, for speedy assembly on site, with a saving often between 10 per cent and 25 per cent from the price of a conventional home.

Our provincial government now has jurisdiction over the plumbing and the electrical wiring in this province, which, I must say, is a great asset. The electrical wiring requirements which come under the jurisdiction of the Ontario Hydro-Electric Power Commission are standard throughout Ontario as far as the building is concerned. Some variations may come about with respect to the exterior connections from the local power authority, depending on their requirements for underground services, backlog servicing and the like.

If I may quote, the words of the hon. Edgar Benson, federal Minister responsible for housing, when he said that:

> It is a disgrace that there is so much red tape involved in the housing industry. We have to get rid of all those local building codes.

Mr. Benson has identified a key problem, but he cannot do anything about it as the federal government has not the jurisdiction over this area; nor is there any hope that the municipalities will bestir themselves into action.

Local politicians seem far more concerned with preserving the sacred principle of local autonomy, regardless of the cost to ordinary families who are desperately in need of housing.

The only hope for action in this area lies with our government. We alone have the power to cut through this red tape—to impose the standard building code, and thereby to simplify and speed up the construction of homes at a considerable saving to the purchaser.

Thank you.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the resolution of the hon. member for Halton East.

> All hair shall be long, washed goat or cattle hair, and free from foreign material.

This is an extract from chapter 37, I believe, of the Toronto building code, written in 1926, and it quotes as its standard of authority, the ASTM 1926.

That ASTM stands for the American society for testing engineers, an organization that is no long in existence, and the only place you can find those specifications is in the library of Congress, which is preserving antiques.

We also have in this Toronto building code, such quotations as those from the Canadian engineering standards association, another defunct association. It is quite obvious, as the previous speaker said, that the municipalities are not keeping up with the times.

The municipality of East York has a termite bylaw which is not felt to be necessary by other municipalities, and they do not have any more termites in East York than in any other parts of the province.

Mr. J. H. White (London South): They do though, York South, too.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): Also, they are bigger.

Mr. Deacon: There are local government objections to the adoption of a national building code. One of the problems that has been cited, is the lack of regulations and sufficient enforcement for high buildings against fire, and other problems, but these changes can be introduced readily into the national building code for, as the previous speaker said, there is an associate committee that is working all the time. There are six standing committees of the national building code that are working all the time to consider and update regulations.

If members look at the national building code under the chapter of housing, you will find a very thick section of amendments since 1965.

In other words, in the three years there have been many changes adopted and it shows that they are flexible and making use of new materials that are available. Now preparations are proceeding for the production of the 1970 edition of the code, and, at the conference that is to be held in Vancouver, at the end of April, they will be working to put into print the 1970 edition.

The reason that they can go ahead with these amendments is that they have available to them, the excellent research facilities of the national research council. Here they can do all sorts of tests under wind tunnels and simulated earthquakes and they can test materials against fire.

It may be recalled that at the time of the flooding of the St. Lawrence river near Cornwall, the national research council made an agreement with this province to burn one whole village. It just did not have a fire roaring through that village. They studied the conditions of setting fire to different buildings and seeing how different materials reacted.

It was the type of research that no individual municipality could hope to equal and here it is available to the whole province of Ontario, to the rest of Canada. We can update our materials, keep up with the most modern techniques and know that we are getting housing at the minimum cost.

Now, one of the basic principles of the national building code that I think is important is that it does not go according to a recipe. In other words, in Toronto they say you must have solid brick construction, or solid masonry construction.

They go to a standard—as long as the material meets a certain fire resistance standard, it is approved—and this means that there is some flexibility. They are not insisting that it be brick. They are saying that as long as it meets the fire resistance standards, they approve the new aluminum materials or other materials that are available on the market.

We must remember that the basic advantage of the national building code over many of these local municipal codes is its insistence on the standard of performance, not on some specific material. The national building code is put out in a very neat book. There are nine parts with supplements, and, as I mentioned, there is constant, co-operative revision of all sections of that code.

The first result is that there is an elimination of wasted effort as each municipality is now trying to develop its own code and it is needlessly doing so. It is trying to maintain its own code and you can see that the city of Toronto for example, is not doing a very good job.

Second, it is enabling building inspectors to be trained for work in any municipality. This is a tremendous advantage. If we can train building inspectors, they know that they do not have to learn a completely different code, with completely different contents in another municipality if they move there.

And third and most important, it enables architects, engineers and builders to work to one set of regulations. Therefore, I heartily endorse the resolutions of the member for Halton East and hope that the government will take steps to introduce legislation covering this in this session.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Speaker, in rising to comment on this resolution, I must say first of all that we, in this group, are perfectly aware and concerned about the hodgepodge of building codes and regulations right across this province.

The various municipalities have various codes and no two very often agree, but the resolution presents us with certain difficulties, and it is pretty comprehensive for all kinds and shapes and sizes of buildings.

Also, the mover said this, that he is supporting, and his resolution means, that we are to adopt in its entirety the national building code without amendment. This was his point of view. Now I am not sure that the member for York Centre agreed with that entirely whilst supporting this, because he seemed to indicate that the code might be amended in some significant ways and then be adopted by the province.

I would remind the House of the long, tough struggle that took place for present building standards to be established in this province in the various areas. Across the House we are reminded, and have been reminded a great deal during this session, that this country was built by the private enterprisers. The member for London South tells us this time after time and he is right—he is right, and I do not quarrel with that in essentials.

This country was built that way, but our problem was that in the whole building field, the result of that private enterprise development was a hodge-podge without order and with little symmetry or beauty. The result also was seen in the sordid slums with all the problems they spawn.

Disease resulted from the lack of proper sanitary facilities, fires spread easily through the jerry-built buildings and, at regular intervals, they cleaned out large sections of our communities. Then, of course, factories and public buildings were often fire traps where the employees were held in there too long in times of disaster.

But gradually, men living in the community began to see that private enterprise was not enough, so governments began to move into this field and regulations were established, regulations by federal government, by provincial government and then by municipalities.

In other words, they tempered the excesses of the private enterprise system with regulations for the good of the people, and even the member for York South would not object to that—what I meant was London South.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Young: Oh, yes, I am sorry, my apology.

Well, I was right the first time and, perhaps, I am right the second time, I am not sure—but in any case, certain standards were established, standards which called for sewage, garbage disposal, certain fire protective devices which had to do with occupancy and all this sort of thing.

But, of course, this kind of regulation gave the free enterprisers apoplexy, and they began to give forth with the kind of words which we have heard from the other side of this House, that this was interfering with private enterprise, and we are going down the road to socialism, and we have got to make our choice between capitalism and socialism and that these regulations have got to be cut out.

This kind of fight still goes on. In many parts of our province; we still have very few regulations except those imposed by provincial statutes, and builders are building as they wish and to their own standards.

It is refreshing, of course, to see today a member of this government introduce a resolution like this, and we are delighted to see that. Fifty years ago, the Tory mind was howling against this kind of interference with free enterprise—so that's progress.

We are on the way, and I suppose 20 years from now the government—or the Opposition of that day which it will be—will be patting itself on the back for its acceptance of good standards in this field, for its acceptance of student participation in university government and for all these kinds of things.

This is progress and I suppose progress moves on, but while this resolution does represent some progress, it also, if it prevails, will destroy many of the hard won standards built up over the years, especially in the urban areas of our province—and that is our concern.

The national building code was designed for application all across this country, and while it is a step forward, after all it is the lowest common denominator which can apply everywhere, this is not as it ought to be.

Some of its problems may be because no senior representative or senior administrator of the building code has been on its central committee until this past year, when one from Vancouver was placed there.

Perhaps it was looked at from a different point of view and the real problems that many parts of the code presented were not adequately represented. The fact is that a great many municipalities in this province have gone far beyond the standard which this code outlines; we have heard that from the other speakers and they recognized that fact. So while for a great many municipalities in the province, adoption of the national code would be a great step forward, for the major urban centres it would be a retrograde step and would result in chaos for their present building standards.

It is a significant fact that no major urban municipality has adopted this code. Some smaller ones have and some of these are finding it does not give them the control they want over such things as dwelling unit construction.

No one will dispute that it is desirable to achieve as much uniformity in building as is

possible. This is particularly true in an area of Metro Toronto, and we heard something of the difficulties there.

As a matter of fact, there is a meeting—I think it is tomorrow, Mr. Speaker—which may very well see the wrap-up of a long series of studies designed to attain uniformity within the Metro area, but the Metro authorities have never been willing to achieve this uniformity by adopting the national code.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Or any other uniform code.

Mr. Young: That is right. But we hope now that they are in that position where they are willing. What they will get may not be as good as some of the boroughs would like, that may not be, but they will finally agree on something which will serve Metro far better than the national code could.

I might point out that the province of Ontario would not agree with this resolution. It has set higher standards in much of its legislation, and I might just mention a few of the Acts—The Tourist Establishment Act, The Theatres Act, The Hotel Fire Safety Act, The Industrial Safety Act, The Ontario Fire Marshal's office has come out with a code which is at variance with the national one.

If the resolution before us were passed, and translated into legislation, it would create legal chaos in Ontario and would necessitate the amendment of a great deal of legislation, to the detriment of standards established in that legislation.

It is interesting to note that one of the arguments for the adoption of the national code is that it would bring down the cost of housing. Mr. Speaker, I have somewhere in my files, if I can find it, a statement by H. W. Hignett, president of CMHC, made at the Metropolitan home builders' association annual conference on November 29. He was speaking of the housing starts in the Toronto market and he said this:

> The cost of constructing new bungalows financed under The National Housing Act is the lowest anywhere in Ontario and almost the best in Canada. But despite your above that anywhere in the country, because bungalow enters the market at a figure high above that anywhere in the country, because the cost of land is so high.

But the housing standards in Metro are among the highest in Ontario, if not in Canada. Evidently where the standards are higher construction costs are lower, according to Mr. Hignett. Mr. Hignett points out that one of the real culprits is soaring land costs. One of the others is of course high interest rates.

Mr. Hignett did go on to say that lower standards in the field of lot sizes and servicing would mean lower prices for homes; but is this where the attack should be made? Should we make houses a little cheaper by attacking the standard built up painfully over half a century? Or should we be zeroing in on the big cost items, such as land and interest rates, where speculation and profiteering are running rampant?

Now let me point to certain other specific areas where the national building code is inadequate for general application.

In subsection 9 of the building code, we have this:

> In this part in respect to house construction, where the term good practice is used, the appropriate provision in the residential standards as published by the national research council shall be used as a guide by the authority having jurisdiction to satisfy the requirements.

Now this simply means, Mr. Speaker, that none of the requirements used in residential standards would become mandatory bylaw requirements. They would be simply requirements to be used by a building official as a guide to good practice. I might quote, if we had the time, several instances where good practice is mentioned.

Just what good practice is, is a matter of judgment. If a builder did not agree with the building official he could produce his own set of residential standards and claim that these constituted good practice in that particular municipality. A building official would then have to make a judgment in the matter, there would be no legal requirement by which he could go.

No building official would want to put himself in this impossible position. Each such official would be a law unto himself. It could lead to corruption of weak officials, and it would certainly mean differing standards in different municipalities.

Now this weakness alone would nullify the whole intent of this resolution as far as residential standards are concerned. They would be completely frustrated because there would be all sorts of standards; it would all be a matter of what local officials consider good practice.

Section 9 was written, basically, as a CMHC guide in the administration of land. It contains many clauses dealing with small apartment buildings which are at direct vari-

ance with part 3 dealing with apartment buildings in general. These conflicts would have to be resloved before this resolution could be implemented. I do not think it is impossible, but we have to deal with this resolution. We could not adopt the building code as it is today.

Part 9 deals with roofs on buildings and it says this:

> All roofs shall be protected with roof coverings in accordance with good practice, including flashing where necessary to be installed so as to shed rain and prevent water, due to ice damming and other causes, from entering the roof.

The supplement which was issued recently deals with roofing too and it sets out certain materials which are outlined by the Canadian government specification board and the Canadian standards association. After it does that, it says this:

> Roofing materials and systems not specifically described in this section may be used when accepted by the authority having jurisdiction.

And so conceivably in our small towns, and even in Hamilton or Metro Toronto, you could have if the building commissioner so allowed—there will be no law to say no—cedar shingles, untreated, on the roofs of houses. I think this needs to be straightened away and some standards established—because today we do have specifications which say which shingles can be used with proper treatment.

The national building code also allows two-storey hospitals, up to 8,000 feet per floor, of wood construction. In this day and age such construction should not be allowed. Similarly two-storey apartment buildings, with from 6,000 to 9,000 square feet of flooring, depending on street frontage—one, two or three streets—can employ wooden construction. There is one provision in the code which says that if the outside wall is a bearing wall—it must be of fireproof material, but if it is not a bearing wall this is not required.

So a three-storey apartment building can go up with the bearing wall of timber and brick facing outside; this can pass the national building code. Certainly this kind of apartment and this kind of hospital construction should not be allowed in an enlightened province like Ontario. Safety is a great factor here. These are potential firetraps. Particularly where even wooden fire escapes are allowed, as in some of these instances, this should not be allowed.

Now I could also mention to members that if the code as it is were adopted then insurance rates would be affected. If wooden buildings which are allowed here, wooden-clad apartments and hospitals, these would affect insurance rates; and insurance rates must go up. So that it may well be that whatever saving that might be brought through lowering standards would be eaten up in higher insurance and maintenance rates.

Now Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I would say that the national building code in our estimation is a fairly good code. The areas dealing with apartments, except for the one which I have mentioned which could be changed, and those dealing with businesses and factories, all these I think are basically pretty good. But this part dealing with housing, which has so much to do with the construction in all our civilization, is weak; and we could not possibly agree that this be done.

I think that the code could be used as a guide; certainly, I think the code could be upgraded. It may well be that a double code ought to be adopted. One for urban areas where people are crowded together, where fire hazards are greater, and another one for rural areas where buildings are spaced farther apart and where, perhaps, even the allowance of cedar shingles on roofs, might be allowed, although even there in a cluster of farm buildings I am not so sure it should.

So this may be one of the answers, that we develop a national building code which applies in one instance to the urban development and the other instance to rural development; some place along there the dividing line would have to be drawn. If this were done, if the code were upgraded in order to meet the difficulties that I have mentioned, to eliminate the conflicts and to bring the housing section into some real state where it could be adopted as an enforceable bylaw by the municipalities, then I think our objections could be overcome. But in this form, this resolution is unacceptable, particularly when the mover of the motion said it should be adopted without amendment in its present form.

Mr. White: I should like to support the member for Halton East, who has introduced this resolution, and speak for just two or three minutes on the subject.

Red tape of every kind is expensive, a fact that our friends in the NDP are slow to recognize, and this I think is a very good

example of how the multiplicity and profusion of regulations adds to the cost and detracts from the efficiency which private enterprise can accomplish in areas of this kind.

I was interested to read, a week or two ago, an article in a Canadian weekly about increasing housing costs. Strangely enough, labour costs had gone up very little and the costs of materials, if I remember correctly, had gone up very little. Legal costs have gone from $500 to $700, and I suppose the legal profession justifies this on a basis that there is a lot more red tape involved. I believe that the governments at every level are making housing much more expensive, and much more difficult to get.

The remedy to the weaknesses in the federal code is not having supplementary codes for provinces like Ontario, but rather for the provincial governments to be represented on the national building code committees, and in this way to draw weaknesses to the attention of the national body and in that way to construct a national code that will be fully applicable to the various regions of Canada. I have no objections to having different standards for rural and urban areas and, as a matter of fact, think this is quite appropriate.

The precedent for this has been established in the tax structure committee on which group the federal government has three members and it may be that they would wish to have some disproportionately large number on the national housing authority.

Now, my friends, the real culprit in this whole problem is the federal government; and that is why housing is very expensive and very hard to get. Through their fiscal policies, they insist on using housing as a contra-cyclical economic instrument. They have deprived the provinces of an adequate share of the total governmental resources available. The municipalities are therefore starved for funds, and instead of providing sewers, sidewalks, roads, schools, and so on, from general tax revenues, these costs are loaded onto the price of a lot.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. White: Listen to me for a minute; when you speak on legal matters, I listen to you!

If these resources were appropriately distributed, the price of a lot would only be $2,000 instead of seven or eight or nine or ten. That is one feature of it. Second, if housing were removed from contra-cyclical monetary policy, as indeed it should be, the most important increase in the cost of housing would be eliminated, and that is the cost of the interest.

A third point I would like to mention, and this is true in the United States–

Mr. Singer: That is very quick.

Mr. White: –is that the federal government should establish a formal second market for mortgages. The United States, notwithstanding inflation caused by the Vietnam war, is the only country in the world where housing prices and rental costs are going down. And one of the important reasons, I am assured by experts in this field, is that there is an active second market for mortgages through an agency of the federal government, comparable to the federal reserve banks but operating entirely with the savings and loan association to make liquid their assets when occasion requires.

Mr. Singer: Why does the government not do it?

Mr. White: So I suggest that the government take a very long look at this, sir, and I am sure they will do so. But it cannot conceal the fact that the problem in housing is coming from Ottawa and from socialistically minded bureaucrats.

Mr. Speaker: This order is discharged.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Mr. Speaker, may I remind the hon. members that tomorrow there will be a night session. The main order of business tomorrow, of course, will be the Throne debate and I think we should be prepared for some second readings, particularly of the one item that is on the order paper today.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 6:00 o'clock, p.m.

No. 14

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

First Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Tuesday, March 5, 1968

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1968

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Tuesday, March 5, 1968

Tabling report No. 1 of the McRuer commission on civil rights, Mr. Robarts 421
Third report, standing committee on private bills, Mr. Carton 422
Second report, standing committee on standing orders and printing, Mr. W. E. Johnston 422
Tabling report of the commissioner of agricultural loans, Mr. MacNaughton 422
Board of education for the city of London, bill respecting, Mr. White, first reading 423
Ewart College, bill respecting, Mr. Whitney, first reading 423
Board of the combined Roman Catholic schools of Renfrew, bill respecting, Mr. Henderson, first reading 423
Township of Vaughan, bill respecting, Mr. Deacon, first reading 423
Town of Palmerston, bill respecting, Mr. Downer, first reading 423
Township of Pelee, bill respecting, Mr. Spence, first reading 423
County of Welland, bill respecting, Mr. Morningstar, first reading 423
City of Niagara Falls, bill respecting, Mr. Worton, first reading 423
City of Welland, bill respecting, Mr. Morningstar, first reading 423
Janbi Holdings Ltd., bill respecting, Mr. Reilly, first reading 423
Village of Point Edward, bill respecting, Mr. Bullbrook, first reading 423
Walbi Holdings Limited, bill respecting, Mr. Reilly, first reading 423
Cardinal Insulation Limited, bill respecting, Mr. Gaunt, first reading 423
Carleton University and English Oblates of eastern Canada, bill respecting, Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence, first reading 423
Town of Bowmanville, bill respecting, Mr. Carruthers, first reading 424
Laurentian University of Sudbury, bill respecting, Mr. Sopha, first reading 424
Question to Mr. Robarts re an inquiry into consumer prices, Mr. MacDonald 429
Question to Mr. McKeough re local taxation of INCO, Mr. Sopha 430
Questions to Mr. Stewart re the sugar beet industry, Mr. Gaunt, Mr. Makarchuk, Mr. Spence 430
Questions to Mr. Dymond re Thistletown children's hospital and the children's psychiatric research institute, Mr. Lewis 431
Questions to Mr. Wishart re the Rev. Russell Horsburgh, Mr. Lewis 431
Question to Mr. Bales re The Workmen's Compensation Act, Mr. Deans 431
Question to Mr. Randall re land assembly, Mr. Deans 432
Question to Mr. Robarts re economic growth plan for northwestern Ontario, Mr. Stokes 432
Question to Mr. A. F. Lawrence re inspection of mines, Mr. Martel 433
Question to Mr. Brunelle re departmental aircraft, Mr. T. P. Reid 434
Questions to Mr. Wishart re transplant operations, Mr. MacDonald 435
Question to Mr. Dymond re chloromycetin, Mr. B. Newman 435
Question to Mr. Randall re financing for homes with septic tanks, Mr. Sargent 436
Municipal Act, bill to amend, Mr. McKeough, second reading 437
Municipal Act, bill to amend, reported 437
Third reading 437
Department of Trade and Development, bill to establish, Mr. Randall, on second reading 438
Recess, 6 o'clock 456

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

TUESDAY, MARCH 5, 1968

The House met at 2.30 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are always pleased to have visitors to the Legislature and today we welcome as guests, in the east gallery, students from St. Veronica's separate school.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to table report No. 1 of the inquiry into civil rights conducted by the Honourable J. C. McRuer.

This report is the first of the two reports which will represent the most thorough analysis and report upon civil rights that has ever been undertaken in Ontario. These three volume contain the commission's report upon statutory powers in the administrative process, the administration of civil and criminal justice in the province and safeguards against the unjustified exercise of statutory powers.

The depth of the commissioner's analysis, together with the incisiveness of his comments and recommendations, reflect the exhaustive effort which he has devoted to his subject. The commissioner is still engrossed in the completion of the companion report to this one. May I say that the people of this province will long be indebted to the Honourable J. C. McRuer for this searching investigation into and report upon subjects that must be part of the life of each and every one of us.

As the complexities of our modern society increase, we must be more careful than ever that the rights of the individual do not become lost in the intricacies of all forms of social organization that overtake us. The protection of these individual rights is the purpose for which these studies were initiated by this government.

We have not yet, of course had an opportunity of considering the detail of the report which I have tabled, but in my brief study of the document it is obvious that it establishes what might well be considered as the guidelines for our approach to all legislation coming before this House. The principles which are enunciated throughout the report will commend themselves to every person in the province, but particularly to all of the hon. members here. Copies have been placed on the desks of all members already.

In some cases it would appear that certain areas of responsibility and action have been approached already by the government in a manner now recommended by this report. These include the assumption by the province of the costs of the administration of justice, but there are many areas to which we have now been directed and to which we will now proceed to address ourselves in what lies ahead of us.

While some of the recommendations may be adapted to matters presently pending before this House, the greater number of recommendations are of a significance and an import which will require considerably more work and time than may be immediately available to any of us. We are starting forthwith upon an intensive study and examination of the report which will lead to the application of the principles and recommendations that are embodied in it.

I am informed by the commissioner that he hopes the balance of this monumental work will be completed by early autumn. While awaiting the final volumes, we will, as I have said, have the benefit of these volumes presently tabled as we go about our business here in the House.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, it may be in order for me to make one or two brief comments on the introduction of this report. Certainly, I join with the Premier (Mr. Robarts) in extending the thanks of this House to the commissioner and his staff, who have laboured long and, I trust well, in preparing the report for our perusal.

As a matter of fact, from this side of the House we have been wondering what that red book with the blue binding was across the way there for some days, and now we know since the three-volume report is at our disposal.

Mr. McRuer, of course, has been associated with the Dumfries township area of this province and his family is still located there. Perhaps it is because he is in the House today that this is a good opportunity for all of us, as hon. members, to express our appreciation for what has been a life of leadership and service, which I know will continue for many years.

Mr. G. R. Carton from the standing committee on private bills, presented the committee's third report which was read as follows and adopted:

Your committee begs to report the following bills without amendment:

Bill Pr25, An Act respecting Wool and Gift Shops (Toronto) Limited.

Bill Pr31, An Act respecting the township of Rayside.

Bill Pr40, An Act respecting the city of Eastview.

Bill Pr41, An Act respecting the Canadian order of foresters.

Bill Pr43, An Act respecting Imperial Sewing Machine Limited and Imperial Sewing Machine Company (Kitchener) Limited.

Mr. W. E. Johnston, from the standing committee on standing orders and printing, presented the committee's second report which was read as follows and adopted:

Your committee has carefully examined the following petitions and finds the notices, as published in each case, sufficient:

Of the combined Roman Catholic separate schools of Renfrew praying that an Act may pass authorizing the board to borrow upon debentures the sum of $350,000.

Of the corporation of the town of Bowmanville praying that an Act may pass authorizing the issue of debentures for public works.

Of the corporation of the township of Vaughan praying that an Act may pass preserving street lighting areas; and for other purposes.

Of the corporation of the town of Palmerston praying that an Act may pass dissolving the Palmerston hospital commission and transferring the assets and liabilities to the Palmerston general hospital.

Of the corporation of the city of Niagara Falls praying that an Act may pass authorizing the continuation of the Greater Niagara transit commission; and for other purposes.

Of Melvin M. Anaka, Helen Anaka and Joseph Dexter praying that an Act may pass reviving Cardinal Insulation Limited, a private Ontario company.

Of the corporation of the county of Welland praying that an Act may pass authorizing the county of Welland and the cities of Niagara Falls, Welland and Port Colborne to enter into agreements for the erection and maintenance of homes for retarded persons.

Of the corporation of the city of Welland praying that an Act may pass providing for the establishment of a parks and recreation board.

Of the board of education for the city of London praying that an Act may pass confirming certain payments of retirement allowances, and for other purposes.

Of the corporation of the township of Pelee praying that an Act may pass authorizing it to establish, operate and maintain a farm for raising pheasants; and for other purposes.

Of Agnes Roy, Jean Louise MacLellan and James Donald McCormack praying that an Act may pass to incorporate Ewart College.

Of Laurentian University of Sudbury praying that an Act may pass changing its name to Laurentian University, and in French to Université Laurentienne; and for other purposes.

Of the corporation of the village of Point Edward praying that an Act may pass removing the application of section 44 and paragraph 8 of section 4 of The Assessment Act as they apply to the Blue Water bridge.

Of Carleton University praying that an Act may pass ratifying a certain deed of conveyance.

Of Walter Bick, Bessie E. Hallatt, Theodore I. Sherman and Jack Sydney Midanik praying that an Act may pass reviving Janbi Holdings Limited.

Of Jeanny Bick, Bessie E. Hallatt, Theodore I. Sherman and Jack Sydney Midanik praying that an Act may pass reviving Walbi Holdings Limited.

Your committee recommends that the customary supplies allowance to members for the current session of the assembly be fixed at $300.

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Provincial Treasurer): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to table the annual report of the commissioner of agricultural loans for the year ending March 31, 1967, and the third annual report of the pension committee of Ontario for the year ending December 31, 1966.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Introduction of bills.

BOARD OF EDUCATION FOR THE CITY OF LONDON

Mr. J. H. White (London South) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the board of education for the city of London.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

EWART COLLEGE

Mr. N. Whitney (Prince Edward-Lennox) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting Ewart College.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

BOARD OF THE COMBINED ROMAN CATHOLIC SCHOOLS OF RENFREW

Mr. L. C. Henderson (Lambton) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the board of the combined Roman Catholic schools of Renfrew.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

TOWNSHIP OF VAUGHAN

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the township of Vaughan.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

TOWN OF PALMERSTON

Mr. A. W. Downer (Dufferin-Simcoe) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the town of Palmerston.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

TOWNSHIP OF PELEE

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the township of Pelee.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

COUNTY OF WELLAND

Mr. E. P. Morningstar (Welland) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the county of Welland.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

CITY OF NIAGARA FALLS

Mr. H. Worton (Wellington South) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the city of Niagara Falls.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

CITY OF WELLAND

Mr. Morningstar moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the city of Welland.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

JANBI HOLDINGS LIMITED

Mr. L. M. Reilly (Eglinton) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting Janbi Holdings Limited.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

VILLAGE OF POINT EDWARD

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the village of Point Edward.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

WALBI HOLDINGS LIMITED

Mr. Reilly moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting Walbi Holdings Limited.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

CARDINAL INSULATION LIMITED

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting Cardinal Insulation Limited.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

CARLETON UNIVERSITY AND ENGLISH OBLATES OF EASTERN CANADA

Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence (Carleton East) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting Carleton University and English Oblates of eastern Canada.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

TOWN OF BOWMANVILLE

Mr. A. Carruthers (Durham) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the town of Bowmanville.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

LAURENTIAN UNIVERSITY OF SUDBURY

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury) moves first reading of bill initituled, An Act respecting Laurentian University of Sudbury.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Before the orders of the day, I think we would like to welcome back the immediate previous speaker of the House who has been away for some time through illness. I think we are all glad to see him here.

Mr. G. Ben (Humber): On a point of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker. I will first state my point of personal privilege and then I will give the arguments in support of my assertion.

My point of personal privilege is that you, Mr. Speaker, have deprived me of one of the prerogatives of a member in this House by having refused me the right to ask a question of a Minister of the Crown.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the conduct of members of this House is governed by the rules of the legislative assembly of Ontario as they have been published by this assembly and given to all new members when they are sworn as members of the House.

I presume that being here, and the Clerk having certified as to returns of the election held in Humber riding in the last general election, I am entitled to be here as a representative of the people in Humber. The first rule under the regulation provides:

> (a) The proceedings in the legislative assembly of Ontario and in all committees of the assembly shall be conducted according to the following rules and standing order.

I draw your attention to the word "shall," which is mandatory: Part (b) of paragraph 1 states that in all contingencies unprovided for, the question shall be decided by the Speaker, and so on.

Mr. Speaker, rule 37 of those particular rules, part 5, states as follows:

> (a) Questions may be put to Ministers of the Crown relating to public affairs and to other members relating to any bill, motion or other public matter connected with the business of the House in which such member may be concerned, but in putting any such question, no argument or opinion is to be offered nor any facts stated and in answering any such question, a member is not to debate the matter to which the question refers.

Part (b), of section 37, reads as follows:

> Such questions and the replies thereto, shall be in writing, and shall be entered in the journal.
>
> (c) Where a question requires, by way of reply thereto, any statement of fact or records, or statistics of a lengthy or voluminous nature or other material which, in the opinion of the Minister whose department is concerned, should be made the subject of a return, the Minister may, instead of answering such question require a motion to be made for a return.

In the same handbook of parliamentary procedure in Ontario, the author, once a Clerk of this House, quotes May, 242, extensively:

> The purpose of a question is to obtain information, and not to supply information to the House. A question may not contain statements of fact unless they be necessary to make the question intelligible, and can be authenticated; nor should a question contain arguments, expressions of opinion, inferences or imputations. Quotations are not permitted, or epithets, or controversial, ironical or offensive expressions. Nor may a question refer to debates.

In the handbook it is stated as follows:

> May has been quoted very fully here to supplement the bare rules contained in the Ontario rule book in order that the members may have the most complete knowledge of how a question should be framed. The putting of questions to Ministers of the Crown is a most important part of House procedure for the private member, and especially so to a member of an Opposition party. Under modern procedure, with the party system in effect and with the management of the House largely in the hands of the government, the putting of questions affords a useful method of supervising the work of administration and provides the private member with the greatest opportunity of taking part in the workings of the House, and to secure

information which is often enlightening and of great public importance.

Mr. Nixon: And often not.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Speaker, if I may be permitted to say so without sounding insulting to your position, the function of the Speaker is to stand between the members of the Legislature and the Crown. Your prime purpose here is to protect the members against the impositions of the Crown, of authority, which in this case is represented by the Ministers of the Crown.

Again without sounding derogatory to your office, Mr. Speaker, I want to stress that you are essentially here to protect the interest of the private members against the interest of the Crown—that is to say the government benches, the Cabinet.

Mr. Speaker, I submitted a series of questions the day before yesterday to the Minister of Education (Mr. Davis). I sat in this House and as the Minister of Education was not here I presumed, as I was rightly entitled to presume, that the questions would be put forward to the following day, that is today. I appeared to ask the questions and I was informed that you had arbitrarily and without any right according to these rules, put these questions on the order paper.

Mr. Speaker, the rule is quite assertive that you can only interfere and create new rules if there is not an existing rule to cover the situation. The rule is there which entitles me as a private member to ask questions of the Crown and, in fact, of any member of this House if it so moves me. The first question that I put is on the order paper for the benefit of the members, and I shall read it.

Mr. Speaker: I would ask that the member not read it, but just refer to it and go on with his speech.

Mr. Ben: The fact I would like to stress is that there was no preamble. It did not contain a statement of fact, it did not contain any arguments, expressions of opinion, inferences or imputations. There were no quotations, or epithets, or controversial, or ironical, or offensive expressions. You, sir, took it upon yourself to deprive me of one of my prerogatives, to ask questions of the Crown. And I say that it is arbitrary and unwarranted.

I feel that if we, the legislators, the people who are charged with the responsibility of framing and putting into effect laws for the conduct of the people of this province ourselves do not abide by the rules which we set, then I ask you, Mr. Speaker, and the members of this House, how can we demand that the average citizen obey the laws that we have?

Mr. Speaker, you are not only the guardian of our rights, you are the guardian of the rights of the citizens. One of their rights is to send a member to this House and have him conduct himself according to the rules of this House—rules which are enshrined in tradition and even printed for the benefit of the members. Mr. Speaker, without entering into any personalities, I suggest that your office in this instance failed.

I exceedingly resent being deprived of the right of representing my people according to the rules of Parliamentary procedure, established by a long period of British government. I request that these questions that you have put on the order paper be stricken by you from the order paper; and that these questions be put to the Minister to whom they were addressed when he appears in this House.

Mr. Speaker, if we are not going to obey the rules, I repeat to you, we have no right to demand that the citizens of this province obey the laws that we pass here.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: The member has placed with my office and I have placed with the Clerk's office, notice of questions which the members can read. The questions are Nos. 22 to 26, inclusive, on the motion of Monday, March 4, 1968. I am pleased to find that the member takes a very keen interest in the workings of the House because that is certainly how a House works properly, if each member learns the rules and obeys them.

I concur entirely in the remarks of the member with respect to the position of Speaker of this House and the position of Mr. Speaker between the Crown and any member of any party. I think he has stated the case exceedingly well.

However, I would point out to the member, and in this I am fortified by the Clerk of this House who is an authority, and the son and successor to the gentleman who wrote these rules quoted by the member, that by rule 39 (a) there must be two days' notice given of any question, and there is no provision for an oral question; the questions must be written and published in the journals of the House.

But over a period of time, a practice has grown up in the House, and I think quite

rightly, whereby the questions can be submitted, in accordance with the rules as quoted correctly by the member, to the office of the Speaker for checking to ensure that they are in pursuance of the rules. And if they come in by a certain time each day, which has been discussed in the House, then they are permitted to be asked, orally in the House with three or four hours' notice, rather than the two days' notice as stated in the votes and proceedings order paper.

I also concur in the statement of the member for Humber, that the Speaker is the servant of this House. I will go further and say that the rules of this House are made for the time being for the members of this House. So, if the member for Humber, or any others, wish to have the House rules amended to deal with the problem which apparently has arisen with him, although there has been little difficulty with other members, it is quite open to him, and I would encourage him to take the necessary action to have the members of this House change the rules.

I would also point out that one of the bases of the oral questions before the orders of the day, with the two hours' notice rather than the written question and answer with two days' notice as provided by the rules, is to allow matters of immediate importance and urgency to be discussed in the House. I think that this is a very sound ruling of the House. It is not in the rules but it is in the tradition and usages of the House.

There is one further condition to a question which will be accepted prior to the orders of the day, orally, and that is that it be of urgent and immediate importance.

I think the members may agree that during the first part of this session, at least, there has been a very considerable latitude given to such questions as have been asked and that this particular rule has not been applied strictly by me or by my office. I would invite the members to read the questions which were submitted by the member for Humber and which formed the basis of his question as to privilege and judge for themselves whether they are of such immediate and urgent importance that they should be dealt with before the orders of the day or, requiring a certain amount of research and government consideration, should be tabled or answered through the printed proceedings of the House.

Now with respect to the member's suggestion that I should strike these questions off the printed records of the House, I must say that I do not have that power on my own; the member has the right to request that they be withdrawn and I would presume also that a resolution of the House might authorize that to be done. But I deny that Mr. Speaker has the right to alter the printed records of this House unless so directed by the House.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak to the point of order that has been raised, if I may. The matter pertaining to questions—

Mr. Speaker: Are you raising a point of order?

Mr. Nixon: I understand, sir, that by the rules there are only points of order. Since you accepted the previous statement—it is this point of order I would like to bring to your attention, that the matters pertaining to questions are obviously going to give us some continuing difficulty.

You may recall, sir, that just yesterday there was a misunderstanding as to whether a private member would have the right to put a question to the Ministry when the Minister involved was not actually in the House, and it was your decision at that time that, in fact, the private member was not granted that privilege.

I would like to bring to your attention, sir, and this is associated with the main point that you are considering, that one of the members had abided by your ruling previously, and although he had not put the question to the Minister when the Minister was absent for two days, when the Minister did return, he answered the question without, in fact, it having been put from this side.

So it appears that there is going to be continuing confusion, since you point out yourself that the rules of the House do not deal explicitly, and in writing, with the whole method of putting oral questions.

Now we have put the argument to you previously that there should be a general review of these rules, agreement being reached by all hon. members with your concurrence and that they would then be set down in writing for everyone to guide themselves by. I would suggest to you, sir, that until we do that, until we get away from just going by the ordinary accepted procedures in years gone by, there is going to be this continuing confusion.

It appears to me that the point of order put to you by the member for Humber is very well taken indeed, until you say that the rule does not apply to oral questions but only to written questions. Surely the intent, however, that is expressed in the rule book that does guide our comments and conduct here, ex-

presses the hon. member's point very well indeed.

So it appears that the only way out of a continuing difficulty with regard to a question period which, I think, has been very serviceable for both sides of the House so far in this session, is to get down to cases and codify an acceptable series of rules that will govern both government and Opposition in this regard.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Speaker, in addressing yourself in reply to the assertion I made, you made a number of points, and one of them was that of "48 hours' notice". There was an implication in your statement, Mr. Speaker, that I had not given the required 48 hours' notice pursuant to the rules. I remind you, Mr. Speaker, that the question was submitted more than 48 hours in advance of this present sitting, at which time I would have been entitled to raise the question, had it not been put on the order paper. Therefore, I am in compliance with the rules in that particular regard.

When it comes to the question of a matter of urgent public importance, there again I draw your attention, Mr. Speaker, to the fact that there is no such provision in the rule as passed by this assembly in 1939, and as reprinted in the parliamentary procedure handbook for the province of Ontario.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, it need not be a matter of public importance whatsoever, but simply of concern to the member, as the rule states. And what is of concern to the member, of course, is up to him to decide.

But if, Mr. Speaker, one feels in your position that it must be a matter of public importance, I respectfully draw your attention, threfore, to the newspaper editorials that have been published in the last week pertaining to this particular topic—on education. The *Globe and Mail* of March 1—in Saskatoon, there was another article reported by the *Globe and Mail* on March 1.

The *Daily Star* and the *Telegram* carried editorials both on March 4 and March 1. As a matter of fact, one cannot pick up a daily paper, one has not been able to pick up a daily paper for the last two weeks—without finding the chief topic of discussion to be the discord that now exists between the supporters of the public school systems in this province and the separate school systems.

So I suggest with all due respect, Mr. Speaker, that if any subject is now topical it is that of education in this province, and certainly it is a matter of public importance.

I reiterate, Mr. Speaker, I do not accept your ruling that it must be a question of importance. The rules are specific, and where the rules are specific, no one can interfere with them except another rules committee which would set up a new set of rules.

There is nothing in the rules which requires any question put to a Minister of the Crown to be of public importance; it need only be a question which concerns the member asking it. I respectfully submit, Mr. Speaker, that it is your duty to this House, and to the members in it, to abide by the rules.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, how do you pick and choose what questions shall go on the order paper?

Mr. Speaker: May I first say to the member for Humber and the leader of the Opposition that I think the suggestion made by the leader of the Opposition is a sound one. It is one which will allow us to proceed in accordance with the customs and traditions and rules of this House, and I, for one, would be most pleased if a committee were set up, representing the three parties in the House, to consult with the Clerk of the House and with Mr. Speaker and see if we can make some progress towards elucidating this matter.

To the member for Humber, I merely say that the rules provide only for written, and not for oral questions; and therefore the procedure followed by the Speaker has been in accordance with the rules.

With respect to the member for Grey-Bruce and his question, I might say that not everyone gives Mr. Speaker the same choice as the member for Grey-Bruce as to disposing of questions. I think if the members will look at the notice paper and at the printed votes and proceedings, they will find out that those matters which were of any significant importance and that could be answered by the Minister having the question at about 12:00 o'clock, or 1:00 o'clock, and answering it at 2:30 in the afternoon were always allowed to go through.

If it was a question which, in my opinion, and often substantiated by the Minister's office, required such investigation and statistics that it was quite impossible that the answer could be produced with any certainty between the hour of 12:00 or 1:00—whenever it was received by the Minister—and 2:30 when the House opened, then the procedure which I

have followed was to have put it on the order paper.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, I—

Mr. Speaker: The member has asked me a question. May I answer it first and then he can have the floor.

And so, consequently, by and large those have been the rules. I think, by and large, the questions that have been of importance have come before the orders of the day orally, and many which should not have come through, and should have gone on the order paper, have been allowed to come through.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, I say most respectfully that the embarrassing questions to the government go on the order paper and I think it is—

Mr. Speaker: The member for High Park (Mr. Shulman) probably would not agree.

Mr. Sargent: Pardon?

Mr. Speaker: The member for High Park probably would not agree with you concerning his questions of the Attorney General.

Mr. Sargent: I am still not clear what yardstick you use to pick and choose what questions shall come before the House.

Mr. Speaker: I have answered that.

Mr. Sargent: Well, we should have the rule changed then because this is entirely wrong.

Mr. Speaker: If the member had listened to his leader, and my comments with respect to that, he would know that a suggestion has been made, in which I concur heartily.

I have asked the House, and I presume that the House leaders of the various parties will deal with it in due course. I hope it will not be too long because Mr. Speaker does not enjoy having to substitute his discretion and interpretation of the rules for the discretion and interpretation of the rules by individual members. But, unfortunately, there is a great diversity in the manner in which you, sir, and other members interpret the rules and, therefore, it always does cause confusion.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, may I just add briefly three points to the points of order that have been raised here.

I take it that you have indicated that you are going to move to establish an appropriate body to consider at least this aspect of the rules of the House, and I would heartily support that. I always supported it from the outset when we had the appropriate body, and I leave it to your own good judgment as to what would be the appropriate body to consider at least this aspect.

Second, in the interim, until we do get some clarification, and I presume a written clarification, I think we might avoid difficulties if when a member submits a question that he be so informed that it is going to be put on the order paper rather than, as I understand it in this case, the member is under the impression that he is going to have the right to ask it, and then unexpectedly—

Mr. Speaker: May I just clarify that? The Speaker's office always advises the member, if he can be reached and if he cannot his secretary, that the question would go on the order paper; and that was done by the Speaker's office in the case of the member for Humber. But he was not there and the message was left for him.

Mr. MacDonald: You have met that point I wanted to make, Mr. Speaker.

The final point is that—and when we get into the discussion maybe this is something we should pursue—I share, in one small degree, an apprehension with the hon. member for Humber; namely, how you draw the distinction between an urgent question and something that should be put on the order paper, because it may be very urgent in an individual member's riding.

For example, if I may illustrate my point, I think of the five questions that you have put on the order paper. There is no debate at all with regard to the first four. They require research.

But I think the fifth one is one that could be answered as readily as most of the questions that are being put here today. It asks for specific figures as of December 31, 1967, and those are readily available, as readily available as much of the information that is given to the House.

I agree this puts you in a difficult position because you have to examine each one with care and even when we have come up with a set of rules, undoubtedly, on occasion, there will be differences of view between you and individual members—but I think we can live with that.

We can sort all this out in the appropriate body that you are about to appoint.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I have a word to say about this whole matter.

I stated previously in this House that I think the question period is necessary. I like the oral question period because there are matters the members want answers to forthwith, and in the great majority of cases the government is able and quite prepared to give them.

I would just point out, too, that over the last four or five years we have maintained the practice of meetings between the leaders of the three groups in the House to discuss matters of procedure, and we have had some very good results from these meetings. We managed through this type of co-operation to straighten out the three debates last year and to establish the private members' hour on a fixed basis. I would be quite prepared to follow that same practice in straightening out this question period and the problems connected therewith.

I would just sound one note of warning to all the members of the House; let us not get into too strict an interpretation of rules and too many rules strictly laid down. We have accepted many questions on this side of the House and answered them, which, in my opinion, could very easily have been refused, and if we were to have a very strict interpretation of the rules on every question, then we should have refused to receive them.

This is the problem when you start getting the rules very strictly interpreted, in the long run you are going to lose something. I like a degree of flexibility.

I have not read these four or five questions —there is an argument here this afternoon about the interpretation of some number of questions. I agree entirely with the Speaker that you cannot go to the rule book to find the rules covering all questions, because oral questions are not covered in our rule book at all. Therefore, the rules the hon. member for Humber is quoting simply do not apply to oral questions.

However, if we want to bring a little more definitiveness to the rules governing oral questions, I would be quite happy, sir, to meet at your request and at your call, to see if we cannot maintain the question period as we have had it. I am sure it is a useful instrument, without crippling it by getting too close to rules that must be followed.

Mr. Ben: I wonder if I might ask a question of you, Mr. Speaker, without the usual 48 hours' notice?

Mr. Speaker, you have put my notices—

Mr. Speaker: May I suggest to the member that the problems which he has had have been well aired and the House is aware of them. The suggestion made by the leader of his party, concurred in by the Prime Minister and the leader of the New Democratic Party, is a sound one. I propose to avail myself of it and I think, perhaps, we should deal with this problem at the present time.

Now with respect to the member's own personal problem and questions, I would be most pleased if he would come and discuss it with me, either in my office here when the House is carrying on in my absence, or in my office downstairs. I can assure him that I will do with him as I have done with the other members – endeavour to arrange things to the best interest of the member concerned.

I do not think we are gaining either any prestige for the member, or for the House, to continue this at the present time.

Mr. Ben: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I do not accept that you should say that I have a personal problem. The matter is your problem. I cannot request to have removed from the order paper anything which I did not put on the order paper, Mr. Speaker and I did not put any questions on the order paper.

My question is this: How do you propose to remove questions on the order paper which were improperly put on there in my name?

Mr. Sargent: That is a good question.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister.

In view of the significant results gained from the inquiry into consumer prices in food retailing in the prairie provinces, would the Prime Minister consider initiating such an inquiry in the province of Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, I assume this question arises from the published reports of the Batten report on prairie living costs, which is very fully reported in the "Report on Business" in the morning paper. Therefore, I think we could all agree that this matter might have some immediate importance and, therefore, would properly be the subject of an oral question.

We are very interested in this report, and the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs (Mr. Rowntree) has made the necessary arrangements to ensure we get copies of

the final report so that we may examine it to see what is contained in it that might be of immediate benefit to us in this province.

After we have had an opportunity of examining it, we will decide as to whether or not a parallel form of investigation would be of value here in Ontario. We have not, of course, come to that conclusion as yet, but I can only repeat we do not think we have a corner on all the ideas that are available, and if there are some findings in this report that will be of benefit to us forthwith, we will examine them and adopt them. Then we will decide, after we have looked at this report, as to whether we need something similar here in this province.

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Municipal Affairs that has been of immediate importance to the people of Sudbury for 58 years.

In view of the indications given by the International Nickel Company of Canada Limited, in its brief presented to the government on the Smith report, that it agrees that the company should pay its fair share of the cost of municipal services to municipal government in the Sudbury area, would the Minister inform the House what steps his department will take, and when they will be taken, to render the International Nickel Company of Canada Limited amenable to local taxation?

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Minister of Municipal Affairs): I apologize that I was not in the House yesterday to answer the hon. member's question. I rather suspected, when the brief arrived on Friday, that there would be some interest in this matter from the hon. member for Sudbury and, indeed, the hon. member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Demers) phoned me about this on Friday night. I am sorry that I was not here to answer the question yesterday.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Was the Minister there to answer the phone?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, you will recall on February 27, that in reply to another question, I referred to a schedule set out by the hon. Provincial Treasurer for the submission of briefs to the government on the Smith committee's report recommendations.

The submission deadline of March 1 was for private individuals and organizations, and the International Nickel Company would fit into this category. I assume that is why they filed their brief with the Provincial Treasurer on Thursday or Friday last.

April 1 is the deadline for individual municipalities and May 1 is the deadline for municipal associations. After that, a series of meetings is proposed for the month of May. Consequently, no decisions or commitments of any kind have as yet been made by the government with respect to the implementation of the report's recommendations, with the exception of the basic shelter grant recommendation and the recommendation regarding the cost of the administration of justice. The submission of the International Nickel Company referred to by the member for Sudbury is being evaluated by the central committee of The Department of the Provincial Treasurer, as, indeed, are all submissions by individuals, corporations, municipalities and associations.

My own department has received copies of the brief and we are, of course, studying it as well. It is being studied by officials in my department.

While acknowledging the importance of the proposals contained in the brief, I must advise the House, and the hon. member in particular, that it is not possible for me to indicate what action the government will take until submissions from all sources have been received and evaluated. But when we do, you will be the first to know, I guarantee that.

Thank you very much.

Mr. Gaunt: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Agriculture and Food, notice of which has been given.

Is the Minister in a position to give a complete report to the House on the negotiations which took place yesterday between his department and the federal Department of Agriculture, and members of the Canada and Dominion Sugar Company?

Mr. Speaker: I wonder if the member for Brantford and the member for Kent would also place their questions which are along a similar line.

Mr. M. Makarchuk (Brantford): I have a question for the Minister of Agriculture and Food.

In view of the fact that the farmers have to prepare ahead of time for spring seeding, is the Minister prepared to advise the farmers what they should do regarding the planting of sugar beets?

Mr. Spence: Mr. Speaker, I have a question to ask the Minister of which I have served notice.

What plans does the Minister have to save the sugar beet industry in the province of

Ontario, since the Canada and Dominion Sugar Company has refused to operate their refinery plant in the city of Chatham?

Part 2: What consideration does the Minister give to setting up a trusteeship to operate a sugar refinery plant in the city of Chatham for 1968?

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): Mr. Speaker, if I may, I would like to deal with all of these questions in general.

First of all I would like to say that we had a useful and productive meeting, I believe, in Ottawa yesterday. It was a meeting that lasted all day at which the province of Ontario was represented by my colleague, the Minister of Municipal Affairs, myself with the federal Minister of Agriculture, with his deputy and representatives of several other interested government departments along with the C and D officials, the sugar beet producers marketing board, and later in the day a meeting was held with that group and the farm organizations. There were many alternatives discussed. There were suggestions made, all of which are under consideration by us. We recognize the importance of the question as referred to by the member for Brantford. The farmers are indeed making plans now for spring planting. We should know as soon as we possibly can what the outcome of these present discussions will be. However, at the moment, I have nothing further than that to report other than to say that we are giving very serious consideration to the suggestions that were made yesterday by the sugar beet producers marketing board.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, may I submit my written question to the Minister of Health?

I remind the Speaker that there is no oral question period in this House, in fact.

To the Minister: (1) What is the current per diem cost of Thistletown children's hospital and the children's psychiatric research institute in London?

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): This question was answered for the hon. member by talking to a member of my staff today, sir. My answer is exactly the same: $38 per diem.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, this question was not answered in discussion with the Minister's staff. It is $38 per diem for which institution?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Both, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Lewis: May I ask a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker: Let me hear it. State your question.

Mr. Lewis: How has the per diem dropped? If memory serves me some $17 or $18 a day in the case of Thistletown children's hospital, from the figure that was given to this House two years ago.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I think, Mr. Speaker, the difference is that the research and educational factors have been cut off the rate I gave today.

Mr. Speaker: Has the member any further questions at this time?

Mr. Lewis: I have a question of the Attorney General: Has the Minister explored the possibility of providing compensation for the Rev. Russell Horsburgh?

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): The answer, Mr. Speaker, is no.

Mr. Lewis: May I ask a supplementary?

In view of the reasonably well known history of this case, does the Minister not feel that it may be an example of similar cases gone awry and worthy of consideration for compensation?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member uses the statement "well known history". I think I would say to him that there are many facets perhaps not known to him and to the public.

Mr. Lewis: What does that mean?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: That means—that part of the member's statement is not correct.

Mr. Lewis: He is a man who was acquitted. What is not known?

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): There should be written interjections.

Mr. Lewis: Is the Attorney General challenging the judiciary?

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Labour. Does the Minister intend to introduce amendments to The Workmen's Compensation Act to increase pension allowance payable to widows and children?

Hon. D. Bales (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, in reply to the question from the hon. member, I expect to introduce amendments to The Workmen's Compensation Act and I anticipate those amendments will include changes in allowances along with other revisions to the Act.

Mr. Deans: And, a question for the Minister of Economics and Development. A very short simple question. There should be no difficulty in answering it. Who assembled the land for Saltfleet satellite city?

Hon. S. J. Randall (Minister of Economics and Development): Mr. Speaker, a very short and simple answer. The land for the Saltfleet project was assembled by B. Kronas Real Estate and Insurance Limited of Hamilton.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Prime Minister. Did the Prime Minister receive a night letter on September 17, 1967, from Mr. R. K. Andras, MP for Port Arthur, proposing a joint federal-provincial project for development of an economic growth plan specifically designed for northwestern Ontario? (2) Does the government plan to participate in such a study? (3) If not, why not?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Yes, a night letter was received on September 17, 1967, from Robert K. Andras, MP for Port Arthur. Mr. Andras and I have been corresponding since early August on a proposal he put forward for a joint federal-provincial economic and sociological research study which would lead to a development plan for northwestern Ontario. The hon. Minister of Economics and Development has also been discussing this proposal with Mr. Andras.

I should like to refer to my letter to Mr. Andras of January 4, 1968:

> As the hon. Minister of Economics and Development pointed out in his letter to you in June, we are taking steps to gather together the many studies already made of the conditions and potential of northern and northwestern Ontario. The objective is to determine whether the existing research will provide the basis for other worthwhile programmes. The preparation for this analysis is completed and awaits only the appointment of the necessary staff to do the work.

And, further, from the same letter:

> Until we have analyzed the existing information I would hesitate to call upon the people of Ontario to spend additional money to finance a new study. As you suggest in your letter of August 1, your proposal "seems quite similar in principle" to what we are doing.

I also informed Mr. Andras on January 4 that, at the request of the federal ARDA, a meeting was to be held in Toronto on January 8 for the purpose of allocating funds for the establishment of the northern and northwestern Ontario research project. On January 8 The Departments of The Provincial Treasurer and Lands and Forests submitted allied proposals for an evaluation of the potential of northern Ontario, with a first year budget of $210,000. A second meeting on February 16 approved this project under the fund for rural economic development—FRED.

Under the project, the regional development branch of The Department of Treasury will undertake a basic evaluation of existing trends in population, agriculture and industry in northwestern Ontario. A similar evaluation is just being completed in the midwestern economic region—MODA—of southern Ontario. The northwestern project is the next major study to be undertaken by the regional development branch.

A further meeting will be held this Thursday, March 7, to establish a federal-provincial steering committee to administer the northern and northwestern Ontario project.

To answer more specifically the question of the hon. member, the government of Ontario is well advanced in implementing plans somewhat similar to those proposed by Mr. Andras. This government has a very active programme, which has been under way for some time, and is a natural follow-through of programmes we have been carrying out elsewhere in the province.

I believe that the study I have just outlined is indicative of the desire of this government to ensure the orderly and vigorous growth of all regions of Ontario.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Highways.

In view of the dangerous conditions which developed when two large cracks appeared in the steel on the Walmapitae bridge, 11 miles east of Sudbury on Highway 17, would the Minister advise the House: When the bridge was built; who supplied the steel; what construction company built the bridge; what tests are given steel used for main highway bridges; will an investigation be conducted and will the findings be made public?

Hon. G. E. Gomme (Minister of Highways): Mr. Speaker, I will have to take this as notice.

Mr. Martel: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Mines.

Can the Minister advise the House what steps will be taken by his department to ensure that no remedial work will take place once a company has been advised that an inspection is imminent?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence (Minister of Mines): Mr. Speaker, when this question was handed to me, I believed that an error had been made in the transmission of it, because I did not honestly and sincerely believe that the hon. member would submit such a question.

I can say to you, sir, I am not too sure whether he is more interested in the safety of the people in the mines, or whether he is more interested in attempting to embarrass the officials of The Department of Mines.

Mr. MacDonald: The new Minister is getting very touchy.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Because I am tempted to give him a short sharp retort—such as absolutely none. Anyone who suggests that a hazardous condition in the mines should remain is simply, in my view, not interested in safety.

Mr. Martel: That is not what I meant.

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I have raised a question that is very important to the people working in the mining industry, in the smelters.

Now, when inspection takes place, the International Nickel Company of Canada cleans up. They keep men in, working overtime, to clean up the conditions which exist, and give a complete distortion to the mines inspectors of what the conditions are from day to day, and that is what I am trying to get at. And for the Minister to make that type of statement, I think, is irresponsible on his part.

Mr. Sargent: He is new on the job.

Mr. MacDonald: No, he is very much in the old mould.

Mr. Martel: This is much like the police raiding a place and telling the crooks ahead of time they are coming.

Mr. Speaker: I would remind the member that this is the question period. He has another question directed to the Provincial Treasurer, perhaps he would put it.

Mr. Martel: Does Imperial Oil give an eight-tenths of a cent per gallon temporary allowance to the dealers and lessees in the Sudbury area, thus creating the impression that the wholesale price for gas in Sudbury is only 24.4 cents?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Speaker, I am obliged to say that I do not know.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I am very disturbed by the answer that the Attorney General gave to the supplementary question directed to him by the member for Scarborough West.

It seems to me, sir, that of all people in this House, the chief law officer of the Crown should be the last person who would imply, in a matter of public importance, that there is something more in it that the public does not know, than that which came before the courts.

The facts involving Horsburgh before the courts were—

Mr. Speaker: May I ask what the point of order is? You should state that first.

Mr. Singer: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I would think that the Attorney General should rise in his place and explain the essence of that statement, because he has damned unfairly, insofar as the public record is concerned, by clear implication, the gentleman who was acquitted by the courts of the province of Ontario.

Mr. Speaker: May I please first ask the member for Downsview to state his point of order? Is he stating that the Minister is misleading the House or what?

Mr. Singer: No, my point of order is this, sir; I would say that the chief law officer of the Crown has acted out of order when he implied that there is something more in the matter that came to public trial, than actually is reflected in the decision of the court.

Mr. MacDonald: My comment is, Mr. Speaker, that I agree completely that the Attorney General should either explain what he said or withdraw it, one or the other.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, I did not say, nor did I imply, that there was anything that was withheld from the courts in the trial of the case. I said there were facts not known to the hon. member, or to the public, and by that statement I stand.

Mr. MacDonald: Why were they not presented to the court?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: They were not necessarily a part of the court action. I say there were other facts.

Mr. Singer: Damned unfairly!

Hon. Mr. Wishart: But I will say this, Mr. Speaker, that I welcome the opportunity, now that this matter has been raised, to relate to the House many of the facts which were not known to the hon. member, and to the public—because certain statements have been made by the reverend gentleman with respect to my integrity, and I welcome the opportunity, which I shall take very soon, to tell this House the facts.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests, notice of which has been given.

Could the Minister advise the number and types of aircraft operating in northwestern Ontario in his department—this is not part of the question here—the principal use to which these aircraft are put; the cost per hour of operating each type of aircraft?

Hon. R. Brunelle (Minister of Lands and Forests): Mr. Speaker, in replying to the hon. member for Rainy River:

1. There are 17 department aircraft based in the northwestern region in the fire season. We have five standard Beavers, six Turbo-Beavers and six Otters. During the winter season, we operate seven aircraft; four Turbo-Beavers, two Beavers and one Otter.

2. The principal use of the aircraft is for fire control, wildlife and timber management, and in the winter months, the primary use is for wildlife surveys, such as moose surveys.

3. The cost per hour of operating each type of aircraft is as follows, and these are approximate figures:

Beaver, $40; Turbo-Beaver, $50; and Otters, $65.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the hon. member for Riverdale—

Mr. Speaker: May I just comment on this last question and then the member has a further question I would like him to state.

I would like to draw the attention of the House, since we have been discussing questions today, to this question which has just been placed and answered by the Minister of Lands and Forests. It is indicative of the desire of the Speaker's office and of the Ministries to give the information available.

This question was addressed to the Minister of Lands and Forests, and it asks this question:

Could the Minister advise the number and types of aircraft operating in northwestern Ontario?

By itself that question, of course, should properly either not have been received, or have been answered by the Minister as, "no", because there are many aircraft operating there other than the department's.

So I would say this; I would ask the members when they frame questions and send them to me as notice, that they read them again and make sure that they ask the question the member wishes to have answered.

Mr. Sargent: You would assume that it is his department, would you not?

Mr. Speaker: This is not a question of assumption. We have been having some difficulty today about not abiding by the rules, and whether we are or not, I would just point out that the members can help a very great deal by phrasing their questions so that they do ask the question which the member wishes answered.

Now in this case, the question was passed on by my office, because as the member for Grey-Bruce said, I assumed that it was his department, and the Minister so answered it. But the question need not have been either accepted or so answered.

The member for Rainy River has a further question.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Mr. Speaker, I accept your rebuke. I must ask you, sir, and also the Minister of Lands and Forests, I have a little blue margin on this question. Could I ask whether the whole question is in order, or have I been censored on part of it?

Mr. Speaker: I do not have a copy of that question, so perhaps the member would send it to me and direct the question he has for the Minister of Mines while I look at this one.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Mr. Speaker, I must apologize. I do not have a question for the Minister of Mines here.

Mr. Speaker: Well, this is an unusual development, where the Minister has one question and I have another. I will pass this up to you and if you recognize it as your question—the Minister has not received it—

I will pass it up to the member to see if he recognizes it as his question, and then, in this instance, I will let him ask it, and the Minister take it as notice.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That was a supplementary question he asked first.

Mr. Speaker: May I just finish with the member for Rainy River? The question which was submitted by the member for Rainy River was not one which was worded so that it could be understood.

I spoke to the secretary from the office and suggested how it could be amended, if the member wished, so that it would make reasonable sense. The question did not come back to my office, so I presume that by tomorrow, it will be reworded and that I will receive it.

That is the answer to this. I suspect that the blue marks were made by the secretary who brought it in, because I talked to her and she wrote while we were talking.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Mr. Speaker, I received notice too late to resubmit the question.

Now, Mr. Speaker, with all due respect, this is a question I believe I asked yesterday of the hon. Miniser of Mines.

Mr. Speaker: We really have the questions sorted out today.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the member for Riverdale during his period of temporary vocal incapacitation, may I put a question to the Attorney General?

Will the Attorney General, if he has not already done so, refer the question about the legal aspects and the procedures involved in the heart transplant operations and other operations of the transplant type to the law reform commission so that there can be a definitive statement of the procedure to be followed?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I have not referred this question of the law relating to heart transplant, or other transplant operations of human organs or parts of the human body, to the law reform commission, and I have not actually considered doing so.

I think that the law in respect to this matter is developing as medical science has moved to perfect this type of operation. I would draw the attention of the hon. member to the fact that we have on our statute books, The Human Tissue Act, which was passed in 1962-1963, and which provides that a donor may, in writing, at any time, or orally, in the presence of two witnesses during his last illness, request that any part of his body, or his body may be used for therapeutic or educational purposes. It does not distinctly say for transplant, but it may be wide enough to even contemplate that, and there are other provisions in the Act providing for the use of parts of a body at death by those in charge, relatives and other persons, and provisions preventing misuse. So that in Ontario I am not really aware of any problem in this field. It is possible that we might enlarge this legislation to cover the situation if deemed necessary but I am not really aware of any problem arising in this jurisdiction.

Mr. MacDonald: Would the Minister consider referring the existing Act, The Human Tissue Act, of 1962-1963, in the light of the developing situations, as to what changes might be made in the House along the lines that he has suggested?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Well that is a meritorious suggestion, Mr. Speaker, and I would like to take it under consideration. But as I say, I think that our Act goes pretty far along the way. I am certainly not averse to advice from the law reform commission and I have availed myself of it many times. I shall take that under consideration.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): I have a question for the Minister of Health, and copies have been sent to him. The *Globe and Mail* reported in March that Washington proposes to appeal to United States doctors to heed a warning to be issued against the over-use and the misuse of the drug chloromycetin. Will the Minister advise if the government will appeal to the Ontario doctors to restrict the use of the drug chloromycetin?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, at this time no such appeal has been made. I do not believe that this is the function of government. I took the opportunity over the last weekend to examine the exhibition of this drug, by the manufacturing company, and I find that in every package, there is a statement clearly warning physicians against possible side effects arising from the use of the drug, and this is accepted as a caution by all of us. So it is carefully considered whether this is the drug of choice for a specific illness.

I believe that the function of government through the food and drug directorate under the federal government is to keep the profession advised of any new information or knowledge that arises out of the research that has not been previously published, and

where necessary to withdraw a product from the market. We have been in communication with the food and drug directorate in Ottawa, and they are keeping us completely informed of all moves they intend to make in respect to this and similar drugs.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, question for the Minister of Economics and Development. Last year, on April 11, on page 2011 of *Hansard*, the hon. Minister of Economics and Development said that the government would support the Opposition motion to have CMHC provide financing for homes with septic tanks. Is he prepared to follow through on this statement now?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I am suffering from the same problem as the member for Riverdale. We have not been in the same political party so it must be coincidental. I am delighted to be able to advise my hon. friend that on April 11, 1967, in reply to the hon. member for Grey-Bruce, I stated that I would make representation to CMHC to review its lending policy in respect of non-serviced municipalities. Representation was made, sir, to the Hon. John R. Nicholson, the Minister responsible for the operation of CMHC in 1967, and to the federal agency itself. In respect of multiple forms of housing, CMHC septic tank policy is particularly firm in that they are not prepared to approve loan applications for such projects. This policy applies throughout Canada, whether the development is privately or publicly initiated under the provision of The National Housing Act.

This firm position was reconfirmed as recently as February 20, 1968, in a communication received from the regional office of CMHC. As the single detached dwelling, CMHC is not prepared to lend in major areas, but is prepared to consider loan applications from home owner applicants in truly rural areas, on large sites or in smaller communities where the plan of subdivision has been approved prior to 1961, and only a few lots remain. We are still concerned about the effect of this policy, and are continuing our representations to CMHC.

I might say in finalizing the question that you will recall the hon. member for Grey South spoke to me and we were able to get something done in Flesherton for some elderly people's homes up there, so we are still pursuing it, and I hope that with a new Minister of Housing we may be able to get them to change the policy. It looks as though we are getting some encouragement in that direction.

Mr. Sargent: This would trigger millions of dollars' worth of building in outlying parts of the province. The present legislation is discriminatory, and I think that if the federal government will not do it, would the Minister agree—

Mr. Speaker: Well ask the question.

Mr. Sargent: Would the Minister agree that—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: The member knows the rules.

Mr. Sargent: The Prime Minister breaks a lot of rules too, and he is only one person here.

Mr. Speaker: Will the member direct his supplementary question?

Mr. Sargent: Would the Minister consider asking the Ontario housing corporation to make funds available along this line?

Hon. Mr. Randall: In answer to that question, I would say this: We have a project going on right now at Red Lake, which the housing corporation is doing, and we are putting in the sewers ourselves to make sure that they do not have to go on septic tanks. In all the areas which we are going into, we are prepared to provide the funds for those services. I think that one of the reluctances on the part of the federal authorities is certainly the water and air pollution problem we have.

Everybody talks about water pollution on one hand and we know in many areas, particularly in our cottage areas, that septic tanks are doing as much to the pollution of our northern waters as anything else. As a boat owner, I think that perhaps the summer cottagers are doing more than anything else to pollute the lakes, putting in more pollution than the boat owners. But this is one of the reasons why I think the central mortgage and housing corporation and the federal government are moving very cautiously in any area where we will add to pollution, if there is a way around of putting in septic tanks, by putting in the regular services.

Mr. Bullbrook: Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I rise on a point of order perhaps in the form of a question for the Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, on Thursday last, February 29. I lodged with your office, a notice of the

question to the hon. Provincial Treasurer. I sat in this House and at approximately one minute after the question period was finished on that date, the hon. Provincial Treasurer came into the House. I did not have the opportunity then of asking the question.

I sat in the House on Friday, and unfortunately the hon. Provincial Treasurer was away from the House, and I was away from the House yesterday, at which time the Provincial Treasurer answered the question that I just had not asked.

Now I wanted, today, to put the question to the Provincial Treasurer, or a supplementary question to the Provincial Treasurer.

This, Mr. Speaker, is a matter of great concern to the people of my riding. The question involved the application of retail sales tax to non-productive equipment purchased by manufacturers in our riding for the abatement or possible control of air pollution. And I ask you, sir, in connection with the conduct of the question period, perhaps during the course of the liaison between the leaders of the respective parties, the hon. Prime Minister might be requested to have his Ministers in the House during the course of the question period if at all possible.

Mr. Speaker: I am sure that will be discussed and I am also sure the member will realize that there are times, just as yesterday when the Minister of Agriculture and Food was in Ottawa obtaining what I hope will be answers for questions being asked, when Ministers cannot be present. I am aware of the situation with respect to that particular question which the member for Sarnia has raised.

Orders of the day.

THE MUNICIPAL ACT

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Minister of Municipal Affairs) moves second reading of Bill 24, an Act to amend The Municipal Act.

Motion agreed to: second reading of the bill.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, I gave an explanation to the House.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): It was carried.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: All right, I would just like the House to know that I am always willing to oblige, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Before we proceed with the matter before us, I would like to ask the indulgence of the members for a moment or two. On the day when I was appointed to this chair I was given the opportunity of expressing my thanks to the members for the support of that motion. The member for York South, leader of the New Democratic Party (Mr. MacDonald), kindly spoke in full support, but I completely overlooked expressing my thanks to him. I just want to take this opportunity to express that thanks to the member for York South and to assure him that I apologize most sincerely for the oversight.

Clerk of the House: The 14th order, committee of the whole House; Mr. A. E. Reuter in the chair.

THE MUNICIPAL ACT

House in committee on Bill 24, An Act to amend The Municipal Act.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Chairman, might I ask the Minister about the meaning of this? I take it this is simply to correct an error of omission. Is this correct? It adds nothing more to the Act than that?

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Minister of Municipal Affairs): That is correct.

Sections 1 to 5, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill 24 reported.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves that the committee of the whole House rise and report a certain bill without amendment and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed: Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of the whole House begs to report one bill without amendment and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

THIRD READING

The following bill was given third reading upon motion:

Bill 24, An Act to amend The Municipal Act.

Clerk of the House: The 4th order: resuming the adjourned debate on the motion for

second reading of Bill 11, an Act to establish The Department of Trade and Development.

DEPARTMENT OF TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak to this bill for the simple reason that it is of vital importance to the people of northern Ontario. The bill itself, in my opinion, makes very little provision for the kind of development and the kind of exploitation of resource potential, both human and natural, in northern Ontario.

I want to confine my remarks principally to the provisions of the bill that deal specifically with equalization of opportunity incentives to municipalities.

Just prior to the last provincial election on October 17, it was announced by the government of the day that forgiveable incentives, up to a maximum of $500,000, would be made available to municipalities that could qualify and were not designated for the federal plan. A good many of the municipalities in northwestern Ontario, and indeed throughout all Ontario, took heart at this legislation and felt that, at last, the government had come up with something that was going to be really meaningful and of great assistance to them. A good many of the smaller municipalities in my riding which were in dire need of secondary industry—principally those based on the resource industries, the forest products industries and the mining industry—felt that at long last they were going to be given some consideration.

I hold in my hand a very comprehensive study that was made on behalf of the town of Geraldton which was faced with the loss of its only industry due to closing of McLeod Cockshutt and the Mosher mines. This action is imminent and will come within the next year or year and a half.

I visited that town some two weeks ago and I met a delegation of municipal council. They were really perturbed when they got a list of some 160 municipalities across the province who would qualify for the equalization of opportunity incentive programme announced by the hon. Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Randall).

It is very little consolation to the municipalities in the north when they find that there are literally hundreds of other municipalities across the province that do qualify, without very little justification for it.

To cite a few examples: In northwestern Ontario, in the riding of Kenora, we have Keewatin which lost its only major industry as a result of a fire in their flour mill. True they were given a grant of some $130,000 under the ODC plan, which would have employed some 30 people. But when you consider they lost the employment of 130 people it is little consolation to them.

Another instance is the town of Geraldton, a town of some 3,300 people who are going to lose their only industry in a very short time. It is very little consolation to them when they find that other towns with a very viable economy, right on the fringe of the markets — particularly down around this Golden Horseshoe that we refer to, down around Lake Ontario here—are to take part in the programme, when towns under severe weather conditions and a great distance from the market are not given special consideration for a plan like this. It is of very little significance to those municipalities when they have to compete on that basis.

Mr. Speaker, I was quite heartened to hear the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) say that he was proceeding with a plan for a complete inventory of the resource potential in northwestern Ontario as outlined by the federal member for Port Arthur, but we need immediate help. We cannot wait four or five years. I think the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. McKeough) said that there would be a plan forthcoming within the next five years for a complete survey and a study of regional government and regional development. Municipalities in northwestern Ontario cannot wait that long. They need immediate assistance to carry them over these periods. In the town of Nipigon they lost their only industry some two weeks ago because of the closing of the plywood mill. I am sure that the hon. Minister of Economics and Development is quite familiar with the problem there and a representative of his department did attend the meeting in that town a week ago Sunday.

I would like incorporated in this bill, or some indication from the Minister involved, that he intends pursuing forthwith a plan that will give immediate assistance to these towns. I am not speaking of isolated cases. There are cases of municipalities which are based on one industry—such as Beardmore; with the closing of Leitch mines it lost its only industry. Towns like Burchell Lake, on the way to Atikokan, that closed last September because of the closing of North Coldstream Copper.

I think it must be obvious to the Minister that if he is going to do anything meaningful to develop the resource potential, both human and natural, in northern Ontario he

is going to have to get with it and get with it fast.

Now, I would just like to quote briefly from an address that the hon. Minister made in Sault Ste. Marie on February 8, when he said:

> I am not going to bombard you with a bunch of facts and figures about your rocks and trees, your lakes and rivers, impressive as those facts and figures are. We both know you are abundantly blessed with natural resources. Tonight, I would like to talk to you about the development of your human resources and I would like to talk to you about some industrial incentives the Ontario government is offering, incentives that will help equalize industrial opportunity.

He went on a little further in his address and said:

> New exploration by Texas Gulf is going on between Dean Lake and St. Joseph's island. I do not know what they are looking for but judging by Texas Gulf's past explorations, you cannot argue with success.

To me, Mr. Speaker, it is success to a degree, but when you consider a huge foreign owned corporation such as Texas Gulf, whose board decisions are all made outside the borders of this country, who is allowed to dig a hole in the ground and export the mineral ores therefrom in its raw state, it is of little consolation to the people in northern Ontario when they see jobs being exported, when natural resources are so abundant, as the Minister said.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Hear, hear!

Mr. Stokes: It is just another indication, Mr. Speaker, that there is such a growing frustration among the people in northwestern and northeastern Ontario about the kind of development lacking in that part of the country.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that if a resource development based on the mining industry and the forest products industry were developed in an orderly fashion we would have three to four times the population that we have in the north. At the same time, we would relieve you people down here around the Golden Horseshoe of your huge cost of land assembly for houses and industrial use. We would take some of the pollution problems off your hands. We would take the huge cost of building your super highways off your hands. Send us some people up there to exploit our natural resources.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that we have had enough studies, by the Minister's own admission. He knows the potential. We have the people to do it. We have the natural resources. We have a good base for our forest products industries and I think that in order that this bill be meaningful it should have incorporated in it something that will assure the people of northern Ontario that the Minister really means what he said when he said that he is interested in developing all of Ontario for the good of people all over Ontario.

Mr. T. Reid (Scarborough East): Mr. Speaker, in rising to discuss this bill I am delighted to say I am pleased that the government seems to be clarifying the responsibilities and administrative functions of its various departments. This type of clarification has long been overdue, and I certainly appreciate, on this side of the House, some of the present efforts made to streamline the government.

Before I get into some of the more detailed criticisms that I have, let me just give some idea of how long it takes this government to straighten itself out on a functional basis. We find that the present Act to re-name The Department of Economics and Development to The Department of Trade and Development supersedes the Act descended to on December 15, 1961, entitled The Department of Economics and Development Act.

If we look over the history of this very strange *ad hoc* evolution, we find that that Act of December 15, 1961, was an Act to amalgamate two then existing departments: The Department of Economics and Federal-Provincial Relations, with the separate department, The Department of Commerce and Development.

When we trace back the history of these two departments which existed prior to December 15, 1961, we find that they too, superseded previous administrative departments of the governments. We end up going back to The Department of Planning and Development Act of 1960, and I dare say that one can trace the history of various administrative functions within these various departments as they have been redefined over time, even further back.

I suggest, sir, judging from some of the folk-lore that I have heard about the administration of the Conservatives during the 1950's, that there is a great deal of fragmentation of government departments. Reasons for this may

be many, and one hears that it is a nice way to run the government, with a Prime Minister who splits his departments up, purposefully confusing their areas of authority, and their areas of administration so that he can cope more easily with his Ministers.

I hope that the present Premier is making the effort and I am sure that he is, to clearly define his responsibility, and those of his government departments; that he has got over this hangover, if you like, of purposefully confusing the functions and administrative responsibilities of his departments; that now, on this side of the House, we can point more clearly in the years ahead, the next three or four anyway, to specific Ministers and say, "You are responsible for this problem"; and that the Premier of this province will back us up when we hit the right member of his administration, instead of getting shuffled along from head of department to head of department.

It is in this context that I think that I would have preferred to have discussed this present Act to establish The Department of Trade and Development in conjunction with other Acts redefining the administrative responsibility of other departments, so that I could see what this Department of Trade and Commerce is intended to do in the years ahead, and what the other departments of this government are supposed to do.

For example, I think that it is pertinent in any discussion of this Act, to raise the questions about the relationship of the proposed Department of Trade and Development to the redefined Treasury Department, which will, I understand, be broken into two departments, more particularly, the area of regional development.

As many of you know, the regional development branch of The Department of Economics and Development was shifted over to The Treasury Department a few months ago.

My question today, if the Minister were here to hear my comments, would be, "What is the relationship between The Department of Trade and Development and The Treasury Department, with particular regard to the regional development branch?" For how can he be responsible for the economic development in the province, when the power to influence regional development is vested in another department under another Minister?

This must be clarified and I hope that I could have discussed both the present Act, and the Act to clarify the administration and responsibilities of The Treasury Department into its two branches, together. The main point is that I believe we must do all we can to eliminate overlapping jurisdiction between the two departments, such as The Department of Trade and Development, and the responsibilities of the other departments.

It is not enough to leave it up to the discretion and goodwill of Ministers who may, in the years ahead, be contesting the leadership of the Progressive Conservative Party in Ontario.

Another issue that I would like to raise is this question that the Act is to establish a Department of Trade and Development, sir. I thought that the federal government has a Department for Trade and Commerce, and I find it extremely difficult to believe that it is necessary for this province to set up a department of trade as well.

The federal government has trade missions abroad, staffed with highly qualified Canadians under a person that I consider to be a highly qualified trade Minister who knows what he is doing in the area of trade.

The people of Ontario are tired of paying through the nose in taxes to support dupljcation and overlapping of activities by this provincial government. I think that the people of this province are going to ask serious questions about this government, which sets up a department, taking the term "trade" and jamming it into a provincial department when that is already being done in the federal government.

Surely it makes little sense to have this costly functional duplication of expenditures by the present government of Ontario. It is in this present context that I would like to refer the members to section 52(b) of the proposed Act in which it states:

> The Minister shall, among other things, prepare to carry out such programmes and projects to improve the economic development of areas for equalization of economic opportunity as may be appropriate, and that cannot suitably be undertaken by other departments, or agencies of the Ontario government.

Mr. Speaker, I think that in there, it should read also:

> That cannot suitably be undertaken by the federal government, under the constitution of this country.

Above all, I cannot understand the muddled thinking that must go on in Cabinet decisions because I understood from the Premier of this province, and the leader of the Cabinet over there from his remarks in this chamber,

about two things that are inconsistent with this present Act.

He stood before us and said, referring to the Confederation of tomorrow conference, and to his programme of efficiency in government, that the intention of his government in the immediate years ahead was to clarify, not muddle, the constitution of this country.

Yet, when we judge this present Act, setting up The Department of Trade and Development, when we judge it from those two things that he stated, the present Act to set up a provincial department of trade is out of the stated objectives of the Premier. We want to clarify the terms of reference of the constitution of the province, and, perhaps, have a clear functional division of what is the province's responsibility, and what the federal government is responsible for.

Under the present arrangement, it is the federal government which is responsible for trade, and it has a very good trade department with highly trained civil servants, and a very highly qualified Minister. Yet this government across the floor wishes to duplicate this very costly function, and have their own trade missions abroad, and so forth.

I think that this is just one example of the Premier going one way, and the members of the so-called team going another. Yet this is the government that tells us that it can manage the public's affairs in Ontario. What a laugh. The final concluding point—

Hon. S. J. Randall (Minister of Economics and Development): The member should have laughed in October.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. T. Reid: I read in the newspaper the other day that when I was giving my maiden address in this House, there were more members of the Opposition in the House than the government, and if you would have relaxed the rules a little, I could have moved a very quick motion of confidence in the government, but of course, this would—

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Why do we not have one right now?

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Speaker, if I might conclude my remarks before I sit down and place ear-plugs in my ears, I would like to say that this is a very fundamental point, and it is this: Housing in the province comes under the present Minister of Economics and Development. Surely, with the human and economical crisis posed by the shortage of housing in this province, his department should be re-named Housing, Urban Affairs, and Development, and not The Department of Trade and Development.

Mr. W. G. Pitman (Peterborough): Mr. Speaker, it is with no apology that I asked to be allowed to rise and take some time of this House in dealing with this piece of legislation. Because either this is one of the greatest hoaxes that has been perpetrated on the province, or it is one of the most important pieces of legislation that has been brought before this House.

I would like to think that the latter is the case, and for that reason I would like to look at this piece of legislation in some detail.

I think it is almost ironic, Mr. Speaker, that this piece of legislation should drop down upon us during the debate on the reply to the Speech from the Throne, because during the last few weeks we have had hurled across this aisle the charge of socialism and all the terrible things there will be if we have this kind of system in our province.

I am wondering now, Mr. Speaker, where are all the anti-socialists? Surely this is socialism for industrialists, and I read from the Act:

> To assist the adaptation of manufacturing industries, to changing positions of domestic and export markets.
>
> Where are all the free enterprisers? Where are all the entrepreneurs to identify and assist those manufacturing industries that require special measures to develop an unrealized potential or to cope with exceptional problems or adjustments?

Well, Mr. Speaker, it appears they themselves are reluctant socialists. We seem to have no concern for government interference in this particular area. I am not going to continue the philosophic ramifications of the member for Lakeshore's (Mr. Lawlor's) comments last Friday afternoon, but indeed, not only are we all socialists, it appears we are also all capitalists.

Seriously taking a look at this whole question, I must say that I find it a very difficult problem to deal with, because it seems to me that a piece of legislation of this nature goes to the heart of the whole problem of planning in this province. But this government has refused to plan, because in realistic terms the only way that you can plan is to have goals. Unless you are willing to have set goals, it is impossible to plan. Goal-less planning becomes nothing more, really, than scatter-gun blundering.

And what I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, is that we have associated with this piece of legislation pseudo goals. I would like to read for a moment the announcement that was made by the hon. Minister when this plan for a new programme of equalization of industrial opportunity in Ontario was brought before the province. And I say it was brought before the province, Mr. Speaker, because it was just that.

One of the difficulties of this matter, of course, is that we have had no opportunity to discuss this matter before it became a part of the government's programme—a part of the policy of this government. It was dropped down in the midst of an election campaign. It has all the disadvantages of that very fact.

One of the points as made in the Minister's announcement, as a reason for this particular programme, is that: "there is no easy way to finance the expanded level of services required both by the municipalities and the provincial government." That is the first reason. At same time, sir, the hon. Minister indicates that the timing of the programme was to relate to the publication of the Smith report.

Mr. Speaker, if the Smith report indicates anything, it is that the whole system of municipal taxes, the whole system of provincial grants is entirely hopeless. It is an incredible mess. Surely that is the impression every member of this Legislature received from reading those three long volumes of the Smith report. The whole Smith report comes to the conclusion that only by massive transfer payments of the provincial government, only by the provincial government taking over considerable functions of the municipalities—and we have already seen them taking over justice—only by the end of the most complicated grant system can we have a viable system of municipal taxation.

And yet I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that in this announcement, this piece of legislation is intended to shore up the existing situation in municipal taxes. We have already seen that the municipalities as they exist today are not viable units of administration. And yet this piece of legislation is meant to put industry in each of the small townships and towns of Ontario, or to shore up these municipalities so they can pay their taxes. This is what I mean, Mr. Speaker, by a pseudo-goal, which makes absolutely no sense whatsoever.

The second reason that the Minister stated was we must also recognize that many of our smaller municipalities are losing a sizeable proportion of their young people, due to the lack of opportunity to employ their skills locally.

Mr. Speaker, there are none of us in this House who like to see a young person leave a community, but I suggest to you that we are now living in the 20th century; it is not the 19th, or the 18th or the 16th century. We are training young people in our schools to be mobile, to be flexible, to be able to move here and there to secure employment. To suggest that we are going to put an industry in all the small towns of Ontario and try and keep the young people in the town is simply lunatic. It is lunatic in every sense of the word.

In the United States this was tried, Mr. Speaker, it was tried when the—

Mr. J. H. White (London South): It is being done in Appalachia.

Mr. Pitman: In Appalachia?

Mr. Speaker, I must argue with the hon. member. In Appalachia they decided to create growth centres. They tried at first to do exactly that, tried to put industries in every small town and it failed, and it failed miserably.

Mr. White: It is the same approach here, creation of growth centres.

Mr. Pitman: It was only when they changed the policy—oh, now, Mr. Speaker, to suggest that this legislation is laying out growth centres is absolutely insane, and the members must realize that.

Mr. Sopha: Is that a parliamentary word, to call a member insane?

Mr. Pitman: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, I shall try and restrain myself. I think to suggest that Appalachia is relative to the province of Ontario says something more about this government than it does about anything else, and even more about the member who made the comment.

Mr. White: The member would just chuck all those rural areas.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): Socialism for the industries, that is all you believe in.

Mr. Pitman: Mr. Speaker, this was attempted in the United States, when the United States Department of Agriculture realized that it had more agricultural economists than it had farmers and came to the conclusion that the only way to slow this up was to try and find some way of making viable the smaller communities in the agri-

cultural areas of the United States. And they brought some of the top economists into this particular project. And they very quickly realized that you cannot simply spread industry around in a thin layer through an entire agricultural population as obviously this legislation is trying to do.

In the United States they very quickly came to the realization that the only way to improve rural areas was by designating growth centres and centring development in these growth centres, in these rural regions. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that this is one of the things that I find particularly ludicrous about this piece of legislation. The Smith report indicates the only possible way of getting viable municipalities is to enlarge the regional governments, and here we have this legislation which is trying rather to shore up the small municipalities in the province of Ontario.

Mr. White: Well, we will not let the people forget the NDP is against the rural areas.

Mr. H. Peacock (Windsor West): The member has not got the guts to do it.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): We deal with the issues instead of playing politics.

Mr. Pitman: I might answer the hon. member that we on this side of the House like to think that measures are rational, that they are not all related to the number of votes you can get in every rural municipality in Ontario.

Mr. White: We are for them and you are "agin" them.

Mr. Pitman: Mr. Speaker, I am not about to deter this government from its fanatical pursuit of error. But the point is that in these growth centres one must develop an industrial base. One must develop a technical structure. One must have a great many transportation means which are not possible to develop in every single rural municipality.

We are living in a complex world, and I am speaking—and you obviously realize, Mr. Speaker, that is a simple proposition but some of the questions from across the other side indicated to me that this statement may be necessary.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Just as I said, today we are all socialists.

Mr. Pitman: Now, I suggest to you that you cannot throw up isolated plants and villages across the entire province. We must set real goals. What I am asking, Mr. Speaker, is this: Surely this government would recognize that we do not want everyone living in Toronto and within the Golden Horseshoe. We recognize this and we have suggested that in every region there are potential growth centres. In the north there are potential centres and also in the east of Ontario. But what we must do, Mr. Speaker, before we start scattering industries around in a manner such as this, is decide just what kind of a society we want in Ontario. Do we want everyone in the Golden Horseshoe? The Minister has indicated by his programme and I think the Premier has commented in his remark on the developments of this province, that this is not the end of this government.

What we have to do then, Mr. Speaker, is decide on how we can spread people through the province in growth centres. But how are we going to do it? Are we going to spread them across in corridors, or are we going to try and simply extend the size of the Golden Horseshoe? Or are we going to develop growth centres in certain parts of the province—or are we going to build new satellite cities?

Second, it is quite obvious that we must deal regionally—that we can, I suggest, set up growth centres under regional government. And we can keep young people not too far away from their homes and families. But we must do it on a regional basis. We cannot do it on a single village basis. And that is what I find debilitating about this particular piece of legislation.

The leader of the New Democratic Party has indicated how in the long run, in the end, Mr. Speaker, this will undoubtedly be done by some kind of municipal foundation plan. This is the only sensible way in which our municipal taxes can be resolved. But I suggest to you that what has been suggested in this piece of legislation is the carrying on of a system which is entirely impossible.

One of the things about this bill, which I find particularly difficult to understand is very much the point made by the hon. member for Scarborough East. We would like to know how does the Minister, as it states in section 4, co-operate with the Ministers having charge of the other departments of the public service of Ontario and the other provinces. We simply do not know. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that we must know. It is impossible to suggest that we should let this legislation come before us when we know that hanging

over our head is some form of regional government; when we know that there are great changes this government has suggested in relation to regional development, in relation to municipal taxes, and have this as the end product of a government in terms of its dealing with the economy.

The most important goal, sir, is to know how the people are going to live, where they are going to live, and how they are going to make their living. And this is what I mean by real goals. We must know the real goals of this government before we can view a piece of legislation such as this. And this is a major matter. I suggest to the other Ministers who are sitting on the front bench that the results of this piece of legislation will have tremendous effects. The Minister of Municipal Affairs, for example, is going to have to shore up any mess which is created by this legislation, unless it is a hoax. And I am not willing to suggest it, Mr. Speaker. I think this is an honourable intentioned Act, and I have tried to take it as that. But if it is not a hoax, then the Minister for Municipal Affairs is going to have a great many things to concern himself about. And so is the water resources commission when you put an industry into an area that does not at present even have a sewer, or any kind of a sewage system.

And then there is the Minister of Trade and Development himself. I am wondering if the government is going to have some kind of interdepartmental committee. If this government is going to suggest this, it will be one of the most important parts of the government. This committee of government will decide the future of this province, the kind of province that we are going to have, by simply deciding the kind of economy we are going to have, and where people are going to live and what kind of amenities those people are going to have.

I would just say, Mr. Speaker, that it is impossible to say that we should deal with this legislation without knowing something of what lies in the future.

I want to turn to this programme of industrial equalization. I have made my remarks very general. I want to do that because I am going to turn to a local situation, and I am not doing this—and I want to make this very clear—I am not pulling out the crying towel and screaming that my municipality or a municipality in my particular area was left out. That is not the point at all. What I am trying to do is to use this as an example of the kind of chaos which you can have unless you set these kinds of goals.

In the particular riding which I represent, Mr. Speaker, there is one major city. And this city has been identified as a growth centre; it has been identified as a growth centre in a study by Professor Gerald Hodge who organized the project which was related to the Lake Ontario development corporation.

I would like to read members just one or two points of this, because it brings up, I think, an extremely important problem which this government must face.

In 1965 a white paper was placed before us on the whole question of regional development, and some of the things in this, I think, are important. The white paper stated that, and here I am quoting from the white paper, Mr. Speaker:

> Through the use of government programme or public expenditures on development capital the government of Ontario can guide regional growth.

And that is what I am suggesting this legislation is doing. Before we have regional government, before we have any effective system of regional development, the government is setting up a system which is going to seriously affect regional growth. Many types and forms of economic activity can be performed at some degree in each region of the province, and that is the point I want to make. There is a place for growth at every part of the province, but it cannot be a thin veneer across every township and every village in the province. To return to the white paper:

> Accordingly, we will strive for regional economic specialization based on an intensive programme of research and enquiry into regional resources for growth.
>
> The smoothing out of the existing regional economic inequalities will be sought through the regional distribution of government budgetary expenditures, to the provision of technical, financial, administrative services and to the use of programmes carefully selected to encourage labour mobility.

How does this jive with the Minister's statement on trying to provide an industry in a small town in order to keep the young people in that small town?

Regionalism, and I hope that we may well come in to this in the future, is a many coloured problem. There are other things beside industrial growth—tourism, agriculture, resource development, manufacturing and other forms of economic activity. And there has been no attempt, Mr. Speaker, to relate this industrial activity to all the other

forms of economic activity that are going on in different regions of this province.

I want to read just a bit further, what this report states about this particular region:

> Future market demands will be generally more complex goods, produced by a more advanced technological system. And I suggest that you cannot distribute technologically complicated and sophisticated industries across the province. Efficient transportation service, rather than low transport cost would become more important, in these highly technological industries.

Again:

> More highly specialized industries tend to group together in order to take advantage of external economies. As a result there is a tendency for larger urban units to develop and become most prosperous.
>
> Pollution control measures, and I mentioned a moment ago, the water resources commission; pollution control measures and conservation programmes will become increasingly important factors shaping development.

How can you do this by placing industries across the province in this veneer?

> The lack of population concentration precludes the development of effective intra-regional markets and a high level of urban amenity, and enhances outdoor recreational and leisure opportunities.

Well, finally, from this report, Mr. Speaker, I do want to get off this point: in this particular area which I represent it was decided by this learned group, that it would be well if there were growth centres, and it suggested Peterborough, Belleville, Trenton, and Port Hope, Cobourg. And it was suggested that there should be an attempt to try and increase these areas to 100,000, which was considered to be a minimum for such a growth centre.

Well, may I conclude. As indicated above, the major centres are to be the foci of regional development.

> They are to be encouraged to grow to a size which will support a sufficient diversity of economic activity to serve as a catalyst for further economic development, particularly of a high order and of social activities to provide a wider choice of social environment causing—

Such as housing—that is another problem. I guess we can come to it another time—

> Greater services, cultural and recreational facilities than exist in the region at the present time.

Now, combined with what seemed to be the direction of this provincial government—a very wise direction—I suggest to you as outlined in that report and in agreement with a white paper presented in this Legislature, the city of Peterborough has gone ahead and tried to develop itself as a growth centre.

It serviced an immense area of land as a Peterborough industrial development organization park for industry to come in. The land was already serviced so that new industries could move immediately into this area. As well as that you had a great deal of time and effort put into building an airport.

Now, once again I hope the House will not see this as a parochial effort to draw your support to this particular region. All I am trying to suggest is that with this kind of legislation you are going in completely the opposite direction to what has already been decided by the government policy over there. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, Peterborough has produced water and sewage services to accommodate 80,000; a population of 80,000 and they are paying taxes and they are paying debentures on the extension of services to accommodate this kind of growth. Well I wish, Mr. Speaker, I had a map. I wish I had a map I could place on the wall here to show you what this programme has done, this particular growth centre. They have managed to designate every area around Peterborough as a slow growth centre, and thereby receiving advantages, and the area of Peterborough, which was to be the growth centre, receives no designation.

Now, words fail one, there seems to be no logic, no sense of rationality whatsoever. One would think that that evidence would be sufficient to make one think twice about the existing situation but even when you look at the statistics, Mr. Speaker, it becomes even more amazing. When the municipality did apply for the programme of equalization of industrial opportunity, it was turned down, and the reasons given, in a very curt note I might say, to the mayor and the city council, were that in the last five years, there have been three new plants and six expansions, adding 125 and 143 jobs respectively; and also that the total commercial and industrial assessment is $40 million compared with $60 million in residential assessment.

There is no reason given; they just simply state that this is the relationship of industrial

and residential assessment and that there have been so many new plants.

Mr. Speaker, it is incredible because one looks at other communities around, and here I do not want in any way—I hope I make this very clear—I do not want, in any way, to suggest that these other areas that have been suggested should not have received designation. I hope that the members for Sunderland and Durham and Victoria-Haliburton will not rise in their seats in righteous indignation that I am, in any way, suggesting there should be a deprivation of their communities.

What I am suggesting is that in this particular case, you have gross injustice on the basis of the facts, the very facts which were in the hands of this particular department. For example, Peterborough has had three new plants and five expansions in the last five years for a total number of additional jobs of 268. Lindsay, which was designated, had a total number of additional jobs of 390. Cobourg had three new industries or expansions with 122 additional jobs, and, yet, as I say, Peterborough was not designated.

Now, we turn to the net position of jobs lost. We find that Lindsay had a 318 increase in jobs; in Cobourg, 122 jobs were created but there was a decrease at Peterborough of 225 jobs. As I say here, you have the municipality facing the plans of a province which suggest that this area should be a growth centre, and should be able to provide the growth and opportunity for people in the area—I see the hon. member for Lambton South has left his seat—and in the rural communities which are producing bright intelligent young people and sending them into Peterborough for jobs.

May I suggest that the federal manpower office now send women applicants to Toronto because you cannot secure a job at the moment in the city of Peterborough. If you take the percentage of total labour, Lindsay has increased by 13 per cent in the last five years, Cobourg by 4 per cent and Peterborough by —1 per cent—and the first two were designated, Peterborough was not. Now can you see why it is very difficult, and why the industrial leaders, the people in the Peterborough industrial development organization and the council itself are concerned about this particular equalization programme?

I do not want to continue on this line this evening, Mr. Speaker. This is a rather parochial term but I do wish to repeat that this is either the greatest hoax or that it is a hope in this province. We do not know if it is going to work. I hope that we will have the opportunity to ask the Minister at the proper time when the legislation has had an opportunity to work, just how many new jobs have been created, and just what the total of production has been in the new industries brought in under this programme.

I hope that we will have an opportunity to find out from the Minister just to what extent this legislation is developing a regional programme, but I hope as well that the Minister of Municipal Affairs, and the Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond), and the Minister of Education (Mr. Davis) are recognizing that the whole effect of this programme does indeed do what it sets out to do.

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Speaker, in speaking for myself, I do not think that in the discussion of the principle of this bill, that an economic review of the province and an economic review in relation to specific areas is particularly relevant or germane to the principle of the bill—however well reasoned and intelligent that review may be—

Mr. Peacock: The member is going to talk about Sudbury.

Mr. Sopha: No. I assure my hon. friend I am not at this time, though I am going to make some tangential reference to it. In order to understand the emphasis in this bill, and its reason for being brought before this House, one must consider the history of this department.

Very coincidentally, if I may say, my mind thing like a great mind, that of the hon. member for Humber (Mr. Ben), he and I, unknown to each other, were making hurried research into the history of this department and there came a time where we met in our researches. I told him that I thought I had your eye, your honour, before he was able to catch your eye, and I would have the privilege of referring to history.

The whole thing began in 1944. I do not recall whether the genesis of this department related to another of the unbroken pledges of George Drew in his 22 points or not—but in 1944, The Department of Planning and Development was formed and that one lasted quite a while when one considers the recent history of these departments.

In fact, it lasted until the session of 1960-61, when The Department of Commerce and Development Act was passed, and The Department of Planning and Development Act was repealed. The point I wish to make here

is that it seems the name of the department always seemed to be selected to suit the personality of the encumbent in the office, and his particular interest and the particular fetishes and obsessions that he had.

So with Billy Nickle, it had been discovered by 1960 that The Department of Planning and Development had planned no development, or developed no plans, so it gave away to The Department of Commerce and Development. And it lasted one year. And the reason for that was that Robert Macaulay in the final stages of that bloodbath at Varsity Arena had put on the Robarts button—I am sorry he left the House and supported the present Premier—and he got this department. The name did not suit Robert Macaulay who wanted to be a Minister of all things, of the entire universe. And a very able, intelligent, vigorous, perspicacious, courageous, and so on person, insistent, avaricious person he was so he changed the name immediately to The Department of Economics and Development and lo and behold in that statute of 1961-62, something known as The Department of Federal-Provincial Relations disappeared. It disappeared entirely.

I can recall the great furore there was when they set up The Department of Federal-Provincial Relations, but it died a quiet death resulting from legislative murder in that session of 1961-62. And there emerged The Department of Economics and Development. And my friend from Downsview will certainly recall, as well as any other member, how on the eve of the Budget, on the eve of the Treasurer's address—the hon. member for Haldimand-Norfolk (Mr. Allan)—the great Robert Macaulay would make an economic review of the state of the nation here. He measured that speech by the calendar, not by hours, but we used to have to listen to that as he gave his review.

Well Robert Macaulay—

An hon. member: There is a good fellow.

Mr. Sopha: Oh yes, yes indeed, I agree.

An hon. member: He speaks well of the member too.

Mr. Sopha: Yes, and he often speaks well of the member. Well he went. He went, and he was replaced by the newly emergent member for Don Mills who received this award for being elected in the election of 1963, and so the name changes again. And, of course, the name "Trade and Development" is very significant because I say out of no spirit of unkindness, at all, I say to my friend from Grey-Bruce (Mr. Sargent) that this is the champion junketer of the world. He wants to carry the message of Ontario to the four corners of the earth; and fire or flood or famine or pestilence do not deter him in spending the people's money in doing this. One is moved to remark of course, that when we see this name "Trade and Development" emerge, one has to remember part of the painful constitutional history of this country. I refer to the emasculation by the Privy Council, and indeed the Supreme Court of Canada, of the trade and commerce clause in section 91 of The British North America Act—where from the earliest days after the assault by Mowat, in the 1880's, beginning with the Hodge case, and Snider, and a few of the other cases—that clause which gave the federal government the power of regulation over trade and commerce was denuded of any importance at all in the economic life of this country.

And only in recent years of course, has it begun to have appended to it by the highest courts some real meaning. And I am one of those, a Canadian with some knowledge, some little knowledge of the judicial influence on the constitution who sits back in the midnight hour and wonders about the power of the federal government to control the economic life of this country on a national basis when we have the attitude of the province of Ontario as seen in all its trade missions and its economic activity in the foreign fields.

Put in a nutshell, I am wondering if the federal government can demonstrate such expertise in the sale of wheat to communist China and to the Soviet Union, it must not follow that that government can also demonstrate the same vigour in the sale of the products produced in Ontario.

But our Minister, accompanied by the first citizen himself, recently went off to Los Angeles, and being one of the few who reads the Premier's speeches, I was furnished with a copy of his remarks to the Canadian society in Los Angeles. Having told them what a great bunch of people they were, even though they thought so little of their Canadianism that they gave it up and removed to the balmy climes of California, the message was that we must promote Ontario in this great state of the union, to the end that we must attract more branch plants to Ontario.

I say to my friend, the Minister, nothing makes him happier, nohing is more calculated to instil euphoria in him than the opening of another brassiere factory in Wiarton,

unless it be a peanut-butter manufacturing plant in Cornwall or some other little community in this province. But my point is this—and I make this general statement because there is going to be an opportunity in this House for people to get up and have their say and get down to specifics as to what they would do—that branch plant mentality in this province perpetuates the shameful neglect of our natural resources and their proper development and utilization.

To be specific, why shouldn't we?

An hon. member: What is Winters for?

Mr. Sopha: I have no responsibility for Robert Winters, at all, nor for any other federal politician. I am a member of the Legislature of Ontario. Why should we not, in a day and age when we are transporting natural gas from the western parts of this country, in great quantities, to the industrial heartland of the east, why should we not insist that all the pipes for its transport be manufactured in Canada, in Ontario? Why not at Sudbury? Should there not be a tubing mill comparable to the one in the riding of the hon. member for Welland (Mr. Morningstar)? Why do we continue to be hewers of wood and drawers of water, and see our birthright, our heritage, those raw materials that a benevolent providence has put in this province, transported out of the country to create jobs elsewhere? I say to my friend from Thunder Bay, I am with him and I welcome him to this House to join my plea for justice to northern Ontario.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Sopha: But even Mexico, you see, we look down our nose at Mexico, we think Mexico is a society which, in its development, in its cultural manifestations, in its parliamentary institution, is far below us. Hardly a democracy we would say, where the revolver is the actual ballot. And yet, Mexico, Argentina, Colombia, Venezuela, and many other countries restrict the uses to which the import of capital is put.

Mr. White: Poverty is the price they pay.

Mr. Sopha: To be specific, and I speak for myself, I said here before and I will say it again—and I will say it if the electorate repudiate me, and some time in the future I will say it as long as there is breath and ozone coming from Sopha's lungs. I would not hesitate to say to Texas Gulf—enough of the nonsense. Those ores mined in the Timmins area will be smelted in Ontario; get on with the building of the smelter.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Sopha: I would not hesitate. And yet it is remarkable, is it not, as they puff themselves up on the other side, and talk about their victory at the polls, as they constantly remind us of the victory of October 17, was it not significant that the two members of the executive council who were defeated by the people came from that part of the province that feels the most neglected? They went down to defeat. I was a bit sorry about one of them; he was an able administrator, a man who was on top of his department. The other I had no sympathy for at all, because like the present Minister of Economics and Development, he failed to understand.

He did not understand, and I say to this Minister through you, that it is a matter of great regret that I see that he does not understand, he does not understand the life and blood of this province, the strength of this province, the fact that this province's wealth and its virility resides in its natural resources, and nowhere, nowhere enunciated in the principle of this bill do I see a recognition of that fact.

This bill is framed in very skilled language, very artfully selected, so as to give nobody in the financial world the impression that the government of this province intends to interfere with the *laissez-faire* exploitation of our resources which has been our misfortune for more than 100 years.

No interference with that and yet will go on until the day when it is reversed, will go on—

Mr. Stokes: Come and join us.

Mr. Sopha: —ripping those resources out of the ground and cutting them down so far as they are part of the forest cover. We will go on and be the only country in the western world of all the democracies that has no restriction whatsoever on the use to which capital is put when it is imported. The Benelux countries have it, Britain has it, the Scandinavian countries have restrictions. But Canadians, sir, Canadians apply none. The Minister goes to Los Angeles and he says, will you not come into Ontario to start another branch plant in Ontario?

That is what he wants us to be, a branch plant economy manufacturing hair pins and other useless articles.

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Brassieres!

Mr. Sopha: Yes, brassieres.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: What natural resources would be used in the manufacture of brassieres?

Mr. Sopha: No, the Minister thinks more along those lines than I do.

Mr. MacDonald: The hon. member should join this party!

Mr. Sopha: What do you mean? I was saying these things in this House before most of them arrived here.

I remind my friend, the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs (Mr. Rowntree) that on a Thursday night I stood in the House and said these things during the estimates of this Minister and I said at the time that I was going to Port Arthur tomorrow to tell the people of the Lakehead these things that I believe in. I was greeted very warmly up there and they gave me some wonderful news stories in the front page of both the papers in which I repeated the very things I said here about the use of our natural resources. And it may be, it may be, to some slight extent—no I will not say that.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: One success story!

Mr. Sopha: I will not say that. I merely say this. Nobody in the Lakehead area, nobody having read what I said was heard to say, that guy is a nut—get him out of town, or in any way repudiated or argued with what I said.

But in this House, Mr. Speaker, I want to be what I was born, that is, a son of the north. As my leader reminded the House, as he did very effectively, the greatest majority of the land mass of this province is north and west of the French river. And I look at this statute that we are asked to approve in principle and I see nothing in it that gives guidance to this Minister to finally grapple with that problem that has beset us since Confederation, and that is the rape—that is a proper word, it is not exaggerated—the rape of our natural resources. We see them carted away, carted away.

For every ton of iron ore that is mined at Atikokan, for every one man employed in mining that ton of iron ore, there are 10 or 12 employed at Pittsburgh in the fabrication of that ore into finished steel products. Finally, some day that must stop. It has got to stop and we have to recognize that our first duty, as politicians, above all else, is to employ our resources for the benefits of our own people. Is that chauvinism, is it nationalism, to say those things? I hope not. Yes, my friends say it is Liberalism. I hope it is nothing short than wanting to hasten the day when the ultimate is the creation of a Canadian integrity and identity to become part and parcel of the life of this province in this nation.

That will not be done by inviting further branch plants. It will not be done by the hosannahs of praise of selling some product abroad in the markets of the world. It will only be done by a Minister at the head of this department who will not necessarily emphasize the trade aspect but will look at our economy and say, what can we do with what a merciful God has given us?

And finally, I would like to refer to what I call evidence. It was very significant to me when I picked up the papers and read during the long vacation that it has been decided here in Queen's Park by the government that the chief economist would depart from this department. Now I do not know whether the chief economist—and he is a very able, very intelligent, very erudite and learned individual is Ian Macdonald—I do not know whether it was that Ian Macdonald failed to understand the Minister or the Minister failed to understand Ian Macdonald. But it was no surprise to me that they would have to part company, because surely Ian Macdonald, in the service that he gives to this province, must have a deeper understanding of its economic life and its character than this Minister, who has no understanding at all of it.

Perhaps it was that Ian Macdonald saw that if he moved over to The Treasury Department that a greater scope would be given to his talents. Now, that is my guess because one would expect that if the chief economist, with all the training and education and ability that Ian Macdonald has displayed, that the natural place for him to be would be right to this department, doing those things that are in (a) to (d) in section 3 and (a) to (g) in section 4.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): But will he get along with the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. MacNaughton) any better?

Mr. Sopha: Well hardly. My leader raises a very good question and I suspect that the Provincial Treasurer was very glad to get the chief economist, because that enables the Provincial Treasurer to continue his empire building and to make sure that all power

resides in the ten mile radius of downtown London.

An hon. member: —like you are.

Mr. Sopha: I am glad I did not hear you. I would not think it was complimentary because you are so incapable of giving compliments.

But you see, until the Provincial Treasurer brought the debate down to that level, I was saying, sir, and I really invite you to consider it if no one else in this House will agree that these points that I made were very valid. To express the thoughts of one here, I am not satisfied with the state of our economy in this province so long as it revolves around only the junket; only the hurried trips travelling first class American express and diners' club to the four corners of the world. Or so far as it involves going to the Americans and saying, come on with another branch plant into Ontario, come on, bring your capital in. Good heavens, as if we have not got enough of it. As if there is not a time we should pause and assess what it has done, what it is in danger of doing.

I know what we are up against. Walter Gordon says these things. He beat the retreat in 1963. He is in a position now, though he thinks and feels very deeply for Canada, and Canada's future and the dangers of Canada, that so often I regret to say—it saddens me to say it about that great Canadian—that it is only necessary to vilify him, the critics do not even have to muster an argument. All you have to do is refer to the retreat he had to make in 1963, when he tried to reverse all this you see. He tried to give Canada back to the Canadians or purchase it back. Now he is vilified. But I am satisfied that if we live long enough, I say to my friend from Thunder Bay, if we live long enough and work vigorously enough on it, we will tolerate no compromise, we will not surrender, that eventually we are going to be successful.

Mr. G. Ben (Humber): Mr. Speaker, what the hon. member for Sudbury said, specifically with respect to the—I would not call it wool, I would not know what I would call it—they are trying to pull over the eyes of the members of this House, in bringing forth yet another amendment to the name of this illustrious department or conglomeration of departments.

Now, as the hon. member for Sudbury pointed out, this department started as The Department of Planning and Development in 1944. The word "planning" seems to play a prominent part in the title of that Act, although subsequent events showed that planning somewhere was left by the road. In 1956, having tired of the name "Planning and Development", another Act came into being, and that was called, if my memory serves me correctly, an Act to establish The Department of Economics. They were going to start and bring economics into the picture. But that did not satisfy them, so in 1960, subsequently assented to in 1961, two Acts were passed.

The Department of Commerce and Development Act superseded, in effect, The Department of Planning and Development, and there was another Act to amend The Department of Economics Act and it became The Department of Economics and Federal and Provincial Relations Act. Without even letting the ink get dry, Mr. Speaker, the following year came another Act, an Act to amalgamate The Department of Economics and Federal and Provincial Relations and The Department of Commerce and Development, and now we have, Mr. Speaker, an Act to establish The Department of Trade and Development.

But what is interesting, Mr. Speaker, is that you must read both The Planning and Development Act of 1944, and the present Act or the present proposed Act to show that very little has changed except the name. They say a rose by any other name, smells as sweet, Mr. Speaker, and I suggest that a roll of putrid baloney also gives off the same fragrance no matter what you call it.

Nothing has changed. Except, Mr. Speaker, this is important, that the government acknowledges that long ago they gave up giving consideration to any planning when it comes to the economic life of this province.

The hon. Minister is supposed to be the one, as the member for Sudbury so well pointed out, who travels all over the world. I do not know, I do not expect that it is all necessarily an American express—it could be carte blanche, but anyway he is all over the world, ostensibly to draw up trade. And yet the biggest sell-out of this province, Mr. Speaker, was with reference to the department of hydro in this province. The hon. member—I am sorry—the hon. Minister, and many other citizens in this province and of this country, were travelling the wide world trying to sell uranium—Ontario uranium—for the production of power to countries which lacked the necessary natural resources to develop their own power. Conferences in Sweden, in Geneva, and elsewhere, "Buy Canadian uranium," which in essence means Ontario uranium; "buy the Candu reactor."

But when this province comes to develop electricity generating plants, what do they

do? They put up coal burning plants. They put up a plant, Mr. Speaker, that is going to consume 6 million tons of a coal a year, purchased from the Cumberland coal fields in the United States, where the Tennessee Valley authority saw fit to construct a nuclear plant. In fact, Mr. Speaker, the coal that is going to be firing the furnaces which are going to create the steam to drive the turbines that generate electric power in this province, were brought from the coal fields which stand in the shadow of the nuclear plant that the Tennessee Valley authority are putting up.

In other words, the Tennessee Valley authority show that they can develop power cheaper from nuclear sources at the very pithead of the mines from which we draw our coal. Six million tons, Mr. Speaker, per annum, which are going to cost us approximately $32 million per annum, plus transportation charges, Mr. Speaker, plus the exchange on the dollar, which is going to come to the sum total of approximately $50 million a year. This is what they say is—they mean when they say buy Canadian.

Not only that, we all know, Mr. Speaker, that the plant is going to be polluting the air. We are going to be dependent on a foreign power, for our power, because if the supply is cut off through strikes either in transportation or in the mines, we will not have that coal, and our only source will be in the east coast, where there is a federal subvention of seven dollars a ton, and the Prime Minister—the Premier of this province—has already explained how much we have to contribute to every federal dollar. So in essence of that seven dollars the taxpayers of this province will be paying approximately four, and the Provincial Treasurer can correct me if I am wrong, and this is what he means by buy Canadian.

While we are producing uranium, in this province, and trying to sell it abroad, our so-called Minister of Economics and Development has been in essence, stabbing our producers in the back by taking the jobs away from Canadians, giving to Americans; taking our money here and spending it in the United States; tying us down for 40 years to an expenditure of approximately $50 million a year. This is what he calls economics going selling abroad. And I say it is a shame.

What does the Minister—the chairman—of the Ontario Hydro have to say? He says that nuclear power is only good for a base load, and you have to have the fossil furnaces for peak loads. The same report in which that statement was made, Mr. Speaker, stated that the cheapest form of power was still hydro power. And hydro power, that is water power, need not be a base load power. So the solution obviously was to construct the plant as a nuclear plant, use that for the base power, and use the hydro plant which is the cheapest form of power, as the peak load power supply.

Another aspect of this hon. Minister's department is Hidden Valley, up north. Now this government guaranteed a loan to enable the construction of a motor hotel at Hidden Valley, and I want it understood that they guaranteed, they did not put up a penny, but they guaranteed a loan for no less than a Seagram interest to construct a motor hotel near Huntsville. Now is that really developing Ontario industries—$450,000, the hon. member for Grey South (Mr. Winkler) says? And what are they going to have in that hotel, or motor hotel? Naturally a liquor licence, what else? So in essence, this government, through a department of planning and development, is guaranteeing somebody who needs money like some members here need a hole in the head. They are guaranteeing them their right to print money, because what else is a liquor licence, except a permit to print money? And this is what they call encouraging industry to come to this province.

And some others mentioned already in this House, about some uniforms that have been imported from Japan. But is this what this department is supposed to be? As I say, I suggest to hon. members that they read the description of the responsibility of the department under The Department of Planning and Development Act in 1944, and a description under The Department of Economics and Development in 1962. And then read the description of the responsibility of the proposed department of Trade and Development, and aside from the wording, there is no difference. In other words, every time they get into difficulty they simply change the name and reorganize the department, so whoever becomes the Minister of the department can get up in the House and say, "Well we are just reorganizing the department so we do not have much information to give you."

Well this government has managed to fool a good percentage of the people for quite a long time but I assure you, Mr. Speaker, that the time is coming when they are not going to be fooling a majority of the people any longer, and this is an example of some of the legislation that is going to bring them down.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Mr. Speaker, basically the motivation is to change the

name of the same old game. I think it has been established by the members for Sudbury and Humber that this department should never have been formed in the first place. This department, as before, will house the economic council, the chief economist, data processing, Ontario housing corporation, Ontario development corporation, conduct of sales missions and so on, and so on.

Never in my life have I seen a more glaring misuse of public funds through any department than through this department. The motivation at the inception of this department, going away back, was to make a gigantic PR machine through the finesse of Robert Macaulay and he did a pretty fair job with it.

In the last four years, Mr. Speaker, I have been sitting here watching the operation of the hon. Minister of Economics and Development and I would say very kindly he is the only bull that I ever saw who carries on his own china shop! Members will notice how he refuses to answer questions in the House; he does not want to get bogged down with any facts at all. We read in the press about a year ago that he was going to build 10,000 houses and at that time he made the big release that he did not have a single lot—serviced lot—available. When pressed for details of the lots that he had, he furnished this list here which I have in my hand.

Mr. White: This is out of order!

Mr. Sargent: Well, it may be out of order Mr. Speaker—

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): No he is not, he is not.

Mr. Sargent: But my leader brought forth the most important suggestion that has been brought forth in this House—the formation of a Ministry of housing and urban affairs, but this government has seen fit to play down the need for housing. A year ago he "conned" us into the fact that he had a HOME programme. We know what a HOME programme he has already; it is part of this whole flim-flam game he is using in this department.

He did not have title to a single piece of land and here we are today, 14 months later —we still have no housing and any houses that are available are not for the average man—in the neighbourhood of $8,000—

Mr. White: On a point of order. The member for Grey-Bruce and the member for Humber were very jealous of the rights of the members of this House earlier today. Now to be consistent, should he not be reminded that he is debating the bill before us and should he not be confined to that bill?

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is quite right. I have been drifting along on a very sore point on our side here and I should not veer into that, but I will say that this department is a great cover-up for a "snow" job and you are using millions of dollars of the people's money. This government will have spent $15 million this year—

Mr. Speaker: Order, order! The member really has not been speaking to the principle of this bill, he has been speaking to the department. I have allowed the previous speakers a considerable amount of leeway and I am prepared to allow the present speaker leeway, but not really quite as much and as far away from the bill principle as he has been taking. I wonder if he would reconsider and now address himself to the principle of the bill.

Mr. Sargent: Thank you Mr. Speaker, I will try to do so.

The bill embraces a whole lot of things, so far as international offices across the world, and the motivation could be to get industry into Canada. In our desks here we have—these are made in the—

Mr. B. Newman: The United States.

Mr. Sargent: Not the United States, these are made in Germany. They are all part of the paraphernalia we are set with here but the point is that we are asked to set up a department, or to change the name of a department spending $28 million this year. This is the budget you plan to spend, and this department is the biggest offender in using public funds on travel. The auditor came out last week criticizing the government on the money they are spending on travel. But this department is the biggest offender in the waste of public funds on this big PR job it is doing. For my part, I know it will do no good, but if the people of this province knew the inside deal that you boys had, in the setting up of the Ports of Call deals and Expo, and what you are going to do round the world for your friends—using the public pot—looking after your friends, I think it is shocking. I hope that the new members in this House—

Mr. Speaker: Order, order!

Mr. Sargent: —that the new members in this House through the public accountants—

Mr. Speaker: Order, order!

Would the member please be seated when the Speaker is on his feet. It is the custom of this House that every member should resume his seat when the Speaker stands.

I would be pleased if the member would continue, and then conclude in due course, his speech with respect to this matter but would he please come back to the principle of the bill and not speak on the operation of the department being renamed by the bill.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, I am very opposed to any bill that in any way has to do with this department.

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): Mr. Speaker, there are two or three things I would like to address myself to in connection with the bill. At present in our situation in Timmins we are facing the closing of the largest gold mine, I suppose, that Canada has ever had. We are in a period of crisis in our area and we have been pressing for a long time to convince the government that the smelter processing the ore for the Texas Gulf mines must be located in our area and all our entreaties and pleas have seemed to be falling on deaf ears in the Cabinet.

Now I think that if the government is going to be concerned about trade and development, they have got to see the situations, as they arise in the province, and do something constructive in those areas where situations exist for something constructive to be done to help the immediate areas to have growth and to get on in the economic development area.

I would heartily concur with the remarks of the hon. member for Sudbury when he says that we must stand up to this particular company and tell them that they must build this smelter in an adjacent area to where the ore is processed unless they can show that it would be a completely disastrous economic enterprise and I am sure that they will not find that. The government at this particular point could prove its integrity on this whole matter of development by taking a stand on this issue.

Another thing that I would like to see in this Act is the Ontario Northland Railway which would seem to be a part of the whole area of development. We have heard that the Ontario Northland Railway could be the development road of the north and if you were going to have a department concerned with promoting industry and development in this particular section of the north, then it would seem that it would be advisable to have this particular government commission under the direction of this particular department, and not a department where it has very little reason to be, except to provide another area of concern for the Minister of that department.

I think that industry in the region could be developed to a greater degree if the Ontario Northland Railway was under a department that was thinking about the development and planning of this certain area of the north which it now serves. I have heard there is even thought of curtailing one certain line of this road, and I would be very disappointed if this was to come about.

I think that the government could even think about extending the ONR or taking over some of the CN line and bringing it right through to Toronto. If secondary industry were to come to the north, so that they could subsidize some of the products that are shipped, then the geography drawback that now exists could be bridged.

So in supporting the one particular aspect —if the government was willing to really do something about development at a time where there is a crisis in a particular area, then it could move in on the Texas Gulf sulphur smelter question, and I would like to see serious consideration given to putting the Ontario Northland Railway in this particular section of the government's Ministry.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. D. Jackson (Timiskaming): Mr. Speaker, when I rise to speak on this bill, I do so in humility, because I bow to the superior intelligence and experience of the member for Sudbury and the member for Thunder Bay and the member for Peterborough.

I would like to point out to the hon. member for Humber, who spoke of the coal we had to bring in from the United States, that we have, in northern Ontario, one of the biggest deposits of lignite in the Hudson Bay lowlands of any coal field, and yet the government of Ontario has not seen fit to try to develop that coalfield. They have seen fit to try to bring coal in from the United States —which they have done I should say—but the cost as the member for Humber has pointed out is $50 million.

There is something else I would like to point out, in speaking to this bill, and that is the fact that it hinges on co-operation

between departments. And in the short time I have been here, I have seen that there is no co-operation between departments and no communication. I have asked two questions and both of the answers indicate to me that one hand does not know what the other hand is doing, and has no intention of finding out.

I asked about a road in Chaput-Hughes and why The Department of Highways had not communicated with The Department of Municipal Affairs to find out if there had been a reason—

Mr. Speaker: Might I please ask the member to confine himself to the bill in question which has to do with the renaming and organization of the department.

Mr. Jackson: Mr. Speaker, I am trying to show that this bill hinges on the necessity of co-operation amongst departments of this government, and I would like to point out that there is no co-operation amongst the departments, and no communication, and without that, this bill is just so much paper.

I asked whether The Department of Municipal Affairs had been consulted by The Department of Highways.

Mr. Speaker: I would point out that the member is not dealing with the principle of the bill; he is dealing with a specific instance with respect to two other departments. He has made his point as to the non-co-operation and it need not be elaborated upon.

Mr. Jackson: I will go back to another question I asked: whether northern Ontario had a representative at the trade conference in Los Angeles. The Minister told me that no one had represented northern Ontario specifically.

When I asked him whether anyone had been approached to represent northern Ontario, he said that he would be glad to have someone from the north to represent us.

But let me point out to you, Mr. Speaker, that until we have industry, we cannot have a representative of industry to go to Los Angeles.

It is my understanding that this was the reason for the trade conference—for more industry to be brought into Canada—to bring it into all of Ontario, not southern Ontario, not Wiarton, not North Bay, but into all of Ontario. But from the answer I received, it is quite obvious to me, and I think it is quite obvious to everyone in this House, that the industry goes not where it should go, but where industry wants to go.

When I asked the question, did we have a representative, as I say, the Minister answered that when we sent a representative down they would listen to him and they would include him in the group that goes to these trade conferences. But this department made no effort whatsoever to seek out a representative from northern Ontario and made no effort at that trade conference to bring our affairs to light so that they could be judged in their entirety.

Mr. Speaker, once again I would like to go back to the spirit of co-operation amongst these departments. Another question I asked in this House, was to the Minister of The Department of Lands and Forests on the E. B. Eddy Company.

In northern Ontario, one of the big reasons we do not have primary industry in the forestry field, is because we have so much land tied up by certain companies, vast tracts of timber that are held by one company.

We talk about development, but, Mr. Speaker, I do not understand how anyone can talk of development when we allow one or two companies to control half of Ontario. Foreign industries control over 100 townships. The E. B. Eddy Company controls 80,000 acres and then we say we are going to promote industry, promote development. If anyone is going to promote development in Ontario, it has to be these companies, because they run the affairs of this country and if we think—no matter what this department is called, no matter who the Minister is—if we think that he can promote industry, when the corporate giants of this country control the country, then we are badly mistaken, and I go along with the member for Sudbury and the member for Peterborough when I say this is the greatest hoax of all time.

Mr. Speaker: The Minister of Economics and Development has moved second reading of Bill 11. I would like to put the motion.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Well does not the Minister wish to reply? I see he is rising.

Mr. Speaker: Does the Minister wish to reply? I thought you might not want to listen to what I first described as the Min-

ister's remarks. Is the Minister prepared to reply?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Yes, I will be glad to.

Mr. Gisborn: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, you might clarify this, but I think we had a ruling yesterday that a member could speak only once on the second reading of a bill and the hon. Minister, if I recollect, spoke following the member for High Park yesterday.

Mr. Speaker: Except for the fact that one who introduces or makes a motion is entitled to make a further speech elucidating the matters raised in his address and any speeches that have been made in the meantime. That is my understanding of the rule.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): If hon. members opposite do not want the Minister to speak we will have the vote.

Mr. Lewis: Well Mr. Speaker, I agree entirely with the Speaker's ruling, so long as it is understood that while it may well be his last pronouncement on the subject, it is not necessarily the last pronouncement on the subject.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Speaker, I have listened with a great deal of interest, and patience to the hon. members on the opposite side of the House. I presume they will grant me the same courtesy, even though I do not agree with them in many of the areas that they have entered.

Certainly one would have to say that they have wandered widely in this last couple of days in this piece of legislation. If I had any doubt that we did not have a very highly successful department, this certainly confirms that we have a very successful department or they would not be attacking in all the areas that they have attacked here. It is obvious that when you hurt, you are going to hear from the Opposition.

I have a number of notes here and I am sure that I could go till about 11:00 o'clock —and I probably will tonight—and cover some of the points that the members have made. But first let me just comment on the principle of the bill.

It was clearly defined in this Act for this government's purposes, and it provides me as the Minister responsible with all the powers I need to continue to assist in the expansion of industrial opportunity for manufacturers in the province, and those we hope to encourage to expand and locate here in the future.

As the hon. leader of the Opposition said the other day, it is simply a continuation of the legislation that we have operated under since 1944, except we have clarified the department's operations by taking The Department of Economics down to the Treasury board. It sets out the proper procedures and functions of a trade Ministry, and under the development aspect covers the activity of the Ontario development corporation, the Sheridan Park research centre, the Ontario economic council, the Ontario housing corporation, and the Ontario student housing and such other Acts as may be assigned to it by the Lieutenant-Governor in council.

I can assure the hon. members that the department will continue to co-ordinate its efforts with all other departemnts of the government as we have done in the past. We have been a service department to the other departments of the government and this is what we intend to do. We will be working closely with the Deputy Minister of the Treasury, who is now in The Treasury Department who will be looking after the economic activities.

I would suggest that endeavouring to answer all the members' questions without wandering, is going to be difficult. I am going to take the remarks of the member for Windsor West, who spoke yesterday and try to qualify some of the questions that he asked and to give him the information he wanted.

First, he questioned the fate of regional development and asked was it in or out of the department's jurisdiction? I want to suggest to him, as he already knows, it has been transferred to The Department of the Treasurer; and I am sure that the hon. Provincial Treasurer will be making some announcements on its activity, and its plans and what it has achieved in the last year in the very short period. My department will continue to be represented on the regional development committee, on ARDA, and therefore I do not share the fear and concern that some of the members have about the co-ordination of our activities and policies with other departments of government.

The hon. member also stated he would like some clarification on the government's

record on plant closing. I would like to suggest that we stand as we always have, ready to assist labour and management if the economics are such that plant closings are necessary. They have been in the past, and I am sure that they are going to be in the future. But unless the government is prepared to subsidize every manufacturer who fails there is no policy, and none contemplated by me or this government, to introduce a programme of this type, which I think would be costly and unworkable except for the odd exception due to unusual circumstances. In this instance we believe the Ontario development corporation is well qualified and prepared, with the consultants and the finances available, to give them all the help that they need.

I see that it is 6:00 o'clock, perhaps I will move for adjournment.

It being 6:00 o'clock p.m., the House took recess.

Legislature of Ontario Debates

No. 15

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

First Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Tuesday, March 5, 1968

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1968

5

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Tuesday, March 5, 1968

Department of Trade and Development, bill to establish, Mr. Randall, first reading 459

Resumption of the debate on the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Lawlor, Mr. Edighoffer 473

Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Jessiman, agreed to 483

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Rowntree, agreed to 483

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

The House resumed at 8 o'clock p.m.

DEPARTMENT OF TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT
(Continued)

Hon. S. J. Randall (Minister of Economics and Development): Mr. Speaker, this afternoon, before adjournment, I was speaking on some of the questions posed by the hon. member for Windsor West (Mr. Peacock) and one of his further statements was that we had no industry location policy. Again I want to stress that this government does not have any policy to force industry to locate in any particular area, other than through the incentive programme we have introduced.

We believe the incentive programme that we have introduced to encourage industry to go into the slower-growth areas will do that job without forcing industry to go where they do not want to go.

I have said it before, I will repeat it again, as far as I am concerned this is not a closed society as visualized by the New Democratic Party. The disastrous results of the socialist government in Saskatchewan, under Tommy Douglas, the national leader, should be evidence to our friends over here on the far right, that this is a disastrous way to set up industry, and certainly if—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Randall: If the new members in the party have not read the book by Robert Tyre on Douglas's Saskatchewan, I will be very glad to see that they get a copy, because this is a bible on socialism failure. Mr. Speaker, I have been in most socialist countries and it is obvious to me as I travel around on the jaunts that my friend from Sudbury (Mr. Sopha) claims we continue to take, that in all the socialist countries, they are at least 50 years behind the western democracies—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Randall: And you will notice if you read what is coming out of eastern Europe today, they are moving towards a capitalistic system. They have found the one they have does not work, but our friends in the New Democratic Party have not caught up with this yet. I thought that the leader of the New Democratic Party (Mr. MacDonald) just before the election, had caught up because he made a speech at the Royal York hotel and he said, "we must be more like the Conservatives."

An hon. member: Is this Minister speaking to the bill?

Hon. Mr. Randall: That is right.

Mr. Speaker: The Minister who moved second reading of the bill has the right to reply to the questions of the members of the Opposition who have placed them on the record.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Now, Mr. Speaker, I am glad that was a new member who got up, because we will bring him up to date on some of the education we have been trying to get to the members who have been here for the last four years.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Well, I tell you, I think we see the difficulty being experienced in the United Kingdom today because of the policies introduced by the late Clement Attlee —in fact if you go to England today they will tell you there is only one thing wrong, he died 30 years too late.

Mr. Speaker, I might also say I was in the socialist heaven of Sweden last October on another one of the jaunts my friend from Sudbury referred to, and they have spent something like a billion dollars in northern Sweden. In talking to their industrial director there, he said, "We are going to try for one more year, and if it is not any more successful we are going to pull out because we cannot maintain a Minister there at the cost to the taxpayer." And just to follow up Scandinavia, and to show what is happening in these socialist countries, Norway went out of socialism a year ago; Denmark went out about two months ago; and I will take bets that Sweden will go out of socialism by this coming September.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Speaker, I am glad we are going to supply a very entertaining evening.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Well, you know where your real opposition is.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Oh, I knew that a long time ago.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Some of them have gone through three and four elections and have not moved—

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Speaker, I would suggest to the hon. member for Windsor West that if he would read the department's published industry report at the end of each year, he will find that we are bringing into this province—I say we are creating a climate where there are 160 to 200 industries a year coming in here. And over 60 per cent of these industries are settling outside of the Metro region of Toronto; they are not settling in this area.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): You have not proved that.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I can prove it, I proved it last year. Go back and look at *Hansard* and you will find that I proved it for you, my friend.

Mr. Speaker, with the introduction of the auto pact, they also mentioned in this House, and you will find it in *Hansard*, there are 52 towns and cities now manufacturing automobile parts here that were not manufacturing before the automobile pact. It is obvious to us that we do have decentralization of industry and the programme we have now, the EIO programme, will further that so that more of the smaller towns in Ontario are going to be able to participate in new industry as it comes into this province.

An hon. member: Speak a little more slowly, I cannot hear you.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Well, turn your hearing aid up. I might say also, Mr. Speaker, that, the hon. member for Windsor West said he first met me at a meeting we had at the former Minister of Labour's office downtown. I think it was one hot July afternoon. I remember the afternoon very vividly. In fact, I was sitting in my office on a Tuesday and a phone call came through from the press and he said, "What time does the demonstration take place outside of your office?"

I said, "What demonstration?"

"Well," he said, "the gang from Oshawa are coming down, are they not?"

I said: "Oh, that is postponed until tomorrow." So I went down to the hon. Minister's office the next day and who should be walking around but 200 men who were laid off from General Motors on a short lay-off, with signs, "Pearson eats steaks with LBJ while we starve to death."

Mr. C. G. Pilkey (Oshawa): This was no short lay-off; some men were off over eight months.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Speaker, right in the midst of all this, was the hon. leader of the New Democratic Party leaning up against the wall in the shade. I said "Good afternoon, Don, I thought you would be on vacation," and he said "Oh, no, we have a government to topple." They hired buses, they did not have the signs printed on Tuesday so they got us to postpone the meeting until Wednesday. As you know this is one of their income areas where they earn money to run the party, by printing signs for anybody who wants to march on Queen's Park.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Speaker, at that time I was able to present to the group from Oshawa the report from the Ontario economic council on the Ford lay-off that they were very worried about. They had pushed the panic button on, and we pointed out that Ford had not only taken all those workers back but they had added many more to the payroll. I assured them in Oshawa the same thing would happen.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Has it happened?

Hon. Mr. Randall: That is exactly what has happened.

Mr. Pilkey: No, it has not, though.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Oh yes it has.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I pointed out also, Mr. Speaker, that there was something like 33,000 new workers on the UAW payroll as a result of the auto pact. Now maybe that has gone up or down since, I do not know.

Mr. Pilkey: As a result of UAW's organizational efforts, and no credit to you.

Hon. Mr. Randall: No, no, as a result of the auto pact.

Mr. Pilkey: As a result of the UAW's efforts.

Hon. Mr. Randall: As a result of the auto pact.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that if the hon. members would work just as hard as we are doing to create jobs in this province that there would be fewer people walking the picket lines and going out on strike. And there would be more jobs for everybody. I would also point out the statement made by the executive vice-president of the UAW the other day when he described how they settled a strike in the St. Therese plant of General Motors last year or a couple of years ago. He said: "We went over and got them to strike in the United States, and came back and said 'how do you like those apples?' "

I would like to suggest that Walter Reuther has said time and time again that regardless of the automobile pact, come hell or high water, American jobs will be protected. I suggest that it is about time that our friend's talents were turned to helping Canadian workers. We had a newspaper strike here and 600 or 700 men are still walking the streets because of it; looking for other jobs and because of what? Because the Canadians were used as guinea-pigs for the American unions to see if they could break the newspapers. They lost that strike and the Canadians were the ones that suffered, and I suggest to you that you should place the Canadian workers first and the American workers second as we do.

I am a little tired of the pious attitude of saying that the government is not looking after Canadian workers, and I would like to remind you of your own weaknesses and they are plenty. Having dealt with that matter, and got our friends excited, I would like to deal with the next one.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: Why are the Tories not looking after the Canadian workers in Oshawa today?

Hon. Mr. Randall: We are over here and you are still at the bottom of the totem pole, and that is where you will always be. Your trouble is that you are a lousy mathematician; you cannot count past 67. We will get you a new slide rule, and I suggest that you use it when high tide is not here.

Another question posed by the hon. member was that he suggested that we were running a commission of industry for Ontario, and I pointed out to him that during the election campaign your own leader, and we totalled it up, advocated something like 43 boards and commissions over and above what we had to run this province.

I might add that the Liberal leader went the other way and said if we cut the Cabinet to 14 we could do a better job. Here we are, we are right in the middle, so I think perhaps we are right.

Mr. MacDonald: What has this got to do with it?

Hon. Mr. Randall: This is answering the question of the member for Windsor.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Well, I listened to you this afternoon and I enjoyed you, I always enjoy you. You are in the wrong profession, you should be in Stratford. I am glad that I gave you the opportunity.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): That is the last time that I say something nice about you.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I was waiting all afternoon to hear it. I even had my hearing aid turned up. I am just trying to share a little wisdom with you, and if you will sit back and relax maybe you will learn a little bit.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): He said relax, not collapse.

Hon. Mr. Randall: The hon. member suggested we had taken no position with respect to foreign ownership. We hold the same views as the federal government.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Randall: And if they make Canadian laws, and in the main they do, sir, this government has not got any intention of changing the rules. We are now witnessing the result of the Levesque and Kierans fiasco. If you do not think that is bringing the chickens home to roost, you should go down to Quebec and talk to some of the people there.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, Johnson is there now.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Oh no, Mr. Johnson inherited the problem.

These two fellows spelled out what they thought was the problem with Quebec and Canada, and they had no answer. Anytime that you bring out a problem without an answer and get that kind of publicity without an answer, somebody is bound to get hurt. I would say that what is happening today, and what is referred to as economic nationalism, has done a great deal of harm to the Canadian economy in many areas when people talk about these things but do not have the answers.

I would suggest to my hon. friends over here that they criticize all they like, but come up with some constructive suggestions. Do that and we will listen to you. My door is open and I am glad to listen to you any time. I would say that if any guidelines are forthcoming in this country for foreign industry, then they should come from the federal government, so that management of foreign industry know exactly where they stand and what the rules are. Certainly, if ten provinces started to bring out the rule book then we would have chaos on chaos.

It is my contention that if the government makes known its requirements enlightened management will make a decision on those requirements. And they will be ruled, not by this economic nationalism, not by some of these pearbrains who would like to see the chaos created in industry as is happening in some of the developing countries where, when they get their independence through nationalism, that is all they get. They cannot eat it and they cannot put it in the bank, and I do not want to see that happen to this province or this country.

Mr. A. Peacock (Windsor West): Would the hon. Minister answer a question, or would he prefer to go on?

Hon. Mr. Randall: No, I prefer to go on. You have had your say and when I have had mine I will answer your question. I would say that I hope that this government would never interfere with industry or tinker around with the rules with regard to foreign industry without first finding out a workable solution. And to date the critics have failed to come up with a solution. I remember that Freddy Gardiner once said, "do not tear down any fences until you find out why they were put up." And I am sure that there are fences being torn down today and people who do not know why they were put up.

The hon. member for Windsor West also asked what we were going to do about assistance to industry that was going to be hurt by the Kennedy Round. That is a good question. I think that we have some answers. We say again that this is the responsibility of the federal government as announced by the Hon. Mr. Drury, the Minister of Industry, and would work similar to the United States Federal Assistance Act.

I might add that this government has had a very close liaison with those industries that may be affected by the Kennedy Round cuts when they begin. And we have a research staff in the trade ministry branch of this province and in this department constantly looking at the industries that may be affected. Some of the things that we have already studied, as the hon. members know is the auto pact, the machinery industry, the farm implement field, and we review all company and industry briefs that are submitted to us or that are available to us.

May I point out that no government in Canada and few in the United States have done as much or given as much service to Ontario industry as we have in this department. I can only refer to the information that I put on record the other day of the industrial awards won by this department for assistance to industry.

Perhaps the hon. members would like to know that the Ontario product index covers over 30,000 items that we have listed in our office. You call us and we can tell you where to find this product anywhere in Canada. This service is not available in any other province in Canada. We have a list of 2,500 manufacturers who are looking for licence agreements at all times; that is why we are successful in arranging licence agreements for manufacturers to manufacture products either imported or never sold in this country before.

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Provincial Treasurer): That would be good for Windsor. It would help Windsor a great deal.

Hon. Mr. Randall: We have also, Mr. Speaker, 1,000 companies that have been researched and are quite prepared to go on any of our sales missions as soon as we can find a place in the world where they can get an order. I would point out to my hon. friend that on these sales missions—we have never had an unsuccessful mission. All of them brought home the bacon.

Mr. Speaker, we run a continued study on a programme called the "fabrication gap" and we research about 700 products that are being imported into this country in high

volume; as we research those products we refer to manufacturers who would like to get new lines on which to operate in their plants.

Mr. Speaker, one of the hon. members—I think it was the hon. member for Peterborough—said this afternoon: why should we take them on these missions, why should we help them, why should we do this?

Mr. W. G. Pitman (Peterborough): I did not say that at all.

Hon. Mr. Randall: They are not all General Motors, I can assure him; they are not all like Dow Chemical. Of the 13,000—

Mr. Pitman: What do you mean?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Of the 13,000 manufacturers listed in this province, 8,000 employed 14 people or less and these are the people we are trying to help to find new markets—so that they can employ 28 people, 56 people—and this is how we have been able to find 75,000 jobs a year for the people in this province over the last four years.

Mr. Gisborn: You call that free enterprise?

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): What about the north?

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, would the Minister of Energy Resources—

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): What do you know about it?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Would you like to put that on record?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order. Will the member please resume his seat? Will the Minister please proceed with his remarks?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Who said they did not deserve to live up there? The Minister never said it.

Mr. Lewis: It is in *Hansard* now, my friend.

Hon. Mr. Randall: No, it is not.

Mr. Lewis: The Minister manages to put many things on record and we would not want to miss any of them.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well, there are a lot of things you should have on record—

Mr. Lewis: They are on record.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The Minister will please proceed.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sopha: I wish we could have some peace and quiet around here.

Mr. Pilkey: This is better than television.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Speaker, I have listened with great interest to what the hon. members had to say the last two days, but it is obvious that they have been up to that brain laundry up in Port Elgin where they go for that socialist retreat and where they say: "Do not give the opposition a chance to say anything, just keep on blowing in you see, crowd them down, keep on top"—

Mr. MacDonald: You mean, like your YPC meeting in Peterborough?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Up in Port Elgin, to the brain laundry where you all go for a brain washing. You know.

Mr. Pilkey: Would you like an invitation to speak there?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Yes, delighted.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Now, do not get mad boys, we are all just having a little fun.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Nixon) asked a question with reference to further assistance to industry and what the criteria was for the EIO programme and I pointed out to those who had been in my office that it was not an easy thing to develop criteria for the EIO programme. I might also suggest that it is a very inflexible programme—at least I should say it is a flexible programme—we are quite prepared to change it if anybody has a better idea. But so far, nobody has come up with a better idea and so, until I get one, we are going to carry on with the one we have.

Mr. Speaker, when trying to set up the programme, it was obvious that the federal authorities had introduced one a few years ago that was very successful. We give them credit for doing something that I think was good for this province, and good for Canada and they established one in the Georgian Bay area. I claim they left it on a little too long; it created some problems in that area, but it did create, as my hon. friend from Peterborough said, some new growth centres which were not growth centres before that

programme was put into effect. They are now growth centres because they have had two and a half years to build up those three cities, Owen Sound, Collingwood and Midland.

When we talk about growth centres, I recognized if we wanted more growth centres in this province then we had to find out what was necessary to create a growth centre by getting to the municipalities and finding what they had to offer, what they intend to do for themselves. As the hon. member for Peterborough said the other day, or somebody said, you have 165 classified municipalities so far, but there are over 1,000 in this province, and the entire 1,000 have a right to fill in this application, send it in and if they are not classified as eligible for the programme today, they may be classified tomorrow.

Now we recognize there are many of these towns that will never be able to take an industry. On the other hand, there are many hundreds of these towns that want industry and where 25 or 30 people could fit in very, very nicely and do something for that town. Not necessarily keep the kids from coming out of high school to come to Toronto but at least producing a payroll down on Main Street. And it is not our intention to make this programme so wide that we create a growth centre in a thousand municipalities; we recognize that it cannot be done. But we suggest that before we decide that we are going to build Peterborough bigger than it is, and build Toronto bigger than it is, we want to decide.

Mr. Peacock: But you have not made that decision.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Oh yes we have.

Mr. Pitman: You have not.

Hon. Mr. Randall: It is all right. We are creating growth centres of our own.

Mr. L. C. Henderson (Lambton): How about Smiths Falls?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Sure, would you call Smiths Falls a growth centre?

Mr. Peacock: Madoc and Marmora are growth centres.

Hon. Mr. Randall: This was an impossible one until four years ago the Ontario development corporation gave it its first loan.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the EIO programme is in its infancy. It only started in January. I will be announcing to the members of the Legislature what success we have had within a very short time. The number of applications that are in—the number of companies that are taking advantage of it to enlarge their facilities, and the new companies that want to come in and participate in the programme.

It is obvious to me as I listened to the hon. member from northwestern Ontario yesterday and this morning that the meetings I held with the chamber of commerce, the mayor and the newspaper editors in northwestern Ontario indicated that they wanted an incentive programme that Mr. Drury was unable to give them. They visited Ottawa at least half a dozen times and Mr. Drury said: Go back and see Randall, I do not have a programme to fit your town because our programme will only fit where the unemployment is above the national average, and the per capita income is below the national average"—and the federal government would not change this criteria.

Mr. Peacock: And the unemployment rate is going back up.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Maybe it will be, but I am just suggesting that this was the first incentive programme. It had merit, it worked and nobody can say it did not work. There are 47 or 48 industries in the Georgian Bay area that two years ago I did not think would go there, and I think a lot of people would agree with that. But they are there and these are becoming growth centres and I suggest that before we decide where we should establish growth centres we should give the rest of the province of Ontario an equal opportunity to enter into this programme such as we are doing.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that we have not got the final solution to creating growth centres; I do not think anybody has. I said earlier that I visited most of the countries where they have a planned economy and there is lots to be said for it; there is lots to be said against it. I would say, from the application forms that we are getting from these municipalities—and there are many we have not heard from—they themselves are beginning to find out what they have, what their potential is and what they can do with it. It never occurred to them to analyze, to turn their eyes inward and find out what the municipality had to offer. They are beginning to find out, and as they find out they can also help themselves.

Mr. Peacock: The information is already in the Municipal Affairs handbook.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Well that is all right but there was never an incentive behind it. Money talks. The minute there was an opportunity for them to get a cash grant they began to take an interest in filing the information with us so we could sort it out and help them decide what their future was going to be.

Mr. Pitman: You did not ask for the right information.

Hon. Mr. Randall: That is your opinion; we do not agree with you. I just suggest you listen for a while; I listened this afternoon.

This is the first application form. We will have many other forms to follow this one, with more information, before we are finished. We are looking at the number of youngsters coming out of the universities in those areas, and the schools; we are looking at the welfare roles in those areas that perhaps could be reduced if there was another industry in there.

I told you when you visited my office in Peterborough the other day that this was not a programme to end all programmes and you yourself today said: "I hope you do not think I am parochial". I did not think you were parochial but I would certainly suggest to you that there are other areas around Peterborough that deserve some kind of a break from this government under this industrial incentive programme.

Mr. Speaker, the matter of northern Ontario was discussed by the Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) this afternoon with the hon. member. He knows what my thoughts are on northwestern Ontario. I have been up there enough, in fact they told me that next time I go back they would make me the unofficial mayor of Fort William and Port Arthur. On many occasions we are working with the mayors of both those towns, the chamber of commerce, the development councils. We know exactly what they want up there.

Mr. Stokes: When can we expect results?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Well, now just a minute, a year ago before you were in politics your Mr. Andras was down here saying "Our government does not have a policy. You must go to the provincial government", and I promised the people in northwestern Ontario and northern Ontario that we would have a programme, and we introduced a programme.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Randall: That is all right, why should we not? You talked about pork barrels the other day—a $100 million pork barrel out of this government. You know that your own leader promised almost $700 million out of his pork barrel, and hon. member sitting over here in the New Democratic Party—his totals almost $1 billion more than the province has coming in.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Do not talk about a provincial pork barrel, a government pork barrel, talk about your own pork barrel.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Speaker, I just want to cover a few notes I made this afternoon. The hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Jackson) was asking why some of the people in northern Ontario did not go on the mission to California. I explained that in full detail the other day and if you get a copy of *Hansard* I think you will find that northern Ontario was not neglected and never is. The hon. member for Scarborough East (Mr. T. Reid), who was opposite me this afternoon, suggested that we had no right to be in the international field in trade. I just suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, I have heard that since the day I walked in this House I do not buy it and neither does Mr. Winters. He was on CFRB the other night being questioned by Jack Dennett and Mr. Sinclair and they said "What do you think of the programme?" and he said, "I think it is the greatest thing that ever happened and it should happen more often."

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to leave this thought with the hon. member who questioned our rights to get into the international market. There was a 70 per cent increase in manufacturing exports in the last year and 19 per cent of that came out of the province of Ontario. The hon. member for Sudbury mentioned that if the federal government can do a good job selling wheat they ought to be able to do a good job of selling manufacturing goods. I suggest to him that Canada has not had to do much of a job of selling wheat in the last several years, to the starving world. Selling manufacturing goods is a different job entirely. Now, Mr. Speaker, I think I have covered most of the points I intended to cover.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): The Minister is out of gas!

Hon. Mr. Randall: No, I am not out of gas, I could go on until 11 o'clock if the hon. member likes but I want to give him another chance. They have even got that hotel for sale, I have a record of it.

Mr. Speaker, on a closing note, the hon. member for Thunder Bay mentioned the $130,000 loan we made up there, but that put almost 500-800 Indians back in the fishing business, so this has a far reaching effect. No matter how big the loan, we have kept that company in business. If you had had a look at the balance sheet I am sure you would agree with me that no bank manager anywhere would have lent them a dime, and so we are dong the thing for the Ontario development corporation through the trade and industry branch and we believe it will help us wipe the industrial faces of the province and give everybody in the province an opportunity to participate.

Mr. Sargent: How much money would the Minister lend us?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I guess, Mr. Speaker, that this legislation we have brought here to change the name from trade and industry is one of the greatest pieces of legislation ever to come into this House. I know that the hon. members having had a full disclosure and opportunity to express themselves will vote for it wholeheartedly.

Mr. Speaker: I would point out that in previous Legislatures there was an agreement, I think, between parties that on such discussions and debate as we have had tonight the debate would be concluded by the remarks of the Minister moving second reading. Now, if I am wrong in that I stand to be corrected, but that is my information.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I certainly have a comment to make. I had no word that we had any agreement of this nature. The Minister exercises the privilege of coming in and explaining the bill, if he wishes, at the beginning and he exercises the privilege of coming in at the end. We have certainly had speakers follow the Minister before. I will say that it is not my intention to engage in a rebuttal to the Minister though I must say that he has been incredibly provocative. I would with delight go on rebutting his remarks until 11 o'clock, but there is one aspect of this debate that I do want to dwell on because I think it is extremely important.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: This afternoon, the other debates had concluded—and I do not think that the member for York South was in his seat—but at that point the Minister proceeded to make his concluding remarks.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: On a point of order. I specifically intervened at that stage to indicate that although the Minister's remarks might be final, it was also possible that they would not be.

Mr. Speaker: It was because of the remarks of the member for Scarborough West that I made the remark which I just made now. I made some enquiry during the adjournment of the House and I was advised that that was the situation. However, that is entirely, as far as I am concerned, up to the House and I will be glad to have it dealt with as the members feel it should be dealt with tonight.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, this discussion again points out the difficulty that we face in this House when we have no standard set of rules. In the last session of this House we had the same sort of argument; there were a number of occasions on which there was jockeying for position; should the Minister get up, should he not get up, did he end the debate, did he not end the debate? If the hon. member for York South speaks, perhaps we start around again. This thing can go on indefinitely. To my knowledge, sir, there is no rule so established in practice since I have been here. The ruling is not at all clear on this, but I would think that it would expedite the business of this House if in matters such as questions before the orders of the day—this one and many others—that we were able to dissolve the discussions once and for all so that we had a standard set of rules that applied to all procedures.

Mr. Lewis: On a point of order. We would concur in that. I remind the Speaker that there have been occasions when members have followed a Minister's supposed concluding remarks but that it would greatly facilitate things if Ministers guided a bill through the House by making an opening statement at the commencement of the reading.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Lewis: And then I think one could reach an amicable agreement about concluding the debate as well.

Mr. Speaker: I think perhaps we would all be in agreement with two propositions, one is that, as the member for Downsview has

said, this should be referred to the committee that is going to be set up, and secondly, that we should hear those members, particularly the member for York South, who wish to speak at the present time.

Mr. Singer: Well, Mr. Speaker, again on a point of order; if the member for York South is permitted to speak, while I do not know if any member of the official Opposition wishes to follow him, I say that they have that right should they so choose.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, on the basic proposition of our getting some clarification by reference to the committee that you are proposing to set up, I would agree. I think this is very necessary because one of the problems we face, if I may speak as a member of the Opposition, is that if a Minister foregoes his privilege of introducing the bill, often when he concludes the debate he states some basic government views with regard to the bill, presumably when the debate is over. And if he thinks we are going to sit here and listen to it without getting back into the debate, well, Mr. Speaker, let us quit kidding ourselves, we are not going to sit here.

If in this committee which you are about to appoint, we lay down the rule that a Minister, when introducing the bill speaks to that bill, and spells out what the government envisages as the purpose of that bill, and we all know that it is the purpose and therefore we intelligently and meaningfully debate that purpose, then at the end the Minister, I would concede, should have the right to a rebuttal.

We have had once again, this afternoon—for whatever reason it always mystifies me—a Minister introducing what in his own words is one of the most important pieces of legislation this House has ever had. That is a slight exaggeration but let us accept it. But he gave no explanation as to its purpose.

Mr. Sargent: What is the member going to do about it?

Mr. MacDonald: Well, just one moment and I will tell the House what I am going to do about it. However, Mr. Speaker, let me lay down the terms which I am going to impose upon myself. I am not going to attempt to rebut the main comments of the Minister. I want to make another point which I think is an extremely important point in relationship to this bill. This bill is laying down the pattern of economic development for the province of Ontario for the foreseeable future. And that is desperately important. In the course of the debate this afternoon—unfortunately in a period when I had to be absent from the House—the hon. member for Sudbury introduced an extremely important aspect of this whole question, namely the issue of foreign control of Canadian industry. Now we have been playing footsy with this incredibly important issue.

Mr. J. H. White (London South): You have been playing politics with it.

Mr. MacDonald: No, we have been playing footsy with it.

Mr. White: You have been playing politics.

Mr. MacDonald: Okay, the hon. member plays politics. Now let me play politics just to match his.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Would the hon. leader include foreign control of labour unions in this country in his remarks too?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is a fair question.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I am not going to get back on to that. In the fullness of time we will have an opportunity to debate that. We have a magnificent example today in Oshawa, of foreign control of industry which is imposing upon Canadian workers a prolonged strike situation—

Hon. Mr. Randall: By foreign control in the United States of the labour union.

Mr. MacDonald: It is a dictate from the head office of General Motors in the United States. And what is the Minister doing about it?

Hon. Mr. Randall: It is a dictate from Walter Reuther, as to what happens in Oshawa.

Mr. MacDonald: It is no dictate of Walter Reuther's.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Yes it is.

Mr. MacDonald: Walter Reuther has settled the issue on the other side but General Motors in its arrogant defiant fashion, backed by $2 billion in profit after taxes every year, is willing to try to take it out on the workers in Oshawa as it did a few years ago, and the

Minister is willing to go along with the whole deal.

Hon. Mr. Randall: This is why you are going to lose Canadian jobs before you get through.

Mr. MacDonald: The Minister thinks so?

Now, Mr. Speaker, this whole issue of foreign control of the Canadian economy and the inevitable political control that flows from economic control, have been headlined and documented in recent days by the production of a Watkins report. Now, before some people on the other side of the House immediately try to dub this report as a product of Walter Gordon, let me remind them that this group happens to be a group of people whose names were submitted by all members of the House of Commons, including Tories—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Oh, well, the hon. member for High Park (Mr. Shulman) would consider it a partisan report if there was a Tory on it.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, let us deal with the substance of the issue—including Tories on the Watkins committee. They came to some conclusions with regard to the nature of the Canadian economy. The basic point is this: No other western industrialized nation of the world has so great a degree of foreign control of its industry as has Canada.

I would agree with the Minister that basically this may be a federal problem; for the most part this may be a federal problem, but I draw the line when the Minister contends that it is exclusively a federal problem and therefore he has no responsibility at all. When he introduces a bill which is the most important bill that has ever come into this Legislature in terms of the economic development of the future of Ontario, I submit that there is some responsibility on him.

Mr. White: You were not here.

Mr. MacDonald: Pardon?

Mr. White: As mentioned by the member for Sudbury today.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, I am sorry, I did not understand—

Mr. White: Well, the member was here. A great example was to hold up Mexico as an illustration of good economic policy.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, let me draw the lines within which I am trying to limit my remarks this afternoon. I am not suggesting that Canada, a young and developing country, should exclude foreign capital. Has that sunk in? I am not suggesting that foreign capital should be excluded and nobody in the New Democratic Party has ever suggested that foreign capital should be excluded.

Mr. Sopha: Oh, yes, you have.

Mr. MacDonald: Oh, no, we have not, Mr. Speaker. What we have said is that if foreign capital comes into this country it should operate under Canadian law and what is more important, we should have governments that have the guts to make certain that the laws are shaped in the interests of Canada. I suggest that some of those guts should be down at Queen's Park as well as up at Ottawa.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I suggest the member's party tried that in Saskatchewan and failed.

Mr. MacDonald: We did not fail.

Mr. Sopha: You failed.

Mr. MacDonald: What the hon. Minister does not know—

Hon. Mr. Randall: You could not even borrow money in New York for less than 4 per cent in Saskatchewan, you had—

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, the hon. Minister is just plain ignorant of the facts. There is no province in this country which came out of the depression and ended up with a better credit rating than the province of Saskatchewan. The records are there for any Minister who wants to look at the facts, but he confuses propaganda with facts because that might get him off the rail. What happened in the province of Saskatchewan—if I may just follow the digression that he has taken me on for a moment—is that after 15 or 20 years of a CCF government they diversified the economy and they rescued it from being a single agricultural economy to a diversified economy.

Mr. Sargent: Who is in power there now?

An hon. member: They are dry.

Mr. MacDonald: They are dry. I tell you, out in Saskatchewan at least they put bars in the hotels.

Hon. Mr. Randall: The CCFers saw the light—

Mr. MacDonald: Well, you know, Mr. Speaker, this brings me to the point I want to make. I do not object to this particular interjection because there is in this country

one category of politician, sometimes he is known as a Liberal and sometimes he is known as Tory, but in fact he is basically a Tory.

Mr. Sargent: He is an NDP member.

Mr. MacDonald: And I will tell you Ross Thatcher is the classic example of it. And then we come down to the point I am trying to discuss at the moment. The government at Ottawa with regard to the whole Watkins report—at which a growing proportion of Canadian people are disturbed—on the basic problem of the control of the Canadian economy, the government at Ottawa stands off. They will not have anything to do with it.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: What government at Ottawa?

Mr. MacDonald: It is not an official report. But this government here takes essentially the same sort of approach. There is no difference at all between the approach of Stanley Randall, and Mitchell Sharp or Bob Winters. None at all. And you do not need to take my word for it, take his words out of *Hansard* just a few moments ago.

Hon. Mr. Randall: They are all good men.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, okay, right. They are all good—

Hon. Mr. Randall: For what it is worth I will tell you who will be the new leader of the Liberal Party, it will be Bob Winters. If you want to make a bet on it, then go ahead.

Mr. MacDonald: They are all good men within the limits of their lights. They are all businessmen who are seeking to develop the economy of this country within the pattern which has emerged within recent years. This is a pattern in which an increasing percentage of the economic development in this province is going to be a subsidiary development of American companies—a continentalism. Somebody asked, what is your alternative? I will suggest what our alternative is.

Mr. G. A. Kerr (Halton West): A 20 per cent decrease in the standard of living.

Mr. MacDonald: What is your alternative in terms at least of reversing the increasing domination of the Canadian economy by foreign control? What is your alternative? Are you happy with that foreign control?

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. MacDonald: You are happy? Okay, Mr. Speaker, let us get it on the record. The Minister said he is happy. And the record a few years ago used to be that 50 per cent of manufacturing was under foreign control. It is now 60 per cent. He is happy. He invites the prospect that it should be 70 or 75 per cent. Well, Mr. Speaker, just let me state something. The Minister does not need to agree with it, but I am confident the Canadian people will agree with it, namely that if you have 60 and then 70 and then 80 per cent of the Canadian and the Ontario economy dominated by foreigners, you will end up being puppets of those foreigners. And as a matter of fact, at the present time, that is what you are to a considerable degree. Both the Minister here, and Bob Winters and Mitchell Sharp in Ottawa. They are willing to promote the continued extension of a branch plant economy.

Mr. Sargent: What is wrong with that?

Mr. MacDonald: I will tell you what is wrong with that, Mr. Speaker. The Tory over here, and he is a wonderful Tory too, despite his magnificently humanitarian front as a Liberal.

The Tory over here asks what is wrong with that. I will tell you what is wrong with that. Canadians have got to retain control of the destiny of Canada.

Mr. Sargent: As long as they employ people.

Mr. MacDonald: And we can retain control of the destiny of Canada by an economic development which means increasingly that control can rest within Canadian hands, and you, who are now bringing in a bill which is establishing a pattern for economic development in the future of the province of Ontario, can do something about that, if you have the will. The tragedy is that you do not have the will. You, along with the Liberals at Ottawa are willing, in effect, to sell this country into increased foreign control.

Mr. Sargent: You are a dreamer.

An hon. member: Who is waving the flag now?

Mr. MacDonald: Now, I am not going to elaborate and repeat what my colleague from Peterborough pointed out this afternoon, but if you have a veneer of industrial development across this province, of small industry in every little community, from Podunkville to you name it, instead of developing growth

centres with the degree of specialization which offers the prospect of an economic growth centre, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Sargent: Who told you that?

Mr. MacDonald: You are not going to have an effective economic development which offers the prospect of Canadians regaining control of their own economy.

Mr. Singer: Whom do you believe, your colleague from Peterborough or the one from Timmins, who said exactly the opposite?

Mr. MacDonald: He did not say exactly the opposite. There is no point at issue at all, Mr. Speaker.

As a matter of fact, just let me elaborate, if the hon. member for Downsview wants an example of it. As my friend from Peterborough said, if you get into the Lake Ontario area, where they have had a detailed study, they said the three growth centres are Belleville-Trenton, Peterborough and Port Hope-Cobourg. And if you go into northern Ontario, the obvious growth centres—

Hon. Mr. Simonett. What about Kingston?

Mr. MacDonald: That is in the eastern Ontario area and I was dealing with the Lake Ontario area. You do not even know the boundaries between the regional and development councils.

An hon. member: Oh, come off it.

Mr. MacDonald: You are ignorant.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: No, I am not ignorant.

Mr. MacDonald: Well let us have some evidence to the contrary.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the member would answer a question for me?

Few years ago I talked about international unions here and the member was the great sponsor of an international union. Does the member still believe that we should have international unions?

Mr. MacDonald: Right, right.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Well you do not agree with what you are talking about right now.

Mr. MacDonald: Oh, I do not? There is no contradiction at all.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: There is no difference.

Mr. MacDonald: Because you do not happen to have a sufficient grasp to see there is no contradiction, we should not be distracted from the main issue today.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: Now Mr. Speaker, let me deal with the point, because this is extremely important.

Mr. Sargent: Are you quitting with that one?

Mr. MacDonald: No, no, I am not quitting on it.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: The hon. member from Sharbot Lake who has been working in cahoots with General Motors, an international corporation, for years and exploiting the poor folk of eastern Ontario.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. That was a very unworthy attribution on the part of the hon. member for York South.

Mr. MacDonald: Was it really?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Speaker, I think on my point of order I have the floor, and on another point of order, while I am on my feet, I suggest you have been very, very generous in this debate. Very, very generous. We have strayed far and wide from the principle of the bill. I have taken part in some the heckling that has taken place here tonight, and the House has strayed so far from the principle of the bill, that it is not even really funny. It is not funny at all.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: Well Mr. Speaker, I am really on your side. If I were persuaded that the Provincial Treasurer thought we were straying, I would have thought his reaction was a non-partisan reaction, if he had voiced an objection while the Minister was speaking, because the Minister strayed miles in every direction. But that was the kind of straying that the Minister agreed with, so he is content. Now there is some straying he disagrees with, so he is discontent.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Would you permit me to ask you a question?

Mr. MacDonald: No. Because I am convinced in advance it would be an irrelevancy.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sopha: We are going to have to hire a dog catcher.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I want to come back to the contention—because this is an important one, and I have heard it from other quarters and I want to deal with it—that the suggestion for growth centres in many of the areas of northern Ontario, is in violation of an intelligent, rational approach to economic development, namely in terms of growth centres that have some rationale. I have heard nothing from anybody in this House or outside that necessarily violates that.

For example, if you go to northeastern Ontario, in an area like Timmins, or Kirkland Lake, or Iroquois-Ansonville, this is obviously a growth centre, in the same sense as Port Hope-Cobourg.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Which one?

Mr. MacDonald: Well I referred to northeastern Ontario. Blind River does not happen to be in northeastern Ontario.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Ask your own member for Cochrane South (Mr. Ferrier) about that.

Mr. MacDonald: He agrees with it. Sure he agrees with it.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: All right, we have got that on the record.

Mr. MacDonald: You bet we have got it on the record and if the Provincial Treasurer had not built up such a head of steam he would have known it was on the record many times earlier this session already.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: We have it on again.

Mr. MacDonald: There are many other growth centres. If you go to northwestern Ontario, there are growth centres in areas like Keewatin and Kenora. There are growth centres at the Lakehead. There are growth centres in areas like Fort Frances and the Emo Valley.

An hon. member: What about Owen Sound?

Mr. MacDonald: Do you think Owen Sound is in northwestern Ontario?

Mr. Speaker, the problem of the member for Owen Sound is that his approach to the subject has floated away from reality since the vote last week.

Mr. S. Apps (Kingston and the Islands): Could I ask the hon. member a question? Which areas are not growth centres?

Mr. Sopha: Why did the Leafs trade Mahovlich?

Mr. Apps: I suggest that you go to the game on Saturday night and find out.

Mr. MacDonald: I enjoy this rollicking as much as anybody else, but this is an extremely important topic. I am almost persuaded that potentially this bill could be one of the most important ones introduced in this Legislature, and I would like to try to return, in a few brief remarks to a serious consideration of it.

The answer to the question from the member for Kingston and the Islands, is that there are some obvious growth centres, and if you go into the Lake Ontario area—and let me take this to illustrate my point—obviously Peterborough, obviously Belleville and Trenton, and obviously the Port Hope-Cobourg area are potential growth centres.

In some areas of the province, if one makes a planned approach to economic development which this government is now paying lip service to, you have certain existing growth centres, and you have others which you have to develop. But there are many little crossroad communities in the province of Ontario which are listed in the 140 or 150 communities that are already going to get assistance from what is delightfully known as EIO, equalization of industrial opportunities; there are many communities which can never become growth centres.

As my colleague from Peterborough pointed out this afternoon, by this scattered approach, you are building an area which has not got a capacity for an economic growth centre. And what are the results going to be? Problems for the Ontario water resources commission, problems in terms of regional development, problems in terms of a Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. McKeough) bolstering an economic structure which really has not got the capacity for development. You are compounding your difficulties. We are trying to make it easier for you.

A final point that I want to make in reference to the question is: what alternative is there? It is that the Minister should not slavishly accept the possibility of an economic development by every American corporation which wants to put a subsidiary in any little town across this province.

What he should do is analyze and assess accurately the possibilities for a genuine economic development and encourage as

greatly as possible a Canadian development. And where that development will not take place through private enterprise, he should take a factual, realistic and rational approach and be willing to do it in terms of public enterprise. In some instances, that is—because I am not pleading for public enterprise to the exclusion of private enterprise. But let us take one case.

My friend from Thunder Bay has raised a problem which I put before the House and before the Minister. The Minister for years has been willing to take credit for every industrial development in the province which looks like an expansion, but if there is an economic collapse, he has nothing to do with it. He will not be associated with it. I suggest that you cannot be associated with success unless you are willing to face the failures on the other side of the coin. And this he refuses to do. What is the Minister going to do about Norply in Nipigon? Here is a potential growth centre, here is an industry that provides jobs for 130 families in Nipigon, which may seem like small pickings down in the Golden Horseshoe area where a number like 130 is small.

But what is the Minister going to do? What is the Minister going to do in terms of ensuring this industry of a supply from the fantastic availability of wood resources in northern Ontario? When is this government going to get off its fanny and do something about the issue of industries like that of Bob Prettie from the Northern Wood Preservers, who for years has been pleading with the government to give him continuing assurance of wood supplies instead of having to go on bended knee to beg for his wood supplies from the empires that the government has given to the pulp and paper companies of northern Ontario. You will not tackle this issue—

Mr. Sargent: Well go on, state your point. What is your point?

Mr. MacDonald: Something that you do not know anything about.

Mr. Sargent: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, a point of order—

Mr. Speaker: State your point of order.

Mr. Sargent: The hon. member says that I do not know what I am talking about, and I cannot understand this point.

Mr. Speaker: I regret to say that this is not a point of order, under the circumstances.

Mr. Sargent: I suggest that he stick to the point of the bill. The point of order is that he is not sticking to the point of the bill, that is all.

Mr. Speaker: The member will carry on and I presume that he will stick to the poinnt of the bill.

Mr. MacDonald: I can quite understand the hon. member from Owen Sound not being able to grasp what I am talking about, since he has not grasped the rules of the House for years.

What I was attempting to say in spite of all these interruptions, and what I attempt to wrap up in summation is that this is a bill which is establishing the pattern for economic development in Ontario in the future. In our view, this government cannot slough off its responsibility with regard to the control of that development and say that it is Ottawa's responsibility to lay down the guidelines.

Within the context of giving assistance for economic development, it can make certain that economic development is Canadian development. To the extent that the circumstances permit it can be a private enterprise, but to the extent that it is necessary, in the underdeveloped areas of the province, do not let the government be fearful of using public enterprise.

The point that I was trying to illustrate was that of Norply in Nipigon. Here is an industry that has great resources; that has the prospect of maintaining employment for 130 families in a town where that represents a significant percentage of their working force, that was told that if it had an economic prospect for a supply of wood, it would have gotten a contract for ten years in terms of a market—so it has a potential wood supply, it has market, it has everything. Under those circumstances I suggest that this government, just as with the sugar beet industry in Chatham, should not shy away from bringing it into operation in some form or another of public enterprise if private enterprise will not do the job.

I am not expressing this as a doctrinaire belief in public enterprise as opposed to private enterprise, but merely emphasizing that we live in a mixed economy. To the extent that you could get private enterprise to do the job, to the extent that it is necessary to use public enterprise to provide the jobs, and to develop the wealth, let us do it. What I objected to is the creeping socialists—the Tories, and sometimes the Liberals—who are willing to use the public purse as handouts

for the development of private enterprise while they shy away completely from the development of public enterprise where there is some justification.

It is obvious that there are others who may want the floor. I have attempted to make the point, but with some difficulty I will concede. But if they will read it in *Hansard* perhaps hon. members will get it then if they did not get it now because they were not listening.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Speaker—

An hon. member: Mr. Speaker, not again.

Mr. Speaker: No, I regret the Minister has spoken on introducing the bill and in rebuttal and I would point out to the House that this emphasizes a difficulty which was inherent in my previous statement that certain statements have been made by the member for York South to which the Minister normally should be entitled to reply but under our present procedure he is not so entitled and therefore, if there are no further—

Mr. White: Mr. Speaker, may I speak on this point of order?

It was agreed a year or two ago in a meeting between the party leaders and Whips that if a Minister spoke at the beginning of or, I think, during a debate which was actually requested by the Opposition then he should have the right to conclude the debate providing only that his rebuttal dealt not with new material but was a rebuttal of the issues raised by Opposition speakers.

Mr. Speaker: This matter was discussed earlier this evening and I raised that point and the sense of the House was that this was something which needed again to be looked into by the committee which was discussed this afternoon. I said that I would allow the member for York South to make his remarks under the circumstances, particularly, because he was absent this afternoon when the debate would have normally closed off.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Clerk of the House: First order; resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the amendment to the motion for an address in reply to the speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor at the opening of the session.

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Mr. Speaker, I must confess that I think they are all great after dinner speakers.

I must say also, that I consider the hon. Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Randall) a very hard act to follow. I would not hope to be, as my leader says, nearly as provocative. He spoke about actors, about Stratford and I would have thought that he would have done rather well there or maybe better at the Poor Alex.

Tonight Mr. Speaker, the atmosphere of the House being what it is and not being used to being tossed on the waves of controversy such as is happening here, I will, I think, avail myself of your kindness when you referred, the other day to some extent, to the protection of a maiden speech.

I had arrived this evening having in my mind, that I would have had a nice quiet, peaceful, completely innocuous maiden speech to complete tonight.

However, Mr. Speaker, if any member of the House feels that he simply cannot contain himself any longer, that he will bust a gusset or something like that, then let him say what he wishes to say; or I would not want to be accused as being responsible for the apoplexy of anybody in this House. So, let her rip if you feel like it.

In regard to that particular aspect I think that there are enormous benefits in being caught in the cross fire of conversation. It does help to put a prick into pomposity and there is a good deal of pomposity over there, and the windbags—a little bit of wind is let out and the air becomes cleaner. It also helps to keep a great many people honest.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I think it is great fun in any event.

After what I said on Friday sir, I heard a number of reactions, some of which were not all together palatable to me and I think I will take this opportunity to reply before going further in the speech, to one or two of these matters.

One is the matter of vocabulary. Mr. Speaker, there are 600,000 words in the English language. In the every-day speech the librarian tells me we use about 10,000 and the average person recognizes from about 30,000 to 40,000 and we have 50,000 words used up. I was going to use up all the other ones, but not tonight. Whatever happened to the other 550,000? I suggest that we have an affluent society; if we cannot have

it in terms of economics because of the misconceived policies on the other side of the fence, then at least let us have an affluent society in words. We spend, literally, thousands of dollars in this province on Bill Shakespeare, and millions on education.

We praise poor old Shakespeare to the sky. Here is a man with an immense range in vocabulary, who spoke naturally and as he thought, and was able to articulate his whole thought pattern into words. We all bow down before him on auspicious occasions, but when anyone in ordinary public life seeks to speak in a wider terminology than is ordinarily used, the Philistines blow into their beards as I said the other day, and there is an awful noise.

Mr. Speaker, may I say further that I consider myself, with all due humility, as one of the new breed of politicians; and sometimes in thinking of this I wonder where that leaves some of you older fellows.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): You are right if you typify the new breed.

Mr. Lawlor: Lastly, if there is somehow a failure in our educational system over the range and use of words, there is a far greater one over the recognition, use, scope and presentation of ideas. An educated man is one who goes among ideas like a toreador among the brave bulls. His ideas—for ideas are like bulls or lions—they will devour you unless you master them, and unless you become familiar with them and even friendly and move among them with certain ease and confidence. A man with one or two ideas or a few leading ones is usually a fanatic or a monomaniac; and the man who fears the ideas of others—any others—has not even begun to familiarize himself with his own ideas. Fear breeds hate and hate breeds ignorance.

One of the indexes of the failure of the educational system is this general paucity of ideas. We graduate people from our schools and universities who are given degrees and yet have never been exposed to more than a handful of them. Engineers are particularly open in this regard, having one or two main ideas, usually, which they trot out for size on almost all occasions, unexamined, untested, picked up from *Reader's Digest*.

Doctors, too, are wilfully deficient generally. They spend so much time in dissecting cadavers and taking electroencephalographs that the possibility of human thinking has gone right by them. I, of course, exclude my hon. colleague from this particular category.

Even our own profession, the lawyers, emerging from those great case book factories called law schools, hardly glimpse the beginnings of what education means. That is what a real education, at least in part, is and that is what it is trying to do—hand down a heritage of ideas, and to sift out the second rate, the misapplied idea, the ill-defined term, the half articulated thought from the "pot of massage."

The educated man moves like a lion tamer among these ferocious beasts and any educational system that produces graduates unable or inexperienced in moving about in this arena fails precisely to the degree that its graduates cannot do it.

Finally, any Legislature, in my opinion, can afford at least one person like myself. It is not too high a price to pay from the public purse; and you may give the largesse out to the judges, why not to an odd poor rambling fellow like myself?

I believe the open and public discussion of basic ideas that move us in life or in this Legislature is a strictly practical matter and indeed, as I said last Friday, it is because more of it is not done that we fail precisely as legislators. For then we neither know where we are going, nor how or why we want to get there. The unexamined politician is a menace both to himself and to his society.

In this particular regard may I say that on reading *Hansard* I have an apology to make to the hon. member for Sudbury (Mr. Sopha) in this House. I believe I said that we had enough of "Elmer's sophisms." I personally will say this for myself, we can never have enough of "Elmer's sophisms." At the moment I will not make the ultimate claim that until kings and legislators are philosophers, and philosophers are kings, no happy, just or equitable society will emerge. That would be impolitic at this stage of our history and in the present state of our Legislature. But forgive me if I intimate that it could very well be true.

Until legislators, Mr. Speaker, get a little clearer about what they mean by the big words like "freedom" and "justice" and "democracy", economic and otherwise, which they so casually bandy about in this great hall, bills and Acts which would free, which would be just Acts, and which would enfranchise people, will continue to be obstructed if introduced and, more seriously, they will never get themselves introduced at all. The simple minded opposition expressed time

after time in this Legislature by both of the other parties in setting up some theory of public welfare against private freedom, as though these were opposed things, is a dereliction of thinking and a basic fallacy that should be attacked at its root whenever possible.

My wife, who is my best critic, and a better heckler than any of you, was sitting in the gallery the other day and indicated to me that perhaps I was not quite clear in what I meant by "individualism." That sometimes I would attack something which I consider an ugly and vicious philosophy of individualism and at other times I would speak well of the individual. There does not seem to me to be any great problem there, but so that the matter will not go any longer unclear, whether in my wife's mind or in yours, Mr. Speaker, I will say this much more about that subject. That so far as I am concerned, I oppose two different ideas—one called individuality and the other personality. Personality is the spiritual pole of the human being and individuality is the material. Spirituality is spoken of in terms of "thou", and individuality tends to refer to an it, or to a thing.

I do not mean that personality which Hollywood means. Probably I mean just the opposite. Hollywood, the popular press, means by personality what I mean by individuality. By individuality it is meant that an individual makes himself the centre of the universe or the absolute possessor of certain infinite rights, which come from heaven knows where, and which he asserts on all occasions for his own benefit, interest, or advantage regardless of the common weal, the equal rights of others, or the common rights of all.

Jefferson said government exists to protect and realize the indefeasible rights of man, and that is a theory of individuality. It does no such thing, or only in part.

Then those who have been and are remain the victims of an ugly, individualistic philosophy which asserts a given egotism over against the common good of the whole populace so-called. It is based on exploitation, greed, a spirit of domination and its law is to grasp or absorb for itself everything it can. It has been the absorbing ethos of our age and it is presently passing away like a miasma.

Now for a few moments I want to talk about what government, in my opinion, is all about. There are seven ends of government which, with a little work, can be reduced to about four. The Premier (Mr. Robarts) in his reply to the Speech from the Throne spoke of something that he called the common good of every human being in this province. Obviously the common good cannot be that of any particular clique or class or section of the community. It cannot be a special good for any sectional element in the community, and I claim this government does primarily, if not exclusively, represent, maintain and protect the particular good of a very narrow segment of her citizens. And the corporate rights, the common good is not the entrenched and controlling good of a minority who use the instrumentalities and powers of this or any other government for their personal gain and advantage. What is good for General Motors is not necessarily good for the citizens at large of this province. Often quite the contrary.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lawlor: The ends of government are fourfold. First, for the general common good or well being; second, to contribute to the realization of human freedom; third, to maintain peace and order; fourth, to realize and establish justice.

Within the first, that is the business of the common good, in promotion of general well-being there are at least four major schools or movements, three of which are directed upon happiness as their goal and the other upon human self-perfection, whether happiness is an element in that self-perfection or not. And these are: 1. The utilitarian idea of the state; 2. The idea of Rousseau; 3. That of St. Thomas Aquinas; 4. That of George Wilhelm Frederick Hegel. And I shall discuss briefly only the first and third, the utilitarian and St. Thomas. You may thank your lucky stars that you will be spared George Wilhelm Frederick Hegel. But we have another four years.

Mr. J. H. White (London South): Then we start on Marx.

Mr. Lawlor: The utilitarian position, Mr. Speaker, is usually set out in seeking to achieve the greatest happiness of the greatest number. But this may mean, really, no happiness at all for a great many, and for many minorities, and as such it is an unjust deal. It stresses a numerical count—by noses. You add up all the happiness together. It has two faults inherent in British empiricism, its end is to maximize pleasure, and sometimes freedom, and not pleasure necessarily of a crude kind; still not happiness properly so-called. This is because of a biological and mechanistic notion of man in utilitarianism as an animal, not different in principle but more highly developed than the beasts of the field.

What makes social practices right or wrong is the pleasure or pain that is promoted by those practices. Secondly, as arising out of this position, it plays up the senses in man, the sensual, to the detriment of the life of intelligence and reason so that the pragmatic and expedient, the *ad hoc* position, the efficient, and the comfortable become its guiding light. It is deficient in any concept of justice and emphasizes the immediacy of individual self-interest over against the total wellbeing of man. And when it speaks of the common good, or as it says, the general wellbeing, this is taken as a sum total aggregate of private selfish goods. It has lived a long time in society and it has had some great successes in the past but on the whole the weight of 19th century literature is dead against it; and Ruskin and Carlyle and Dickens attacked it every time they saw its ugly face. And because it had about it a relative inhumanity as do the government's philosophies.

The second position that I wish to speak about is that of Rousseau.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Is the hon. member's wife here?

Mr. Lawlor: No, Mr. Speaker, she has children to put to bed.

Mr. Speaker, I want to tell the Minister from St. Andrew-St. Patrick all about himself for a few moments if he will just be quiet and listen. As a matter of fact I do not want to say very much about Rousseau.

The idea of a common good in Rousseau is based upon a general will. It is inherently totalitarian. It is a dangerous theory and it is one which we repudiate. Curiously enough it has a great deal of liaison to basic conservative philosophy. Conservative philosophy, if you really want to know, began basically in Plato and came down through Burke, emerged in Hegel, and Hegel has an enormous amount of Rousseau in him. The general will says that there is an overpowering will like a cloud above us that is really our true will and that we become part of it and cease to be ourselves, and so on, and the more we identify ourselves with some external power, greater and bigger and with a stronger purpose than what we have, to that extent we really become ourselves.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: If he is trying to punish me, he is succeeding.

Mr. Lawlor: The third position, leaving aside Rousseau, is the position of Thomas Aquinas. In the theory of Thomas Aquinas —and I now agree with very little about what he says in other problems—but on his political philosophy there seems to me to be great truths. He recognizes, unlike British empiricism generally, the reality of universals. The common good is such a universal. It has a reality embedded in, but distinct from, the individuals who participate in it. It is an objective living reality, not a mere composite of individual desires nor a sum total of them but a general idea in which each finds his highest aspirations, not as an individual, but as a communal unselfish, being as a member of society deeply involved in that society and realizing them so fully through the friendship, love and purposes present in that society. It is not an ideal, it is a concrete, practical sharing, having objective norms and excluding fractional groups and individual self-seeking. Let me briefly quote from the writings of Jacques Maritain who is the leading man on this theme, and who, not so many years ago, used to talk about these matters at great length not a stone's throw from this chamber.

> There is a correlation between this notion of the person as a social unit and the notion of the common good as the end of the social whole. They imply one another. The common good is common because it is received in persons, each of whom is a mirror of the whole; and among the bees there is a public good, namely, the good functioning of the hive but not a common good, for that is a good received and communicated. The end of society therefore is neither the individual good nor the collective of individual goods of each of the persons who constitute it. Such a conception would dissolve society, as such, to the advantage of its parts would amount to either a frankly anarchistic conception or the old disguised anarchistic conception of individualistic materialism in which the whole function of the city is to safeguard the liberty of each and thus giving to the strong, full freedom to oppress the weak. The end of society is the good of the community of the social body, but if the good of the social body is not understood to be a comman good of human persons, this conception also would lead to other areas of a totalitarian type. The common good of the city is neither the mere collection of private goods, sir, nor the proper good of a whole, which like the species with respect to its individuals or the hive with respect to its bees, relates the parts to itself alone and sacrifices them

> to itself. It is the good human life of the multitude, of a multitude of persons, it is their communion in good living, it is there for comment about the whole and the parts, into which it flows back and which, in turn, must benefit from them.

Two texts of St. Thomas which supplement and balance one another can guide us to a deeper penetration of these ideas. Each individual person is related to the entire community as a part of the whole and from this point of view and in this respect that is because it is by reason of certain of its proper conditions a part of society that the person is in his entirety, engaged in and ordained to the common good of that society. But let us add at once, that although man in his entirety is engaged as a part of political society since he may have to give his life for it, he is not a part of a political society by reason of his entire self and all that is in him. On the contrary, by reason of certain things in him, man in his entirety, is elevated above political society. St. Thomas' second text that completes and balances the first is pertinent here:

> Man is not ordained to the body politic according to all that he is and has. There is an enormous difference between this statement: Man by reason of certain things which are in him is in its entirety engaged as a part of political society; and this other statement: Man is part of political society by reason of himself as a whole and by reason of all that is in him.

The one is true, and the second is false. Here lies the difficulty and the solution of the problem, and anarchical individualism. The thing I am talking about denies that man by reason of certain things which are in him is engaged in his entirety as a part of political society. Totalitarianism asserts that man is a part of political society by reason of himself as a whole and by reason of all that is in him. All in the state, nothing against the state, nothing outside the state. The truth is, that man is engaged in his entirety but not by reason of this whole self as a part of political society, a part of being to the good of that society.

In the same way, a good philosopher is engaged in his entirety in philosophy but not by reason of all the functions and all the finalities of his being. He is engaged in his entirety in philosophy by reason of the special function and special finality of the intellect that is in him. If this is too difficult a doctrine, loaded with subtlety after a few drinks at dinner time, it cannot be helped. It is for me, a perfectly true social philosophy and it makes sense.

It makes nonsense, utter and arrant nonsense of a lot of the things that people talk about in this House without understanding them, or taking the time or concentrating their minds on such issues. It is a difficult thing; and to bandy words like "freedom" and "free enterprise" back and forth across this House in the light of clarity and yet the difficulty of the statements that have been made, seems to me to be a dereliction of responsible minds.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lawlor: Members are coming to Teilhard de Chardin. We will get to him in a moment. That is the high point.

The third position I want to discuss is the basically conservative position. The conservative philosophy of government. Oh, I do not know if you will be so proud after it is all over. It is a rather simple-minded, threadbare affair as far as I can see. I can get rid of it in two or three minutes. The point is I want to say this: When we get down to basic conservatism, it is a pretty anaemic bird. You know a good show when you see it. The basic position of the conservative with a small "c" of course, is that they have a too great respect, I submit, for peace and order.

If order, which is a type of justice, is the chief end in society, not the common good, and not the human freedom, but order, and not justice, if that is the thing that keeps stability in society to retain its coherence, and its unity, then the tendency always within that kind of concept is to support the status quo at all costs. Anything in discovery, any experimentation, any branching out, does tend to rock the boat, you know, and the rocking of the boat is the thing that give them sea-sickness.

There are some strong things in the conservative position which give them, which is very often overlooked in the Liberal position, and that is that the Conservatives, generally speaking, and I give them credit for this, have a strong nostalgia for the past.

The second thing that they have is a strong sense of the fragility of human nature, that in human nature, if pricked and the blood begins to flow, the savage is just beneath the skin, and that it is necessary to place some kind of restraint, constant and vigilance on human potentialities, because human beings range out like the beast, and will destroy each other.

The Conservative mind is deeply imbued with this sense of how a disturbance in civilization, of how a new law, if I may put it that way, can so cause a disorientation as to misalign the society to a considerable extent. I say that they are caught up in this; it is to some degree obsessional; it has a certain amount of justice in it, and at the same time it is a wrong assessment of the possibility in human beings. It assesses them pessimistically, and it does think, primarily, of the aboriginal beneath the skin.

I think a more just appreciation would be more optimistic, more affirmative, and give more credence to the benevolence, and to the other regarding instincts in human beings, and would see them as more outgoing and as less fragile, than what they say they really are, and less given to indulgences. But such is conservative philosophy.

The last end of government as I see it, is that governments are set up in this world to administer and to confer upon their people, justice. If I may say so, over against the Liberal reliance upon human rights and freedom, as they see it—and I shall come to that later—over against the Conservative position based on order, the socialist position is fundamentally arrogated upon a concept of justice.

Justice itself is made up of three parts, the part of equality, desert and rights, and the central portion of justice we will always find will be equality. We are egalitarians, we think that too great a disparity in the society between rich and poor, and between the various elements that make up that society is disruptive, is a disease in the very heart of that society. And it breeds enmity in the citizens, it causes unnecessary social disorder, and I do not think that you Conservative gentlemen have a proper appreciation of what is involved in any concept of social justice.

But this is not altogether true, you know. This afternoon we have placed on our desks three great volumes of civil rights—I am using my privileges, three great volumes of civil rights—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Speaker, I call for your protection. I was saying that this afternoon, the former chief justice J. C. McRuer gave us three great volumes on human rights and on the rights of the courts, and I had prepared to speak about that great man tonight because he, being a little older and a little more penetrating as to what social ills there really are, has in a fine paper, written and distributed to all of us, called "The Law Calls for Justice", before the section of judicial administration of the American bar association in 1966, said things like this:

> During the last 50 years, there has been a growing discontent with certain laws and customs. Never before have the people on this continent and other continents been more alert to injustice than they are today. It may well be that if what is interpreted as disrespect for law in fact may only be the manifestation of a burning desire for justice.

I would have you apply that to the condition of our youth in contemporary society, and to all the vaunted conservative nonsense about respect for law. If you make just laws, they will be obeyed, if you make laws that are anachronistic, out of date, or repressive, or that are not up to date, many of these laws will bring about disrespect, and you will have asked for it. You are presently bringing that upon your heads in terms of the juvenile problems, and in the increasing crime rates.

I would like to take a moment more to pursue a sort of dialectic. I have said that there are three or four chief ends of government: human happiness, freedom, order, and justice. The dialectic takes this form, that for those parties who place their chief emphasis upon them, and think that the final end of government is for instance, freedom, for that party, order or justice or human happiness falls into second rank. Sometimes these other things are means to the end, and other times they are simply subordinate instances of the main principle, and for those people like the Conservatives who like to think that order is the chief end, then freedom must suffer to some extent. It must not, at least, be regarded as highly, it is not essential, and not the key point.

Human happiness must fall by the way somewhere, and justice will not be given the proper cognizance, particularly in terms of social justice, that we would think is necessary. Of course this works all around, and if you place as your chief end, in the social order, justice, then human freedom, unless it contributes to justice, is not as important, nor is order; and happiness, unless it is to be identified with justice, then so well and all right. But this is not necessarily the case.

As we go through this life, we must make our choices as to which of these four objectives, and as to the interrelations between the four, we are seeking to achieve. For myself, I have elected the concept of human justice, for it means the most to me, politically. "Blessed are they that hunger and thirst after it." For those who seek happiness, let them

have their day—the utilitarians and the Liberals. As far as the search for human freedom is concerned, the freedom means nothing if there is no justice to support it.

Human freedom is not an end unto itself, it is a means whereby human justice may be achieved. You will not get justice without freedom, but the end is justice in a fair society.

The Premier in his reply to the Speech from the Throne, has boasted about all the things that it has taken the Conservatives over 50 years to accomplish. I dare say that if one went over these items one by one, and reviewed the history of each measure, about which he is now so proud, one would see the degree of resistance, harassment, and frustration that each measure met in turn, as it went through this House. Again all because of an ugly individualistic philosophy. But the fight goes on.

The history of mankind, Mr. Speaker, from time immemorial, through the slave revolts, the levellers of the English 17th century, down through the French revolution, it has always been a quarrel between the reactionaries, between the conservatives—with a small "c," who represent both the Liberals with a big "L" and the other fellows with the big "C"—not all of them, but the consensus in their parties, over against the radical, over against the man who seeks the roots of things and sees what the well-springs of human wellbeing may be.

This is the quarrel and the quarrel of the law, and we inch forward generation after generation, but thank heavens it is beginning to accelerate and even you fellows are coming to heel. And it has been the same in the past and it is the same today.

Look at the way our proposals for a reform of The Landlord and Tenant Act is treated, made fun of, dismissed with scarcely a word. Look at the way our natural resources are squandered, the sell-out to the powerful interests in the north. Look at the inept approach of the Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond) to the pollution problem and to medicare. Look at the way the Premier permits honest and decent people, some of the best of our citizens to go to jail because of his vaunted "model labour laws".

For the Conservative and for the Liberal mind there seems to be only one source of human emergency and that is war. When war comes they can go to any lengths to achieve victory over a parlous condition. But not for arts of peace. Not in the struggle against poverty. Not to solve the housing crisis. Not to alleviate the deplorable condition of tenants. Not in a hundred ways and not for the pressing immediate needs of thousands of citizens.

They and their friends, who support them, both in policy and with money, especially with election funds, simply never seem to see or to feel the urgency of these crippling social wrongs, which would be often rather easily cured.

Our war should be a peaceful and productive one. We have not yet conquered poverty here at home—and I still have something to say on this as it affects Ontario, at the opportune time. Nor have we even begun to stem the baneful effects of poverty abroad. Not only have we not done so at home, and here in Ontario, but this Legislature as a Legislature, seems unaware of the lot of nine-tenths of the human race.

This complacency is typical. Not only do we in this chamber ignore in our policy the human race as a whole, we, it seems to me, blind ourselves to our own economic condition. We balance precariously on the brink of another economic depression which will drag down every one of us and not least those who have the most to lose, those who sit on the other side of this House. They are the people who so strongly strive, and they are the ones who act mightiest in this House and outside of it to prevent and obstruct the necessary measures, the only measures of rational, foresightful, economic and social planning which might save them along with the rest of us.

It hangs like a spectre, or like a Damoclean sword over all our heads, that threat. We have tried to build safeguards into the system, anodynes to kill the pain but not to cure. Transfer payments. Baby bonuses. Unemployment insurance. Aid to widows, and various welfare measures, but these attempts to maintain a consumers' market may not be enough and probably are not enough.

I often fear the rationalization of almost anything; but I support rationality, particularly in an economic system. We need a public development corporation in this province, planned social capital and regional planning, including land use.

We need also to stimulate and enhance the public sector of this economy. To trot out all the old mistaken freedom argument in order to leave room for the slump, is a perversion of intelligence. It is like saying with Anatole France that the rich and the poor are equally free to sleep under the bridges.

The world is moving towards a certain convergence, and you are not with it. I have spoken of the unification of mankind and the process of socialization which is presently going on in the world, and which is at a never quicker pace destroying the outdated atavistic modes of thinking. Having hit the high point, may I quote from Teilhard de Chardin. He is not much loved among the Jesuits either:

> From which, to sum up, the following situation arises. To elect in the depth of our being for the possibility and hope of an infinitely increasing unification of universe is not merely the only course we can pursue which conforms to the evolutionary past of the world. It is the course that embraces in its essence every other constructive act in which we might look for an alternative. Not only does this road offer a positive outlet for the diminished or specialized forms of consciousness, a victory dearly paid for by life, the consciousness as a whole must follow it with all the accumulation of riches which at each turning point we had thought to abandon.

Which amounts to saying that the world is well made. In other words, the choice which lies at the core of our considered actions is a great deal less complex than at first seems to be the case. One is reduced to the simple choice between the first and the last stages of the successive alternatives which we have been able to define. The rejection of being, which returns us to the dust; or the acceptance of life and being, which leads us by way of socialization into faith in the supreme unity —opposite directions along a single road.

But as history suggests, there is really a quality of the inevitable in the forward march of the universe. If in truth the world cannot turn back, then it must mean that individual acts are bound to follow, in the majority and freely the sole direction, capable of satisfying all the aspirations towards every imaginable form of higher consciousness.

And having the fundamental choice of the individual, the grand option, that which decides in favour of a convergent universe, is destined sooner or later to become the common choice of the mass of mankind, and thus a separate and generalized state of consciousness is presaged for our species in the future, a conspiracy in terms of perspective and intention.

It is at this point that we must rid ourselves of a prejudice which is deeply embedded in our thoughts, namely as a habit of mind that causes us to contrast unity with plurality, the elements with the whole, and the individual with the collective, as though they were diametrically opposed ideas. We constantly argue as though in each case the terms varied inversely, again on the one side being *ipso facto*, the other side loss. This in turn leads to the widespread idea that any destiny on monist lines would exact the sacrifice and bring about the destruction of all the personal values in the universe.

The origin of this prejudice which is largely imaginary can no doubt be traced to the disagreeable sense of loss and constraint which the individual experiences when he finds himself involved in a crowd—involved in a group or lost in a crowd. It is certainly the case that any agglomeration tends to stifle and neutralize the elements which compose it. And why should we look for a model of collectivity in what is no more than an aggregate—a heap?

Alongside these massive inorganic groupings in which the elements seem to intermingle and drown, or more exactly at the opposite poles of them. Nature shows itself to be full of associations, brought about and organically ordered by a precisely opposite law.

In the case of associations of this kind—the only true and natural associations—the coming together of the separate elements does nothing to eliminate their differences. On the contrary it exalts them, in every practical sphere, or true union, that is to say, synthesis does not confound, it differentiates. This is what is essential for us to understand at this moment of encountering the grand option.

The true idea of property and property rights is a trust concept. We hold our possessions, not only for our own benefit, but in trust, and for the benefit of others. Anything over and above what is needed for our own security and development belongs by right to the community. "L'argent est le sang des pauvres"—"Money is the blood of the poor". We are all of us vehicles of a power higher than ourselves, we are the earthly spokesmen of a better social system which strives to wipe out ignorance, poverty, and disease. To lift up "les miserables", and to pay attention to that which it attends and causes us to attend to the impoverished people everywhere. This struggle has only begun—but some time, every speech must end, and with that the dreamer sits down.

Mr. H. Edighoffer (Perth): Mr. Speaker, for the first time in more than 20 years the riding of Perth is represented from this side of the House. I am honoured to be the representative of Perth county and, of course, am happy to be here under the leadership of the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon).

My home is in Mitchell—a community with a population of 2,400 people. Mr. Speaker, Mitchell is in the centre of Perth and I claim that the man in the middle sees more. I see a county neglected by our government. I see a county whose farmers get little recognition from Queen's Park. I see a county which prides itself in the acclaim of the city of Stratford, in spite of the half-hearted support of the provincial government.

Twice during the recent election campaign, Mr. Speaker, the leader of the Conservative Party planned to appear in Perth, once for a nomination meeting and once for a political party—a tea party being held at a branch of the Canadian legion—but the Premier (Mr. Robarts) failed to arrive to support the local standard bearer of his party. This indifference of the government to Perth is also found at other levels of the provincial administration. Recently a senior member of the staff of The Department of University Affairs sent a letter addressed to me in the town of Perth, some 300 miles away from the riding of Perth.

Mr. Speaker, a great deal has been said concerning the proposed boundary changes and general reorganization of school areas in the province. It would surely be remiss of me to refrain from placing on the record an impressive list of objectors to various aspects of the proposed changes. I am referring to representations I have from (1) the Roman Catholic school section of Maryborough, Mornington, Peel and Wellesley, (2) the Wallace public school area board, (3) the Downie township area board, (4) the public school board of the township school area of Elma and Logan, (5) St. Mary's public schools, (6) the South Easthope township board, (7) Elma township council, (8) Tavistock public school board, (9) the public school board of the township school area of Mornington and Milverton, (10) the township school area board of Blanshard and Fullarton.

Mr. Speaker, one letter which communicates the feeling of many of my constituents reads, in part: "We do not want the cities to run our rural schools as we couldn't afford it. Taxes are too high already." The letter concludes by stating: "We hope you will stand by us in this matter."

Mr. Speaker, I am certain that many members supporting the government have received similar letters. I can only marvel at their silence in this matter. But, Mr. Speaker, it takes courage to bite the hand that feeds, and courage to challenge the stubborn inflexibility of a Minister entrenched with his own ideas.

Now, Mr. Speaker, looking around the riding of Perth I am not satisfied that it has had a fair deal from the government during the past 20 years. Looking ahead through the words of the Speech from the Throne, I see little occasion for hope that the attitude of the government toward Stratford and Perth is changing.

Let me tell you of my riding and its needs. In area, Perth county covers 537,000 acres in western Ontario of which all but 30,000 acres has been classified as farm land. Over 450,000 acres is improved land. We grow wheat, oats, barley, some rye, flaxseed, mixed grains, dry beans, shelled corn, fodder corn and soya beans. The yield per acre for all these crops is among the highest yield per acre in western Ontario and almost always higher than the average yield per acre for the province. This is rich farm land.

I want to be sure, Mr. Speaker, that the farmers of Perth receive proper compensation for their investment in labour, management and capital. In the past the government has failed to heed the needs of farmers—failed to understand farmers. Let us see this changed. Let us hope that 1968 will be free of tractor parades and farmers' marches on Queen's Park. Again I see little in the Speech from the Throne which indicates any enlightenment on the government side of the House.

There is nothing to indicate that the controversy surrounding the milk marketing board will be resolved. The price of milk paid to milk producers has been a point of contention during the past few years and rightly so. The price of milk is especially important in Perth county. Mr. Speaker, this county is where there are more cows kept for milk purposes than in any other county in Ontario. Milk production provides much income to the farmers of Perth who have more than $13 million invested in cows for milk purposes.

What plans does the government have for the milk marketing board? The Speech from the Throne makes no references to any plans. It says that special legislation will be introduced to strengthen the position in the market place of the producer of beef. What

action is being taken to strengthen the position in the market place for the milk producers?

I am interested in beef producers also. Perth county has its beef producers and is the sixth highest beef producing county in the province with approximately $6 million invested in steers. In fact, Mr. Speaker, when it comes to livestock, Perth county takes a back seat to no one. It is the largest hog producing county in Ontario and almost ten per cent of all hogs produced in Ontario are produced in Perth. There is also an abundance of poultry with more than 1.5 million chickens raised annually.

Much of the food that reaches Ontario's tables is grown or produced in Perth county which has a population of about 55,000. Of this total, 24,000 live in the city of Stratford —the county seat of Perth and the festival city. I am sure that most hon. members have been to the Stratford festival and I am pleased to invite them again this year. I hope they received the brochure which I mailed to them today. Sadly, sir, when coming to the festival, you will only be able to use Highway 401—Ontario's main street—for a portion of the way. Whether you come from the east or the west, you will still have to leave Highway 401 and drive a further 30 miles or so to Stratford.

I spoke earlier of neglect. Mr. Speaker, this highway situation is a clear example of gross neglect of Perth county and of the city of Stratford by the Ontario government during the past 20 years. A highway was built and they ignored the third largest tourist region in Ontario. It is a matter of great wonder to me why they failed to direct Highway 401 north of Woodstock instead of south of it, which would have been its natural course as you look at it on any map. Had they done so, they would have served Woodstock as they are doing right now, but Stratford would have been served more directly also. Highway 401, as we are all aware, has become a lifeline to many, in fact to all the cities and towns along its length. Those cities and towns are growing rapidly. Many of them are booming. Industry is attracted first to those cities with a direct access to Highway 401.

Wages are higher in all the cities of western Ontario that are located on Highway 401. So Stratford is suffering. I am not asking or suggesting that Highway 401 should have gone through Stratford but there seems little reason—in fact there seems to be no sound reason—why the government should have ignored Stratford when they were deciding the course for this road.

However, after this unfortunate decision I do not understand why The Department of Tourism and Information and The Department of Highways have continued to ignore Stratford. Believe it or not, it was only about a year ago that signs were erected on Highway 401 directing people to Stratford and the Shakespearean festival which has been in existence for about 15 years.

Now the hon. Minister of Tourism and Information (Mr. Auld) has announced what he terms "a far reaching study of tourism and outdoor recreation designed to produce a master plan for tourism in the province". According to the hon. Minister from Leeds, the study will measure and analyze the current and future demands for tourism and outdoor recreation in quantitative, qualitative and locational terms. I trust that from this study it will be found that Stratford and Perth county need a highway link to Highway 401.

In July, 1967, the Ontario Department of Tourism and Information published the results of a Stratford visitors' survey. Among other things, this survey showed that $8 million is spent annually in Stratford by tourists. This sum represents, according to the survey, more than 20 per cent of the total expenditure in the community. This is a high proportion in relation to local income.

The report also states that there is a close correlation between expenditures and employment and that, therefore, it can be assumed that approximately 20 per cent of employment in Stratford and vicinity is generated directly or indirectly by tourism.

Sir, tourism is important to Stratford and Perth county. Could not the government, The Department of Tourism and Information and The Department of Highways recognize this? They know it. Why do they not do something about it? Now of these tourists to Stratford, according to this survey, 91.8 per cent use passenger cars. This naturally indicates to the festival and to the county the importance of good roads, adequate directive and informative signs. What a pity we do not have that link. In the report, the summary and recommendations state, and I quote:

> Throughout the report the greatest revelation was in the tremendous amount of leverage tourism has on the economics of the community. Although the theatre is the main attraction, only 26 per cent of the total tourist expenditures was on admis-

sions, the remaining 74 per cent being spent on other facilities in the community mainly as a result of the tourist business.

Item 4 of the recommendations states:

Use of highways by tourists is extensive and good highways well signed are a very important factor in attracting tourists.

I again point out to you, Mr. Speaker, that this survey was completed by the Ontario Department of Tourism and Information. I also feel that they have ignored their own findings. Stratford has gone it alone without any great assistance from this department. Let us put an end to this lack of assistance.

The Speech from the Throne promises the establishment of an Ontario roads to resources programme. The resources include tourism. This programme is to further promote the development and use of the natural wealth of Ontario.

The programme is said to include the planning and development of a transportation system to and from the main arterial roads. Well, the Macdonald-Cartier freeway is a main arterial route and Stratford is one of the major tourist areas in the province. Why have we not got that link now?

Now, another promise in the Speech from the Throne says we will be asked to approve an impressive programme of highway improvements and expansion in all areas of Ontario. Surely, we deserve to be one of the first areas so designated. Instead we have already heard that another super highway is being built into London, Ontario. Why London? The 401 goes right through it. Why does it need another super highway? Again I ask, why London, Mr. Speaker?

Many industries have chosen to locate in Stratford. They are most welcome and I hope that they will continue to prosper. However, with a link between Stratford and the 401 I am sure industry will be able to ship raw materials in, and finished products out, much easier.

Speaking of promises, there is one which has been made repeatedly in Perth county over the past five or six years. I refer to the proposal to build a new teachers' college in Stratford which was announced from Toronto on May 5, 1967, as well as in 1963. I quote from the Stratford *Beacon Herald* on that day:

A new Ontario teachers' college will be built in Stratford to replace the existing one, now crowded to twice its capacity.

Since being elected, Mr. Speaker, I have investigated this promise and I have found no evidence that the government had any real intention, at any time, of building a new teachers' college in our area. My investigation has shown that this was purely an election promise—the lowest form of election chicanery. It was, I consider, simply a carrot dangled before the voters just prior to an election; but no one had any intention of honouring this promise.

Land, however, has been set aside for a new teachers' college in Stratford. Our area needs an updated modern teachers' college—as the present one was built in 1908. What a pity we have been played with by the government. I have no figures to show what income the teachers' college means to Stratford each year, but 400 students can be of assistance to the economy. Most of all they can continue their education close to home and not be forced to lose their interest in their own community.

This point I think is important, not only to Perth county but to all the areas in Ontario that are half urban and half rural, or close to that division. The problem of the young people moving out and into large urban areas is an urgent, serious situation and should not be forgotten or neglected. Without employment opportunity for the young people, we in some parts of Ontario will not be able to join in and say "Ontario—A Place To Stand and a Place to Grow".

Mr. Speaker, I ask the government to honour its promise and build the teachers' college in Stratford. I ask the government to honour all of its promises—fairly.

And in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I just wish to take this opportunity to congratulate you on your election as Speaker of this twenty-eighth Parliament. I as a new member, have formed my opinions and as far as I can see to this date, I am sure you will carry out your duties with dignity and fairness to all.

Mr. J. Jessiman (Fort William) moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we might have some second readings and we will proceed then with the Throne debate.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 10.30 o'clock, p.m.

No. 16

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

First Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Wednesday, March 6, 1968

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1968

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Wednesday, March 6, 1968

Presenting report, Mr. Welch 487

Questions to Mr. Randall re senior citizens' accommodation, Mr. B. Newman and Mr. Peacock 487

Questions to Mr. Davis re the Ontario College of Art, Mr. Pitman 488

Question to Mr. Davis re county school boards, Mr. Pitman 488

Question to Mr. Davis re the Brantford board of education, Mr. Makarchuk 489

Question to Mr. Gomme re speed limits on Highway 401, Mr. Burr 489

Question to Mr. Simonett re visits by boats from other jurisdictons, Mr. Paterson 490

Question to Mr. Dymond re the Thistletown children's hospital and the children's psychiatric institute in London, Mr. Lewis 490

Question to Mr. Davis re fire safety problems, Mr. Lewis 490

Question to Mr. Davis re the Hamilton board of education, Mr. Gisborn 490

Question to Mr. Bales re school board employees, Mr. Gisborn 490

Question to Mr. MacNaughton re gasoline prices, Mr. Martel 490

Questions to Mr. Randall re land assembly, Mr. Deans 491

Questions to Mr. Brunelle re jacklighting of deer, Mr. T. P. Reid 491

Question to Mr. Brunelle re hydro lines through Quetico park, Mr. T. P. Reid 491

Questions to Mr. MacNaughton re mining municipalities, Mr. T. P. Reid 491

Questions to Mr. Haskett re boating and boat racing, Mr. B. Newman 492

Questions to Mr. Welch re the LCBO, Mr. Sargent 492

Questions to Mr. Wishart re the Melchers case, Mr. Sargent 493

Question to Mr. MacNaughton re central purchasing, Mr. Sargent 493

Questions to Mr. Wishart re the Don jail, Mr. Sargent, Mr. Sopha 494

Questions to Mr. Wishart re the inquiry on civil rights, Mr. Sargent 495

Questions to Mr. Brunelle re the Algoma Central Railway, Mr. Sargent 496

Question to Mr. Gomme re bridge on Highway 17, Mr. Martel 496

Question to Mr. Gomme re road signs, Mr. Pilkey 496

Resumption of the debate on the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Jessiman, Mr. Shulman 497

Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Shulman, agreed to 521

Royal assent to a certain bill, the Lieutenant-Governor 521

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to 521

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 6, 1968

The House met at 2.30 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are always pleased to have visitors to the Legislature, and today we welcome guests from the following schools: in the east gallery, All Saints separate school in Weston, and in the west gallery, Owen Boulevard public school in Willowdale, and Richard W. Scott Catholic school in Toronto.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Hon. R. S. Welch (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present to the House the annual report of the Minister of Lands and Forests for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1967.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Introduction of bills.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I have a question of the hon. Minister of Economics and Development. Would the Minister inform this House if any consideration has been given by the Ontario housing corporation to the utilization of the now-vacant Prince Edward hotel in the city of Windsor for senior citizens' accommodation?

Hon. S. J. Randall (Minister of Economics and Development): Mr. Speaker, I understand the hon. member for Windsor West has a similar question. Perhaps he would like to ask it and I can answer the two together.

Mr. H. Peacock (Windsor West): Mr. Speaker, I have. My question to the Minister is: Will the Minister ask Ontario housing corporation to purchase or lease the Prince Edward hotel in downtown Windsor for use as hostel accommodation for senior citizens, either as a temporary arrangement until new senior citizen units are built, or in addition to them?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Speaker, in answer to the hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville, the Ontario housing corporation has not received any instructions concerning the utilization of the Prince Edward hotel in the city of Windsor for senior citizens' accommodation; and in response to a resolution the city of Windsor sent to the Ontario housing corporation on February 13, 1968, the corporation has today advertised for builder proposals for the construction of 400 one-bedroom, self-contained dwelling units for senior citizens. If a proposal for the conversion of the Prince Edward hotel, to meet the accommodation requirements of the proposal call, is submitted to the Ontario housing corporation, it will receive consideration together with all other proposals that are received. Perhaps I can add a little more to that without a supplementary question, and then if there are any questions I would be glad to take them.

In answer to the hon. member for Windsor West, as the Ontario housing corporation has now advertised for proposals for senior citizens' accommodation in the city of Windsor, the present owners are at liberty to offer it to the corporation for this purpose. However, the requirements of the corporation in response to the request of the city of Windsor is for one-bedroom, not hostel, accommodation. It may be of interest to the hon. members to learn that the Windsor housing authority, which administers Ontario housing corporation accommodation in the city of Windsor, has experienced some difficulty in renting the 78 units of hostel accommodation in OHC's downtown development, which was completed during December 1967. Of the 78 hostel units available in the complex, six remain vacant.

A point that the hon. member would perhaps like to know, Mr. Speaker, is that we will take a look at the hotel if some contractor, or somebody else there, wants to submit it completely rebuilt with cooking and kitchen facilities; we will take a look at it. But we would not want to take it on ourselves and rebuild the hotel into one-bedroom apartments, such as we have called for in our tender proposal.

Mr. Peacock: Mr. Speaker, would the Minister permit a supplementary question now? I would like to ask the Minister if

he would consider revising the rental rates for the present hostel accommodation which is not fully occupied, and the income ceilings for eligibility?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I will take that question as notice, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Speaker, if I may ask the hon. Minister a supplementary question, would he consider having his officials investigate the feasibility of the use of the hotel for senior citizens' accommodation?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I might say this, I am informed by the OHC staff that they have had similar offers made. For instance, the former Norton Palmer hotel was offered on the same basis and on looking it over it was found that the amount of money that we would have to put in to renovate that hotel from top to bottom would be more costly than building a new project. For this reason, I do not think we would be too interested in undertaking an extensive survey of what it would cost. We would prefer somebody else to take it over, and if he wanted to offer it to the Ontario housing corporation to meet these demands, we would be glad to have a look at it.

Mr. Peacock: Mr. Speaker, I have a second question of the Minister. Is the Ontario housing corporation study of rent levels and rent increases in major Ontario cities—now underway, according to OHC's managing director—designed to determine the need for rent controls? The second part of my question is: Will the Minister agree to release the findings of the study once it is completed?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Speaker, in answer to the question, the Ontario housing corporation study is concerned with rental levels in relation to present-day operating costs. In other words, the purpose of the study is to determine the extent of the problem insofar as it affects both tenants and owners, and I can say this, when the study has been completed, I would be very glad to make this information available to the hon. members.

Mr. W. G. Pitman (Peterborough): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could direct a question to the Minister of University Affairs?

Does the Minister concur with the remarks made by Mr. Frederick Fletcher, chairman of the Ontario College of Art governing board as reported in the Toronto *Telegram* of Monday, March 4, 1968, namely, that participation in the Ontario union of students:

> is all related to communism and fascism and it is almost a fascist country that allows that kind of an organization. It seems strange to me that they have a student union on our campuses and they are not even educated yet.

Assuming the negative, and assuming also that Mr. Fletcher is an appointee of this government, would the Minister review Mr. Fletcher's appointment to the board of governors of the Ontario College of Art?

Hon. W. G. Davis (Minister of University Affairs): I suppose, Mr. Speaker, one could very appropriately suggest that none of us are completely educated yet, so I do not know why one would make this particular reference.

I think, Mr. Speaker, it is obvious the Minister does not concur. I would not go so far as to say that the Ontario union of students, in total, supports the Progressive Conservative Party of Ontario, but nonetheless the results last October 17 indicated that a substantial number of students in the province of Ontario do—I think a surprising percentage, at least surprising to the gentlemen opposite.

I think, Mr. Speaker, we should recognize that during those rather difficult four or five days last weekend, including part of the former week, emotions were running high and certain things were said, things that were regrettable. As I say, Mr. Speaker, I do not concur, but at the present time I do not intend either to review appointments, whether it be by Lieutenant-Governor in council, or the board or the council itself at this particular moment. I am very encouraged to date by the response at the College of Art and I believe they are well on their way to resolving their difficulties.

Mr. Pitman: Might I ask a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker? Could the Minister indicate what qualifications this gentleman has for appointment to the Ontario College of Art's board of governors?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I do not know what one would outline as being specific qualifications. I am sure the member for Peterborough has read the legislation in the past few days. I would be surprised if he had not. Really it does not set out any qualifications for appointment to the council, in the same way that qualifications are not set out in any of the university legislation, as far as appointments to boards of governors are concerned. If the hon. member wants to ask me what I regard to be the qualifications for a

member of council, I am sure he would permit me several days to conjure up an appropriate answer, to outline all of the qualifications so that we would not in any way limit the very qualifications—

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Too bad the Minister has to conjure up an answer to the question, because the real answers do not exist.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I am sort of anticipating there may be one, but I am really not prepared today to outline what qualifications might fit any individual for any task.

Mr. Pitman: Mr. Speaker, might I direct a question to the Minister of Education, which I mistakenly directed to the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. McKeough). It has gone through your office, Mr. Speaker, and I have been informed by the Minister of Education's office that he would be quite happy to answer this question. Would the Minister consider delaying the elections to the proposed county school board until late December in order that those elected to municipal councils and present school boards will have a greater opportunity to participate?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I can more readily answer this question when the legislation is introduced—the question of when the elections are to be held, and who will be qualified to become trustees of the new county boards, will be dealt with in the Legislature.

Mr. M. Makarchuk (Brantford): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Education. Has the Minister received a letter from the Brantford board of education regarding extra payment of wages to an official from the Brantford board of education, who attended a Department of Education workshop at Fort William? Does The Department of Education intend to continue with the policy whereby the Brantford board of education official whose salary is over $20,000 a year, was paid an additional $77.50 a day for attending the workshop in Fort William? What was the total cost in extra wages paid to education officials who attended the workshop in Fort William? Is it The Department of Education's policy to pay extra wages to local school board officials who attend meetings at other than regular work periods, that is Monday to Friday?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I will try to deal with this as briefly as I can. I have in fact received the letter from the Brantford board of education. I understand that the official does not earn $20,000 a year, but something considerably less than that. I understand also that he attended the workshop and spent a considerable amount of his personal time preparing material—curriculum material—for discussions.

I should also point out to the hon. member, Mr. Speaker, that the honoraria, if any, of the officials who attended this workshop were paid by their employers—that is the boards concerned—not by The Department of Education. The question of whether they pay employees, and the amount to be paid for additional work over and above their regular duties, is a matter of concern of the local board. The boards in turn in some instances receive reimbursement from the provincial government and it in turn from the federal government if these workshops relate to the manpower training agreements. I should add, Mr. Speaker, that this aspect of honoraria being paid is under study now with respect to the manpower training agreements.

Mr. F. A. Burr (Sandwich-Riverside): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Highways. Has the Minister any reason to believe that the proposed increase of the speed limit from 60 miles per hour to 70 miles per hour on Highway 401 will increase the safety of motorists or reduce the seriousness of accidents?

Hon. G. E. Gomme (Minister of Highways): Mr. Speaker, the answer is no.

Mr. L. A. Braithwaite (Etobicoke): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Highways, proper notice of which has been given. In view of advertisements placed by The Department of Highways in the Toronto papers, listing for rent two houses at 151 Rangoon Road and 37 Summerfield Crescent, Etobicoke, would the Minister advise as follows:

1. At what monthly rate, and for what length of time will these houses be let?

2. Has any approach been made to the Ontario housing corporation and/or the welfare department of Metropolitan Toronto with a view to these houses being made available for emergency or short-run, low-rental housing?

3. Have any of the other houses in Etobicoke, which were expropriated for the widening of Highway 27, been relocated to Bramalea?

4. If the answer to part three is "yes", have these houses been sold or rented to the public, and if so, at what prices?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Some of these questions will take considerable research, and I will take them as notice.

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Energy and Resources Management. Will the government of Ontario allow in 1968 visits into the Canadian waters of the Great Lakes or inland Ontario waters, by yachts, or vessels registered in other jurisdictions that comply with the sanitary regulations of their base port, and do not meet the requirements or sanitary conditions as laid down by your department?

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Mr. Speaker, the answer is yes.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Health, and it is somewhat supplementary to yesterday. What is the current per diem cost governing education and research at (a) the Thistletown children's hospital, and (b) the children's psychiatric institute in London?

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, as this is not related to patient care now in our considerations, it is not available on a per diem basis, I cannot give the member the lump sum anticipated to be expended this year.

Mr. Lewis: I have a question for the Minister of Education. Has the Minister been advised regarding a total violation of fire safety regulations at 253 Spadina Road, the site of George Brown College? If so, what action does the Minister intend to take in event of a serious fire hazard?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I have not been advised of any fire safety problems at 253 Spadina Road. I shall be delighted to look into the situation, but I have not been advised of the situation.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Windsor West will please put his question and then the member for Hamilton East afterwards, but if the member has a statement, then I would suggest that this is not the place.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): My question is for the Minister of Education. On what date will the Hamilton board of education know the amount of the provincial grant for 1968?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, the grant regulations for all the school boards in the province of Ontario will be sent out this week, at that time the information upon which they can base their calculations of the amount of the grant should be available to the Hamilton board of education. As the hon. member is well aware, the grant regulations do not specify the total amount to be received, but specify the regulations under which the grant can be calculated. These will be available to the Hamilton board, either by the end of the week, or by the beginning of next week.

Mr. Gisborn: I have a question for the Minister of Labour. What will be the position of the employees of various boards of education who are represented by unions at the moment after the merger of two or more boards? Will the Minister, in sufficient time to avoid possible confusion, meet the unions involved to clarify and discuss the situation?

Hon. D. Bales (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, this question might have been referred to the Minister of Education, but it is my understanding that all the obligations of existing school boards, including their relationships with the unions, will be assumed by the new boards.

I believe that these points will be clarified when the legislation is introduced in the House. In reference to the second part, however, about two weeks ago, the president of the Ontario federation of labour, and senior officials of the Canadian union of public employees, met with the Deputy Ministers of Education and Labour, in reference to these matters, and I believe that they were quite satisfied with the discussion that took place.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): I have a question for the Provincial Treasurer. Would the Minister inquire of the president of Imperial Oil, whether or not there is a temporary allowance of eight-tenths of a cent on the wholesale price of gas to its dealers in Sudbury, and would the Minister advise the House of these findings?

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Provincial Treasurer): In answer to the question: In my opinion the information required by the hon. member for Sudbury East is one of internal company policy, associated with its dealer-distributor relationships. For this reason, I do not think that it is appropriate for the Minister to make such an inquiry of the president of the Imperial Oil Co., and I would suggest to the hon. member that he

would have as much access to this information as would the Minister.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister of Economics and Development. What was the total amount paid for land assembled for Saltfleet satellite city? Second, how much commission was paid to B. Kronas Real Estate?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Speaker, in answer to the hon. member's question, as Ontario housing corporation is in the market place for great areas of land on a continuing basis, the disclosure of purchase prices could seriously affect the corporation's ability to negotiate satisfactory prices. For this reason it is not in the best interests of the land development programme that purchase prices be made public.

No commission was paid by Ontario housing corporation to B. Kronas Real Estate, as that firm was not acting for the corporation. His commission, if any, would have been paid by the vendor, Jon-Enco Limited.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, may I ask a supplementary question? If I were to ask the Minister for the answer to this question, would he be prepared to give it to me as an individual member outside the House?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I do not think we are going to release that information on land prices.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Lands and Forests, notice of which has been given. In view of the increased practice of moonlighting or jacklighting of deer in Rainy River district, can the Minister advise whether his department has any plans for strengthening existing legislation with regard to the practice of moonlighting or jacklighting of deer?

Hon. R. Brunelle (Minister of Lands and Forests): Mr. Speaker, in reply to the hon. member for Rainy River, may I say that jacklighting deer is already an illegal offence and officials of my department lay the charges which are subsequently dealt with by the courts. In such cases, confiscation of equipment does not permit the return of such equipment to the owner. I would be pleased to review whether or not additional conservation officers are required to enforce the Act under the jurisdiction of this department.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question. Has the Minister been made aware of the fact that this is the worst year in the history of Rainy River district for this practice of jacklighting and I would suggest, therefore, that some stricter enforcement—

Mr. Speaker: The member will ask his question and then stop. He asked his question and then proceeded to make a statement. Will the Minister answer the question?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Speaker, may I say in reply to the hon. member that I have received several letters with reference to the concern of jacklighting of deer. As the hon. member is aware, a person can have a light at night in his car; he can take a light and flash it on a deer or any animal. There is no law against this. I would also like to mention that a person is allowed to have a rifle in his car providing it is encased. These things are allowed. As I just mentioned, we are looking into this question of trying to have more conservation officers to try and deal with this problem.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Mr. Speaker, I have a second question for the Minister of Lands and Forests. Can the Minister advise whether Ontario Hydro has been given permission to erect high voltage lines through the beautiful and wild Quetico park at the east end of Pickerel Lake? If so, does the Minister not think these hydro pylons will destroy the natural beauty of Quetico park and the very reason for the park?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Speaker, in reply to the hon. member's question, I would like to take it as notice. I was not aware of the hydro going through that area and I agree with him that it would destroy the area. May I also remind him that there is an Indian village in that area, however. I will have a reply for him tomorrow.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Thank you, sir. I have a question for the Provincial Treasurer. Does the Minister have any current plans for visiting the northern mining communities to meet with the mining and municipal officials to discuss with them the proposals of the Smith report, before these proposals become legislation?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Speaker, in answer to the hon. member's question may I say that I have no current plans for visiting northern mining communities and municipal officials to discuss proposals on the Ontario committee on taxation. All interested parties, groups, agencies, associations and municipalities have been invited to submit their views in the form of briefs to me and the target dates for these submissions have been

made known to all concerned, including the members of this House. It has also been stated that briefs will be considered by a central committee headed by the Deputy Provincial Treasurer, Finance and Economics, following which these submissions and all aspects of the report will be dealt with in a series of conferences to which representative bodies will be invited.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question. Is the Minister aware of the travelling expenses from northwestern Ontario down to Toronto incurred by the municipalities and mining officials?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes, Mr. Speaker, the Minister is very well aware of that. I would just say one thing more. I did not say that the conferences would be held in Toronto or Windsor or the Lakehead. We do propose to have a series of conferences, but these plans have not yet been made, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Transport.

The Windsor *Star* of March 2, 1968, in discussion of the problems of boating and boat racing in River Canard, quoted the hon. Paul Hellyer, Minister of Transport, as stating that the federal Department of Transport's plan for general boating and boat racing regulations as such, could not be made effective in any province without the co-operation of the provincial government. Has the Minister been in touch with, or, contacted by any officials of the federal Department of Transport with a view to implementing the plan for general boating and boat racing in Ontario?

A second question: Does the Minister propose to meet with an official of the federal Department of Transport to discuss such a plan?

Hon. I. Haskett (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, no, not that I am aware of. However, this matter does not appear to fall within the purview of my department.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Minister to advise me to which department I could direct that question, then?

Mr. Speaker: The Minister may not be able to, but I am sure that if he can, he will.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Speaker, I said I was unaware of any correspondence from the federal Minister of Transport in this matter. Boating normally falls under the aegis of the federal government.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Speaker, the comments state that without the co-operation—

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the member would direct a communication to the federal department concerned and ask them with which department in this government they propose to deal, because there have been no communications apparently from the federal department, so the Minister states.

Mr. B. Newman: All I would like to know of him, is to which of the departments of the government opposite should I direct such a question then?

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, perhaps I could be helpful. One area here would pertain to the policing of boating and boat traffic generally. We have had some correspondence extending back over a period of time and have considered that area of the matter quite a bit. It is a big job to take care of the situation in Ontario which has so many lakes. But if I could be helpful in giving the hon. member any information I would be glad to do so.

Mr. Speaker: In order that this matter may be clarified I would like to advise the member that when this question came in I suggested to the secretaries that the first part of it be directed to the Attorney General and the second part either to the Minister of Transport or the Minister of Energy and Resources Management, but apparently that was not done.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Mr. Speaker, a question for the Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts). Will he advise when he will answer the question I asked about ten days ago relative to the commission of the London Life Insurance Company?

Mr. Speaker: May I ask the member to ask the question with which he has furnished me notice.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, I asked the Prime Minister when he is going to answer the question I asked ten days ago.

Mr. Speaker: May I request the member to abide by the present rules and customs governing questions and that, at the moment, does not fall within it. There is a great variety of questions here with which the member may question Ministers if he is prepared to proceed.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, a question to the Provincial Secretary. How much are

the distillers charged to get their names on the board in the LCBO stores? If not, can he guarantee the House that this course is not in effect in the LCBO stores in Ontario today?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, the answer to the first question is "nothing". I cannot understand the second question but if he means by "this course" that as a result of answering the first question "nothing"; such in fact is the case, it is.

Mr. Sargent: With all this—too many orders in the House—I cannot understand that jargon. Will the Minister accept a supplementary on it? What are the arrangements then to get a name on the board in the LCBO?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Thank you. The policy of the LCBO is that each individual store manager lists a brand when there is sufficient demand for that particular product. I understand that the brand must sell at least two cases a year in the smaller outlets and four cases a year in the larger stores, if it is in fact to remain on the store list.

Mr. Sargent: Then Melchers did not sell enough to get on it legally.

A question to the hon. Attorney General. Will he please advise the House when the Melchers case is coming to trial? I put it to the Prime Minister and they steered me back to the Attorney General again.

An hon. member: Order, order!

Mr. Sopha: Do you want to order four cases? You have to take a minimum of four cases—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sargent: The question again, sir: Will the Attorney General please advise the House when the Melchers case is coming to trial, and if not, has he personally intervened?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, I did indicate the other day in answer to a very similar question that I had no knowledge of when the case was coming to trial and—

Mr. Sargent: If ever.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Well, I will enlarge to this extent for the benefit of the hon. member. The Attorney General does not intervene in civil matters.

Mr. Sargent: Who has, then?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Well, just allow me to proceed and I will tell you. Parties engaged in civil litigation are usually represented by counsel. If they are not, we now have a Legal Aid Act where they can certainly get counsel if they are unable to by reason of financial inability. I believe that the parties in this case are both represented by very capable counsel. All they need to do to get their case on for trial is to speak to the officials of the court and arrange for when they want it to go for a hearing.

To the second part of the question—will he personally intervene—I say no. It would be an intolerable thing if an Attorney General were to intervene in civil matters.

Mr. J. H. White (London South): He is not even listening. No wonder the question is asked a second time.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: It would be intolerable, and I think the hon. member would realize this, if he were a litigant if the Attorney General or any political person, the Minister of any department, were to intervene and say: This case must be dealt with in this manner or that manner. There is no thought of intervention in any civil action in this province by the Attorney General. It is not proper to do this.

Mr. Sargent: Thank you.

A question to the hon. Provincial Treasurer: When does the central purchasing plan go into operation? How much is budgeted for salaries? What is the salary of the chief administrator?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Speaker, the central purchasing plan will go into operation on February 19—rather, I should say on February 19 the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Connell) announced to the House that the government had authorized the creation of a new division which will be the central purchasing authority for all departments.

A committee of Deputy Ministers under the chairmanship of the Deputy Minister of Public Works was established in January of 1968 to provide guidance in the establishment of administrative policy.

Mr. R. W. Clarke, formerly of Canadian Kodak Company Limited has been appointed executive director of the division and will commence his duties on March 11, 1968. The initial task of the division will be to review existing purchasing practices within the government service. Following this

review it will formulate in detail purchasing policies for all government departments.

Since the purchasing authority will also be involved in identifying those items which are commonly used by the government, which can be more economically purchased through a central authority, it is anticipated that the development of the purchasing guidelines and identification of items to be purchased will absorb the major portion of the division's time in 1968-69.

In answer to part two of the question, an amount of $45,000 has been included in the 1968-69 estimates to provide for the salaries of the staff of the purchasing and supply division. The answer to part three of the question, the salary to be paid to the executive director of the purchasing and supply division is $19,000 per year.

Mr. Sargent: A question to the Attorney General: How many prisoners are in Don jail being held without bail awaiting trial?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, I am advised that as of today, and the figure changes from day to day, there are 100 prisoners in the Don jail held without bail. And there are 151 persons in custody who have not been able to raise the bail which has been set by the court. As I say, those figures change from day to day.

Mr. Sargent: This is shocking—I am sorry, Mr. Speaker. Will the Attorney General tell the House, is he not concerned, is he not going to see that the rights of these people are looked after? This happened before last year and we had a big hassle about it, but nothing happened.

Mr. Speaker: Would the member now take his seat and allow the Minister to answer the question which he has placed?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, I can make some comment. First of all, the conditions under which bail is granted are set forth in the criminal code, as part of the criminal code, which is a federal Act, and under federal jurisdiction. All the provisions relating to bail are found there.

The granting of the bail is in the discretion of the judge, magistrate, judicial person trying the case, hearing the case, and I am not prepared to say that this figure in this area of dense population is shocking. I do not know that that would be the case at all. I do know that we have complaints on the other side of the ledger, where persons are said to have been granted too little bail and have gone out of custody because they were prepared to forfeit the amount of bail which was—

Mr. E. W. Sopha: (Sudbury): Very rare, very rare. Two per cent, or one per cent.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: That may be. I am not prepared to comment on the percentage. I say we do have objections on the other side. Anyway, the granting of bail is a discretion of the magistrate or judge who hears the case.

Mr. Sopha: May I ask a question for clarification? Did I understand the Attorney General correctly when he said that there were 100 people for whom no bail had been set?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: The answer I gave was that there were 100 persons in the Don jail as of today who are held without bail—I think you used the expression without any bail being set.

Mr. G. Ben (Humber): Being set or refused?

Mr. Sopha: That is shocking.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: The information I got from the officials of the Don jail was that there were 100 persons in cells without bail. I take that to mean they were not given bail. They were refused.

Mr. Sopha: This is shocking.

Mr. Speaker: The member will proceed with his question.

Mr. Sargent: They tell me last year they were five months waiting to get on trial.

Mr. Speaker: Order! Will the member proceed with his question?

Mr. Singer: McRuer does not. McRuer puts the responsibility right there.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

An hon. member: Not where I read it.

Mr. Singer: The hon. member read it?

Mr. Sargent: A question to the hon. Prime Minister. How many suites were reserved for the Ontario government in Habitat at Expo? For how long were they reserved? How much did they cost and to whom were they available?

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I think this is exactly the type of question that should go on the order paper. It will require some research and I will take this as notice and I would suggest that it be put

on the order paper and the answer will appear in due course.

While I am on my feet, Mr. Speaker, if I may, I would like to clear up the question the hon. member for Grey-Bruce was trying to ask, and did not. On page 150 of *Hansard,* he asked a similar question, I then explained to him the fact that he was talking about one insurance plan and referring to another. Having straightened this out the question appeared on the order paper as No. 4, where it now rests as No. 4.

My answer to him to the question on page 150 was that this whole question of insurance came under the Ontario civil service commission which is under the administrative jurisdiction of the Provincial Treasurer. The Treasurer undertook to answer the question and he did so, and his answers are contained on page 207 of *Hansard.* I do not know if the hon. member was in his seat at the time, but the answer to the question is in *Hansard,* and the question should be removed from the order paper.

Mr. Sargent: My apologies, I did not know that it had been answered.

Mr. Speaker: I might just say, before the member proceeds, that following our discussion yesterday in the House, I decided that all questions that were received by my office either today or tomorrow would come here orally, so that I might ascertain whether or not the members were willing to abide by the rules and place the questions that should have been on the order paper, through the Clerk's office. There were at least two today which should have been dealt with by notice, but they have come to you today so that we may judge how this privilege and right of asking questions was dealt with by the individual members. The member may proceed.

Mr. Sargent: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, the question is for the Attorney General. On the civil rights bill just released yesterday, what was the cost of the report and did the Attorney General have access to this bill before it came before the House?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, I do not have any figure as to the cost of the inquiry on civil rights. This is not within my department at all, and I have no responsibility in that direction. I would suggest that perhaps, if the hon. member would put the question on the order paper, it could be answered by my colleague, the Treasurer. As to the second part of the question, whether the Attorney General had access to the report before its release to the House, I would have to answer "yes" I have had it for some few days prior to its tabling here yesterday. When the commissioner delivered the report to the government, I think it was his request that since he was going away for a brief holiday he would be pleased to be here when the report was tabled and perhaps be of use in answering questions.

I took occasion to get this copy of the report, and I was very eager to get it and read it, which I did; and I could think of no better way to spend my time because it touches the whole field of civil rights and the administration of justice. I trust that the hon. member will not think that in this case, I was trespassing too seriously on the privilege of the House.

Mr. Sargent: I have a question, if the Minister will answer this one. On the news report on the radio this morning, he is quoted as saying that it was a coincidence that the legislation recommended in the report was going before the House shortly. He was taking credit for second guessing, and yet he had access to the report—and the legislation is just coincidental?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, I have not heard the news report. I think that I did say to some newsman after the report had been tabled, that some of the legislation that I was introducing carried out several of the recommendations and that I was glad to see that we had been thinking along the same lines as the commissioner.

Mr. Sopha: The Minister has a wandering microphone.

Mr. Sargent: A question for the Prime Minister. Will the Prime Minister advise the House, in view of the projected figures of a $61 million deficit announced in the press, does he plan to increase the sales tax?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I can only say that if that deficit was announced, it was not announced by the government. I am sure that the hon. member is well aware of the provisions of budgetary secrecy, and on Tuesday next, as I advised the House, the Budget will be brought down. Our plans have not changed, and these matters will be discussed there.

Mr. Sopha: Will it still be $61 million?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I can only say that this was a purely speculative news report that appeared in the morning paper. I do not think that it would be proper for me to comment on it, other than as I have, and that is to say

it was not an announcement by the government, and that it is, as far as we are concerned, a speculative news item. However, I might point out to the hon. member, that on August 31, 1967, when the Smith committee report was first given to the government, the Provincial Treasurer, or I, or both, together or on different occasions, said that we welcomed the proposals for a basic shelter relief grant and we would see if we could implement this. I believe we gave some undertaking at the time that if it were done this year, it would be without increasing the sales tax or the personal income tax. I think we are both on record as having said that in the latter part of last year, or in the early part of this year.

Mr. Sargent: They are thumping on their desks for $61 million in the hole!

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Sargent: A question for the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests. How many tourist and resort operators are still paying rent or permit fees to the Algoma Central Railway?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: In answer to the hon. member, The Department of Lands and Forests has no record of agreements between resort operators and the Algoma Central Railway relative to the paying of rent. I would recommend or suggest to him that if he was to contact the company, they may deal with the question.

Mr. Sargent: May I ask a supplementary question? Am I to understand that the Minister does not know that they are paying permit fees in Wawa?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Speaker, the Algoma Central Railway own their own lands, and as private owners they can rent their land to other persons, but we are not aware of this.

Mr. Sargent: The Minister certainly should be aware of this.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: We know that they do rent, but we have no record of the persons, or how many persons they rent to. It is not our concern.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: That was one of the Liberal government deals.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Speaker, I have the answer to two questions, one asked by the member for Sudbury East (Mr. Martel) yesterday:

In view of the dangerous conditions that developed when two large cracks appeared in the steel of the Wahnapitae bridge, 11 miles east of Sudbury on Highway 17, could the Minister advise the House (a) when the bridge was built, (b) who supplied the steel, (c) what construction company built the bridge, (d) what tests are given steel for main highway bridges, (e) will an investigation be conducted, and (f) will the findings be made public?

The answers: (a) The bridge was built in 1939, and (b) the steel was supplied and shop fabricated by Disher Steel Construction Company Ltd., of Toronto; (c) the bridge was built by the Ontario Construction Co. of St. Catharines; (d) Donald Engineering Co. inspected the steel in the shop in 1939; (e) presently we use independent companies to test steel physically and visually at the fabricator's plant and at the construction site. An investigation is currently under way, and the hon. member can rest assured that the House will be kept informed.

Then there was a supplementary question asked by the member for Oshawa, it had to do with the signs of service clubs on the highway, and would the B'Nai Brith club not qualify under the formula. The answer is that the B'Nai Brith, a very worthwhile and prominent service club, unfortunately does not qualify according to the policy which I outlined to the House on February 28, 1968. The service club in Oshawa applied for permission to erect a sign, but because it did not qualify, the request was not granted.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Before the orders of the day, may I ask, with regard to the future business of the House, is it the intention of the Prime Minister to carry on the Throne debate up to and beyond the Budget, and to what point?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, it had been my intention to let the Budget debate continue this afternoon, tomorrow afternoon, tomorrow evening, and for whatever time we might have on—

Clerk of the House: The Throne debate!

Hon. Mr. Robarts: —the Throne debate; and then at that time I was perhaps going to have a conversation with the hon. member and the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Nixon) to see how many speakers were left and what arrangements could be made. We can, of course, run the two debates at once if that should be necessary. On the other hand, as soon as the Throne debate is com-

pleted, the Budget debate takes its place and it may be that we could wind up this debate but that will be a matter for some discussion when we see how many people are left who want to speak.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: First order; resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the amendment to the motion for an address in reply to the speech of the Honourable, the Lieutenant-Governor at the opening of the session.

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

Mr. J. Jessiman (Fort William): Mr. Speaker, I would like at the outset to associate myself with those who have spoken earlier in this debate and who have offered you their congratulations upon your election as Speaker. As a new member, I look forward to your advice and counsel from the chair during the current session and for the remainder of the twenty-eighth Parliament.

It is, of course, the custom for new members to relate most of their first speech in the Legislature to their own riding, and I shall offer no exception to this tradition. I must say I consider myself more fortunate than most, for the riding of Fort William is both vibrant and diversified. It is not without its problems, and I plan to touch on some of these, but I feel it is fair to say that the advantages which Fort William offers to its residents and the interests it holds for its visitors make it truly one of the most vital parts of our province.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, Fort William has had an extremely unsettled political representation during the last decade. In the general election of 1959, the voters gave their support to a Liberal who lasted for all of four years and who was succeeded by a New Democrat in the election of 1963. His term of office also was for four years. And now the voters of Fort William, I am happy to say, have turned to the government party.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Jessiman: From this very brief outline of our recent political past, I think you can clearly see that the people of Fort William have been groping through the entire political spectrum for decisive, concerned and active representation. They have rejected the Liberals as inept, they have rejected the New Democrats as misfits, and they have turned, finally, to the Progressive Conservatives for action, for stability and for the party which has proven it can do the job.

I would like to say at this point that I have the utmost personal respect for my predecessor, Mr. Ted Freeman, who always had the best interests of the people of Fort William at heart. I do not believe his defeat at the polls last October was a personal one. Rather, it was an expression by the voters against his association with a band of stereotyped, unswerving, dogmatic, political evangelists whose main interest in the north was to tear it down, rather than build it up. Defeatism in the past was a socialist attitude. Optimism in the future is the credo of the Progressive Conservatives.

Mr. Speaker, I do not intend this address to be entirely political in tone, but I do feel that I should make a comment upon a movement that seems to be afoot in the NDP with regard to northern and northwestern Ontario. It has been suggested that members of all three parties who are representatives of the north should band together in a sort of tri-lateral internal pressure group, to hound the government for a special status for the north.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Good idea!

Mr. Jessiman: Speaking personally, I should like to state that I am first of all a Canadian, secondly a citizen of Ontario and thirdly a northwestern Ontarian. As a Canadian, I am only too aware of the mood of sectionalism that exists in various parts of our country and I am not about to participate in any venture that would transport these sectionalistic ideas to northern Ontario.

We in Fort William regard ourselves as Ontarians and we seek no favours that would be denied others. Certainly we have social problems and problems of geographic and climatic conditions that set us apart from other areas of the province. But we feel these can be dealt with by positive programmes of regional development, and not the negative sectional demands for a special status that seem to be part and parcel of the main NDP programme for the north.

It should be pointed out that reckless abandonment of northern Saskatchewan by the NDP was allowed while that party was in power for 20 years. I just mention this to illustrate that those who look for a positive approach to the challenge of the north will find no comfort in the policies of the NDP. It is nothing short of pure sectionalism, an attempt to set one part of the province

against the other as in the case of Saskatchewan—

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Point of order, point of order!

Mr. Jessiman: —when that party had a chance to do something for its northern residents and failed for 20 years.

Mr. Speaker: Order. Will the member please take his seat while the member states his point of order.

Mr. Stokes: Mr. Speaker, I think you suggested a couple of days ago that we extend the courtesy of no interjections while a member was speaking the first time in the House. I think we are sticking to that and I would hope that the other side would do the same thing.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Stokes: I would say: Do not interrupt the member when he is talking. We have agreed not to interject and I would hope that hon. members opposite would do the same thing.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: I would hope that the memory of the members would last two or three days.

Mr. Jessiman: In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I might say that we who live in northwestern Ontario do not feel ourselves underprivileged. It is impossible to do so when we take inventory of our great natural resources, our dividends from primary industry and our wealth of recreational areas and activities. Surely that is what the future holds for northwestern Ontario—new industry, new jobs and new people, to make our area increasingly attractive for migratory Canadians and for immigrants seeking a place of their own—a place to stand, a place to grow.

Some hon. members: Hear, Hear.

Mr. Jessiman: I can therefore say to all members of this House: Do not let anyone label us "have-nots", not in northwestern Ontario. The expression "have-nots" is a left-wing invention, an illusion. I know all of us in northwestern Ontario resent being called "have-nots".

If I may, I will turn now to specifics and suggest to the government a few of the projects were we seek their leadership and co-operation in the forward developmnt of Fort William and its attendant area.

First of all, let us take a look at the tourist industry. As president of the Lakehead convention bureau, it gave me a great deal of pleasure to state in my 1967 annual report that we were successful in achieving our centennial year objective of $1,000,000 in gross dollar volume from conventions, delegations and visitors attending seminars and other events, or just sightseeing in the Lakehead area.

Thus, tourism ranks as one of our major industries. To keep it that way, I would draw again to the government's attention the need for further highway development in northwestern Ontario. Just outside the city limits of Fort William, we have a great natural attraction in Mount McKay. A road to the first ledge of the mountain 1,000 ft. above the sea level, provides access to an outstanding lookout, but the time is now upon us when we must consider extending this road for about a mile across the face of the mountain to join with Highway 61.

The existing mountain road is operated by the Ojibway Indians as a toll road and it is obvious that an extension to this road would be to their benefit and to ours. The connecting link would add immeasurably to the appeal of the scenic route from Fort William southwest to the Minnesota boundary at Pigeon River and it would give us an opportunity to further develop the mountain park, in co-operation with the Ojibway band.

The subject of roads in northwestern Ontario is one constantly put forward to the government by interested groups from our area and I will not go into great detail on this at this time. However, I would like to spur The Department of Highways on towards a long-range programme, a programme for construction of a highway linking Atikokan, 130 miles west of Fort William on Highway 11, with the trans-Canada Highway No. 17 in the Dryden area. Certainly, it is only a matter of time until this road is built, but I am hopeful The Department of Highways may begin making plans for it in the near future, in the context of the roads-to-resources programme outlined in the Throne Speech. Such a highway would open up virgin territory within relatively easy driving distance from the Lakehead and would be invaluable to the development of tourism and primary industries in our area.

Still on the subject of tourism, Mr. Speaker, may I say how pleased I was to learn of the preliminary work being undertaken under the auspices of The Department of Tourism and Information, and public records and archives, with regard to the feasibility of reconstruction of old Fort William. My own view is that it may be entirely possible to locate the reconstructed fort upon the very site where it was originally built by William McGillivray, in the first decade of the 19th century, and where it served as inland headquarters for the Northwest Company. Even were it not to be located on the precise spot where it stood originally, a reconstructed Fort William would have a worthwhile historical validity and tremendous tourist appeal.

Mr. Speaker, I applaud the government for undertaking such projects as, in eastern Ontario, Upper Canada village, and Sainte Marie among the Hurons in the central part of the province. I commend to the government the reconstruction of old Fort William as providing needed and deserved balance in the west for this programme of historical restoration.

I would like to make mention of two other tourist attractions: Kakabeka Falls has already been developed into a provincial park. In fact, it has become one of Ontario's largest revenue-producing parks, despite its relatively small area. When you think of the falls and its gorge—deeper even than Niagara—the phrase that immediately comes to mind, Mr. Speaker, is "rugged grandeur."

Kakabeka is establishing a wide reputation among campers and sightseers, both at home and south of the border, and I feel The Department of Lands and Forests should give further attention to the expansion and development of this park which could well become the most attractive of all provincial parks in Ontario.

To the northeast of the Lakehead, we have Ouimet Canyon, still largely unknown and unexplored by the great masses of travellers ever in search of new things to see and do. Ouimet Canyon is a striking geological formation unlike any other we have in Ontario. The time is ripe to improve the road —if I may call it that—the road into Ouimet Canyon and to acquire the property in this area for a future provincial park. I believe The Department of Lands and Forests has some plans for this, but I would be most appreciative if the Minister could inform the House, perhaps when his estimates are being discussed, what long-range plans are being developed for Ouimet Canyon.

The Department of Lands and Forests has, I know, a programme for building launching ramps on lakes in provincial parks. Mr. Speaker, I would like to see this programme expanded outside of park areas, so that launching facilities and serviced harbours for small craft could be made available along the north shore of Lake Superior, at approximate intervals of 50 miles. From our point of view, one of the most valuable functions of The Department of Lands and Forests is its restocking of lakes and rivers. Now that the lamprey eel is being beaten into submission, I would suggest that the time has now come for an expanded stocking programme in Lake Superior—hopefully, with Cohoe salmon and rainbow trout. Lake Superior is the largest and still the cleanest of our great lakes and offers potential from the point of view of both tourism and commercial fisheries.

About the latter, Mr. Speaker. Commercial fishing is often a marginal and hardly lucrative business among many operators in the northwest. I would ask The Department of Lands and Forests, as well as The Department of Agriculture and Food, to investigate the idea of establishing a fish marketing board for these operators. I realize the complexities involved, but it is important for us to seek some means of assisting the commercial fishermen, while bearing in mind the need to avoid damaging sport fishing in our northern lakes. One means of satisfying both these ends may be to make it more worthwhile for commercial fishermen to harvest coarse fish from inland waters. A series of strategically located satellite freezing plants would be an invaluable asset.

Mr. Speaker, some of us from the north were pleased at the announcement contained in the Throne Speech that the government will assist northern municipalities to build landing strips for small aircraft. This programme takes second place only to highway construction in opening up the last virgin strongholds of our natural resources. Bridging the communications gap in the north also means extension of telephone and hydro lines to remote settlements, where such facilities are fast becoming a necessity for survival.

Much of the responsibility for northern development must necessarily rest with the federal and provincial governments and their various agencies, but there is a great deal of room here for action by private citizens, and by professionals of all disciplines, as well as the continuing efforts of our northern pioneers, to whom we owe such a great debt. When I refer to professionals, Mr. Speaker, I

am thinking primarily of the medical fraternity, which in my mind faces a definite obligation to export its services to the far reaches of the province.

Even such substantial communities as the pulp and paper town of Marathon and the mining town of Manitouwadge suffer from a shortage of doctors and medical services. For example, we could point out that the ratio of dentists to population is one per 2,360 residents. But in Manitouwadge, which has more than 2,000 population, there is not a single dentist.

From a humanitarian point of view, as well as that of maintaining a high regard in the eyes of the people for the medical profession itself, I wonder if it would be possible for the Ontario medical association to discuss the possibility of launching a "supply doctor" system, a system to bring both doctors and dentists in, on a regular schedule of visits, to communities and settlements where medical people are either in short supply or absent altogether. I wonder too if the Ontario medical association might entertain a review of their fee schedule, so a financial-incentive system similar to that previously used in cities of over 100,000 people might be adopted and applied to northern Ontario communities for towns and villages of less than 1,500.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me suggest to the members for Port Arthur (Mr. Knight) and Rainy River (Mr. T. P. Reid) that they take a message to their big brothers in Ottawa to the effect that we are getting very weary —that we are getting very fed up—trying to open up northern Ontario while the federal Liberals try to close it down. As we drive forward, they drive us backward. In the riding of Rainy River, where many hundreds of settlers, trappers and our friends from the Ojibway tribe live, we have as one means of communication between Fort Frances and Fort William a 200-mile ribbon of Canadian National Railways tracks, with hardly a connecting link between the tracks and the highway. Yet the federal government has allowed the CNR to reduce its passenger service from a daily trip to three trips a week. We try to open the north and they try to close it and force these people to either plan their sickness or accidents to Monday-Wednesday-Friday, or be without transportation for the balance of the week.

Navigable waters, sir, are the responsibility of the federal government and we in Fort William are cut off by the Kam River which flows into Lake Superior and is a navigable river and a bridge that deters expansion of the city to the south. Still the only bridge since 1911, when it was constructed for horse-and-buggy traffic, it remains the symbol of inequality, of neglect, by the federal government.

Fortunately we from the Lakehead have had assistance from the provincial government—the construction of a new bridge above the navigable portion of the Kam River and the expenditure of some $12 million on this new expressway round our cities of Port Arthur and Fort William to reroute heavy traffic from the downtown streets and roads.

In recognizing that navigable waters are a federal government responsibility, we should co-operate with them in an attempt to keep navigation open on the Great Lakes 12 months of the year, so that we would eliminate seasonal unemployment. We could initiate immediately action and research to take advantage of the programme recently announced through the northwest passage. Surely the northwest portion of our province would benefit greatly from such action, and immediately.

We are a strong part of Ontario, sir, and I am extremely proud and humble to have been chosen the representative of the Robarts government by our people.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Jessiman: Mr. Speaker, many of the special problems faced by the Lakehead cities are caused by their relative isolation from other major population centres. For instance, there are no juvenile training school facilities at all in northwestern Ontario. From as far west as Kenora, all non-Catholic boys must be transported to Bowmanville, east of Toronto, and all non-Catholic girls to Galt. Catholic boys are taken even farther east, to Alfred near the Quebec border, and Catholic girls are taken to Toronto.

The disadvantages are obvious. Each youth committed to a training school must be escorted by an adult officer at considerable cost. Airline transportation from Fort William to Toronto and return costs $111, and from Fort William to Ottawa $135. In addition, there is the cost of ground transportation from the airports to the training schools, plus overnight accommodation and loss of time on the part of the accompanying officers.

Besides this, it becomes almost impossible for parents to visit their children when they have been so far removed. Since these youngsters usually remain in training school

for periods of from seven months to a year, they may be without personal contact with their parents for the whole of this time. Obviously, this is detrimental to their rehabilitation.

Mr. Speaker, during the last year for which figures are available, there were 32 boys and 13 girls from Thunder Bay district transported to these far-off training schools, and for all of northwestern Ontario there were 105 boys and 31 girls committed altogether during the year. I believe the Minister of Reform Institutions (Mr. Grossman) already has indicated a training school would be built at Sudbury. Still, this would not help the Lakehead area a great deal inasmuch as air transportation between Fort William and Sudbury is more difficult than between Fort William and Toronto.

Taking into consideration the number of youths from northwestern Ontario who are committed to training schools each year, I would suggest to the Minister that the time has come to give serious consideration to the establishment of facilities, for boys especially, in the Lakehead area.

I would also point out to the Minister that the Lakehead has no adequate detention homes for holding juveniles either before trial or after trial for assessment purposes. In some cases, these youngsters must be lodged in district jails. I submit that a detention centre should be located at the Lakehead to serve the area from Algoma west to the Manitoba boundary.

We extend a most cordial welcome to all of you to visit us, and often—as often, I hope as the leader of the NDP did preceding October 17.

An hon. member: What did he do now?

Mr. Jessiman: I have not seen him back since.

We are most happy with the new programme extended to the north—in the equalization-of-opportunity programme, which I might call a recipe for success. I might also report to you, sir, that we are taking full advantage of them.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Jessiman: Mr. Speaker, we in the Progressive Conservative Party take the positive approach, not the negative. In this regard, I would like to congratulate the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) and the Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Randall) for their programme for the equalization of industrial opportunity, which promises to provide a major boost to the north.

I would like to tell the Minister of Tourism and Information (Mr. Auld) that the people of the north appreciate the interest his department has shown in devising travel-promotion programmes to fit our particular needs. These programmes and others which I could mention at length have served to indicate that Queen's Park is becoming increasingly aware of the differing economic and social needs of this young and energetic part of the province.

So far, we have had several new announcements in this connection, and, under the $500,000 grant programme announced in the Lakehead by the Prime Minister, 50 applications are already being processed—and we expect many more to follow. However, I would suggest that we take even greater advantage, where possible, by opening a trade and tourist office in Minneapolis, the same distance from Fort William as Kenora.

Let us concentrate our efforts on the 17 million people who live within a short day's drive and sell our products and our tourist attractions to a large and very eager market. Let us open a research centre in the north, so we may learn why roads built to tran-Canada specifications and formulated in Toronto do not survive the seven to ten feet of frost that we have in the north.

Let us examine the problem of distance, for patients must take longer to get to hospital and remain longer in hospital when they have no means of getting back home. Six beds per thousand persons in a density of population such as London is adequate, but it is a ratio that cannot apply, of course to the thousand persons living on the stretch of track between Fort Frances and Fort William.

I would like to say at this time to the hon. Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs (Mr. Rowntree), that we were very pleased with his action in bringing his department's new programme to the Canadian Lakehead, with a three-day conference on consumer credit. Over 275 attended the conference, from Marathon to Dryden, and it was the most acceptable type of adult education attempted by any government agency, fully explaining every segment of legislation passed by this department since its very inception. I would welcome and encourage many of our other departments to set up such conferences and move them from centre to centre throughout the entire north.

Let us be thankful the north is—and shall remain—a large and integral part of the

great province of Ontario, and may I affirm, under the finest government which we have ever enjoyed.

And, in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, to correct any misconception of what has happened in Norply Mill at Nipigon, I would make it abundantly clear that I am indeed sorry for friends of mine who have invested in the mill which is now bankrupt, and I am very sympathetic to the people of Nipigon who are unemployed because of the mill's closing. I am pleased with the action that the Minister of Lands and Forests has offered, and if I can be of help, I offer my services in any manner that will help in getting Norply re-opened.

But, Mr. Speaker, contrary to the remarks made by the members for Thunder Bay and York South, there are still existing contracts with Great Lakes Paper Company, Domtar, Abitibi Paper Company, as well as several small contractors in Nipigon and Red Rock, who have wood cut and waiting to be delivered, and contracts that are valid for years to come. I have here a letter from the president of Norply which admits that it was mismanagement and under-finance that caused the collapse, not a shortage of wood or supply of wood. I would submit, sir, that yesterday's remarks by the member for York South were completely irresponsible and unjustified.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): Mr. Speaker, hon. members, I would like to begin by thanking the Premier (Mr. Robarts) for my promotion. After all, were it not for his actions I would be still working in the morgue at Lombard Street. The surroundings here are much more pleasant, although I must confess that on a number of occasions in the last few weeks, sir, when I have looked at the government front benches I have had the distinct startling feeling that I was back at Lombard Street. For this reason, I welcome interjections from the back seats because they must have something to do; there is so very little for the back-benchers on the Conservative side to do.

The six issues which I intend to press in this session of the Legislature are, in order of importance: air pollution, housing, taxes, the workmen's compensation board, automobile insurance, and health insurance. However, as this is my maiden speech and maiden speeches usually are brief and non-controversial, I shall just touch briefly on these matters, leaving a fuller discussion for the various departmental estimates. Instead, today I will discuss less important matters on which we can all in this House agree. I am sure there will be no dissension on any of the matters that I bring up today.

To start, I would like to explore a subject which this House has discussed on a previous occasion but without all the facts which I have available today. I am referring to the Canadian Oil-Shell Oil scandal, and I would like to provide some additional information to the members so that they will finally know exactly what happened and will learn how some people can commit grand larceny, forgery and contempt of court without paying any penalty in this province.

To set the stage, I would like to read an editorial from the Toronto *Telegram* of September 21, 1963, because this sets out the situation as it was at that time. The heading is:

THE LETTER

Premier Robarts has responded promptly and correctly to the mystery of the Bay Street letter. He has ordered a full investigation by The Attorney General's Department into the predated letter from the president of Shell Investments Limited, V. F. Grafstrom, purporting to authorize G. H. Rennie and Company Limited to buy shares of Canadian Oil on behalf of Shell.

What is known about it, is the letter was misdated and was written after, not before, Shell announced its takeover bid last September 25. But the Toronto stock exchange knew the letter was falsely dated when it investigated Rennie's activities in Canadian Oil stocks and fined and suspended the Rennie firm, and that the Rennie firm did not buy Canadian Oil shares on behalf of Shell before the takeover announcement.

The Shell-Canadian merger was investigated by the Ontario securities commission after rumours that insiders made huge profits, by buying Canadian Oil stocks at relatively low market prices before the announcement of the takeover bid, and re-selling them to Shell at $55 a share.

There are several unanswered questions. How did the letter escape the scrutiny of the Ontario securities commission in its investigation of the merger? How and where did the director of Rennie, a relatively small firm, get $3 million to invest in Canadian Oil shares before the merger was announced? What was the source of heavy foreign investment in Canadian Oil

shares before the takeover bid? What indeed is the significance of the mystery Bay Street letter?

Liberal leader John Wintermeyer has been quick to try to reap political hay from what has been learned so far about the letter. He has called the investigation of the merger by the Ontario securities commission, a quasi-judicial body, a Tory whitewash.

Mr. Robarts, as he has so often done in the past, takes the responsible line: "Let us get the facts. The facts are more important than anyone's political advantage."

Well, Mr. Speaker, today I am delighted to present the facts to the hon. Prime Minister.

I am going to beg by reading from a letter sent to Mr. J. R. Kimber, vice-chairman of the securities commission by Mr. H. S. Bray, counsel who was in charge of directing the investigation done by one Mr. W. A. MacDonald—let me stress that this is not our Mr. MacDonald, this is your Mr. MacDonald—into the takeover of Canadian Oil by Shell Oil. I have a number of documents here. I am only going to read the pertinent part but if there is any member who would like to have any of these documents read in full I would be delighted to do so—if he would let me know, and I am directing myself particularly to the member for London South (Mr. White).

Paragraph 4 of this particular letter from Mr. Bray to Mr. Kimber reads as follows:

> The most serious individual matter is that set out on page 19 of the report where Wookey and Grafstrom admit that a forged letter on the letterhead of Shell Investments dated September 11, 1962, in which Shell purports to guarantee Wookey against loss, was produced for the purpose of deceiving the board of governors of the Toronto stock exchange. I use the word "forgery" in the strict sense set out in the criminal code. On the evidence, it is a "false document" within the meaning of section 268(c), the document not being made on September 11, and the guarantee not being authorized by Shell Investments in the language of section 309(1)(b). It was produced for the Toronto stock exchange as a defence to the charge that Rennie and Company were deficient in capital, obviously with intent that some person (the Toronto stock exchange) should be induced, by belief that it was genuine, to refrain from taking action against Rennie and Company's membership in the exchange. That Wookey did not succeed in the attempt is not really material. I wish to point out the deliberate and designed nature of the forgery.
>
> Respectfully submitted,
> H. S. Bray, Q.C., Counsel.

It struck me as odd that instead of laying criminal charges against these thieves—who had not only committed a forgery but also were known by the Toronto stock exchange and the Ontario government to have stolen some millions of dollars from their partners—I will be glad to give details of that later on—instead, Wookey and his associate, Anderson, were thereupon granted a new registration by the Ontario securities commission as partners with J. C. Allen Limited to once again deal with the public. Today I would like to explore this mystery and perhaps find some explanation as to how our good Conservative government ticks.

Incidentally, after Mr. Bray's letter was sent to Mr. Kimber and after Mr. Kimber then sent a most interesting letter to the Attorney General (Mr. Wishart), which I will read this afternoon, the Attorney General was quoted:

> The suggestion that there were some unusual circumstances about the takeover of Canadian Oil Companies by Shell are based on unfounded rumours, suspicions and inferences.

He also said that the Ontario securities commission probe was, and I quote, "most thorough" and that it revealed no evidence of insider profits. At first I thought that a portion of the mystery could be dispelled by reading from this very interesting letter between Mr. Grafstrom, president of Shell Oil, and Mr. Wookey, the broker at Rennie and Company referred to by Mr. Bray. This letter is on the stationery of Mr. V. F. Grafstrom, 505 University Avenue, Toronto, Ontario, dated March 5, 1961, and it is addressed to Mr. I. R. Wookey, Suite 412, 67 Yonge Street, Toronto, Ontario. I quote from the letter:

> Dear Dick:
>
> Attached is a copy of my letter of today's date to Lloyd Fogler enclosing a memorandum setting forth a proposed corporate structure for the Broadway-Erskine project along the lines of our discussion yesterday. I appreciate that you may have some comments but felt it best anyhow to send the matter directly to Fogler in the interests of speed. Of the additional 3,000 units to be issued, it was our thought that they be divided as follows:

Pirini Personnel, 1,500; Binch, 500; Rountree, 400; Carswell, 400; Cameron, 200.

Sincerely,
Verne.

Who are these people? Perini was the contractor that was building the project. Binch was the lawyer for the Royal Bank who arranged the loan from the Royal Bank to Wookey's company and who, incidentally, was later given another present of 1,000 Shell warrants at half their market price; Carswell is an engineer who was associated closely with the project; Cameron was Wookey's office manager. Rountree is the only name on the list that we have not been able to trace. And let me say right now, how relieved I was to hear the statement of our Minister the other day that he has never met Mr. Wookey or Mr. Grafstrom and he has never had any business dealings with them. I am very relieved for the reason that the partner of Mr. Wookey and Mr. Grafstrom who gave me this particular letter was under the strange misapprehension that the Rountree in the letter was our Mr. Rowntree. But the hon. Minister has said it is not and I am sure he would not mislead the House so we will go on from there.

To refresh your memories in the Canadian Oil-Shell Oil scandal, Canadian Oil was the last integrated independent Canadian oil company. On September 25, 1962, the Shell Oil Company made an offer of approximately $55 per share and bought out Canadian Oil. They actually offered a little bit more but it was approximately that amount. Before the offer was made public, Mr. I. R. Wookey was informed by his close friend and business partner, V. F. Grafstrom, then president of Shell Oil, of the forthcoming offer and he proceeded to buy up thousands of shares of stock of Canadian Oil.

Because Wookey and Grafstrom did not have enough money, some millions of dollars worth of stock were purchased using the credit of Rennie and Company, where Wookey was a partner. This was done with the active co-operation of the president of Rennie, Mr. Philip Anderson, but without bothering to let the other partners know. He did not want to disturb them with these little matters. After the profits had been made—they were only $5 million—they were channeled into the private accounts of Anderson and Wookey so that although the Rennie firm in effect did the financing and took the risks, it had the profits stolen from it.

It is a very interesting mystery that although the Ontario securities commission were given full details of this theft, no charges were laid. Perhaps this was because the amount involved was $5 million. In Ontario, under this government, theft of a newspaper is a serious offence; proven theft of millions is ignored, or perhaps they get six weeks in jail, if the government is forced to take some action.

Due to digging by the press, word of this massive swindle leaked out and the government was forced to have an investigation. Following Conservative routine, they appointed a suitable gentleman to conduct the investigation and after its completion, the Attorney General and the Premier announced there was no evidence anything was wrong at all. Nothing wrong here. They have never released the investigation report, and with a very good reason. The findings are in such contradiction with the obvious facts that they were embarrassed to do so. For example, I will read finding five:

> The evidence does suggest that notwithstanding the profit by professionals the market activity herein must have resulted in a benefit to the shareholders of Canadian Oil.

The statement that this market activity must have resulted in a benefit to Canadian Oil shareholders is ludicrous, and just in case there is any doubt here, I will show you how ludicrous it was.

I have a letter here Mr. Nesbitt, of Nesbitt Thomson and Company, I would say probably Canada's leading broker, sent to Mr. O. E. Lennox, former head of the Ontario securities commission, which makes this perfectly clear. This letter is dated October 16, 1962, and let me again inform you I am quoting the pertinent part; the full letter is here if anyone wishes it read in full. It reads as follows:

Dear Mr. Lennox:

A number of clients of Nesbitt Thomson and Company Limited sold shares of Canadian Oil Company Limited on Monday and Tuesday, September 24 and 25. Some of these clients are bitter toward our firm because we did not advise them to retain shares in the light of the Shell Oil bid which was publicly announced on Tuesday night, September 25. It has also been brought to my attention that there have been suggestions that insiders made a great profit in this transaction and that a full investigation would be in the public interest. The purpose of this letter is to advise you that Nesbitt Thomson and Company would welcome a full investiga-

tion and would co-operate in every way in this connection.

Yours sincerely,
A. D. Nesbitt.

The commissioner had this letter, yet he brought in finding five, no harm done to the shareholders. Finding two reads:

> The evidence does not establish that Wookey and Anderson acted on inside information to purchase Canadian Oil shares.

We will go into that in detail today. How did the government succeed in getting such a whitewash, phony report on this scandal? This is a question which is of particular interest to me for a number of reasons. The investigator, if I may use the term reasonably loosely, did not even follow the usual Conservative commission routine and go through the motions of a complete investigation. His primary function should have been to determine what Grafstrom had told Wookey about the forthcoming offer. And yet he did not even bother to interview Mrs. Agnes Doherty, who was the switchboard operator at G. H. Rennie and Company. Mrs. Doherty knew the details of the whole swindle, for she had listened in on Mr. Wookey's conversations with Grafstrom.

It is hard to believe that the government was not aware of Mrs. Doherty's knowledge, for the Toronto city police had received the full details. Incidentally, they received the full details in a most interesting way and I am going to digress for a moment, because it is quite fascinating.

In the middle of this great financial confusion, Mr. Wookey who, I must say, has the reputation of being a very bright gentleman, arrived at police headquarters with a typed letter of extortion, purportedly from Mrs. Doherty. Personally I do not believe it was from Mrs. Doherty. It said unless she received certain consideration she was going to spill the beans. In any case, regardless whom the letter was from, Mr. Wookey took this down to police headquarters and a very strange series of events followed.

Mrs. Doherty was visited by the police—sorry, Mrs. Doherty was called to the police station and was interviewed by senior officers. Mr. Doherty was visited at his place of work by two detectives and was told to tell his wife not to bother Mr. Wookey any more, yet no charges were laid in this supposed case of extortion. I believe the reason was the police were not convinced either, because when Mrs. Doherty was called in she denied ever having seen the letter before. She admitted she had listened in to conversations, but denied having had any thought of blackmail or extortion and she subsequently denied it to her husband, and to her sister and to everyone who was close to her.

I am convinced personally that she did not send that letter. She became so upset by this interview with the police and by subsequent pressures that she attempted to commit suicide shortly after this occurred. She went into a depression from which she never really did recover and subsequently one year later she made a second attempt at suicide, which was, unfortunately, successful However, I did interview her husband last week.

Now let us come back to the commissioner who did this very thorough investigation for, if I may quote the last speaker, the Robarts government. Apparently he had not really enjoyed his work at the securities commission for some time. He had one real desire and that was to be a Crown attorney. The senior officials at the securities commission, including Mr. Harry Bray, requested the Attorney General to keep Mr. MacDonald at the securities commission because of the difficulty of maintaining a trained legal staff. But the Attorney General said that MacDonald had done a great job on Canadian Oil and on May 1, 1963, he was appointed Crown attorney for Parry Sound, a suitable reward for a job well done. Premier Robarts was quoted as saying that he was satisfied that the investigation was, and I quote, "complete and thorough."

The government later, however, did get into a little difficult position with MacDonald's report because they knew it was inaccurate, inasmuch as the Attorney General received a letter informing him of certain evidence available from Rennie employees. This letter is dated November 24, 1964. It is addressed to the Attorney General, Parliament Buildings, Queen's Park. I will read it:

> Dear Sir:
>
> Further to our previous correspondence it has come to the writer's attention that some evidence is available which the writer believes is within the scope of your investigation. The writer has interviewed two witnesses, both of whom would be willing and able to testify under oath that at the time of the Shell-Canadian Oil takeover and of the investigation thereof by the Toronto stock exchange that there was active collusion between the investigator for the stock exchange and the management

> of G. H. Rennie and Company Limited in this transaction and that the same was well known to Mr. I. R. Wookey and other officers of the company. Further information about these witnesses and their testimony is available at your request.

Now both of the witnesses referred to were employees of G. H. Rennie and Company at the time of the takeover and I have sworn affidavits from both referring to the matters in this letter.

What did the Attorney General do when he got this letter? Why, he did not do anything. He just hoped the scandal would not become public and he was quite successful up until today.

Incidentally, I have been informed by another former Rennie employee and a partner that when the Toronto stock exchange sent an investigator, a certain Mr. Lavender, to examine the books, Mrs. Joyce Kennedy, the ledger typist was set to work typing new ledgers which were passed across to Mr. Lavender as fast as they could be typed. Mr. Lavender, of course, never saw the real ledgers.

During this same period, there was a court injunction in force preventing the transfer of any securities, and perhaps I should explain that. The partners, or at least two of them, two of Mr. Rennie's and Anderson's partners, discovered that they had been swindled. So they began civil proceedings to get some of their money and the civil court gave an injunction preventing the transfer of any Canadian Oil warrants while this injunction was in force.

During the period of this court injunction, some 25,000 Canadian Oil warrants were transferred in direct contempt of court. I have a sworn affidavit from a Rennie employee, who worked in that department at that time, to substantiate this, and I would be glad to have a copy made available to the Premier, whom I have embarrassed. I see that he has just left us, but if he comes back I will be glad to send a copy across to him.

Let us now look at the principals in the case, for certainly this entire scandal had its origins in the relationship between Shell Oil executive Grafstrom, and stockbroker Wookey. Wookey and Grafstrom met in the late 1950s around the time that Dick Wookey moved into a grand new home on Steeles Avenue, just west of Bayview. About a quarter of a mile way behind a long private lane was the richly unobtrusive home of Vern Grafstrom.

In this Thornhill area, where most houses sit on broad expanses of property, it is fair to say that the two men were neighbours. They became fast friends and shortly embarked on several business ventures together. On the surface they made an unlikely alliance; Wookey was then only 28, Grafstrom was 44. Grafstrom had an extensive formal education, graduating in law from the University of Minnesota.

Wookey finished school in his teens and became a clerk with a firm of shipping agents. Grafstrom was 35 before he started his career with the vast international Shell group of companies. At 34, Wookey had already won material rewards on Bay Street that veteran stockbrokers still envy. In the investment community, Wookey is often referred to, and I may say not derisively, as the "Turk." This is not because he was born in Izmir, Turkey, but more because of his skill in the market place. He is an acknowledged expert in the market place and probably one of the most skilled that our country possesses.

At 23, two years after coming to Canada, Wookey was registered as a customer's man with Bache and Co. In 1959, he became a shareholder and director of G. H. Rennie and Co.—and let me say that both companies were fine, reputable firms, and if Mr. Wookey had not come to Rennie and Co., I am sure they would still be in business. Bache of course is still an international firm that has had no difficulty whatsoever. While with Rennie and Co., Wookey and Grafstrom began to invest in earnest together. Among the private companies in which they had interests, were Apogee Investments, Grandwood Investments, and a Nassau company, Providence Investments. One of their companies, Seniority Investments, developed and built the impressive apartment at 100 Roehampton Avenue in the Eglinton-Yonge district.

I find the Nassau company especially interesting because it is amazing how many lines lead to Nassau when we go through the various cases involving this department. Wookey also took a whirl with Grafstrom in a marble tile company and a shoeshine company. They had varied interests; they did not really care what they did as long as it made money. The closeness of their relationship can be shown by these telegrams which I have here. I have a number of telegrams, but I will read two of them to indicate to the members just how close they were.

From Mr. Grafstrom, Toronto, to Mr. Wookey, Nassau Beach Lodge, Nassau, Bahamas, January 15, 1960:

> Vernon has airmailed today certificate requiring your signature for increase Apogee's capital to $400,000. Please sign and return airmail urgently. Hope the sun is hot and the water warm.

Here is the answer from Mr. Wookey to Grafstrom:

> I hereby authorize you to sign all instruments as my attorney in fact in connection with increase in capital of Apogee Investments Limited to maximum $400,000.

There is no question that these two gentlemen were closely related both as friends and as business partners. The reason that I am setting this out in such detail is that Mr. MacDonald decided in his summary in the findings that he made of the investigation, that Wookey was not told anything by Grafstrom, about this takeover.

Well, was Canadian Oil the first time that these gentlemen took advantage of their position? No gentlemen, it was not. There had been at least one previous instance in 1960, when Shell Oil took over North Star Oil at $34.25 per share. By some coincidence the day before the company was trading at only $20 per share. So if someone had known in advance, they might have been able to make a little money. Well, by some strange coincidence, Wookey bought up, and I do not know the exact sum, but somewhere up to $1 million worth of North Star stock prior to public announcement. He also purchased an unknown quantity of Cree warrants before the public was made aware that Shell intended to purchase all this security. He made at least $300,000 in this transaction.

I have a sworn affidavit on this matter, which I will now quote from. It is signed by Mr. George Warn, clerk of G. H. Rennie and Co., of 141 Northlands Avenue, in charge of the securities cage. I quote:

> I also clearly remember when the Shell Oil were taking over North Star that I. R. Wookey through the G. H. Rennie and Co. purchased North Star stock which I personally delivered to the Montreal Trust Company and received a cheque for over $1 million. This North Star transaction was similar in timing to the Canadian Oil-Shell Oil takeover.

In this affidavit there are also a number of interesting facts in relation to the Canadian Oil-Shell Oil takeover, and I would be glad to make a photostat available to the Premier, if he returns, to assist him in cleaning his house.

Now let us go on to a little matter of forgery. After the Toronto stock exchange began to investigate the Canadian Oil swindle, they quickly found that, because of the huge purchases of Canadian Oil, G. H. Rennie and Co. had fallen far below the required cash reserve, and in fact they had bought huge amounts of stock with no money to pay for it at all. If for some reason, the deal had fallen through and been prevented from consummation, G. H. Rennie's partners and customers would have suffered losses of millions of dollars.

The way that they were to able to buy this—they bought $18 million of stock without having any money for it—was as follows: They made a deal with the bank, and somehow managed to persuade the manager that they were reasonably certain that this deal was sure to come through, and he agreed to loan them $18 million. However, perhaps they have honest faces; I understand that they do. In any case if in some way the deal had been prevented, G. H. Rennie and Co. partners and customers would have lost millions of dollars.

Suppose for example the Canadian government had stepped in and said; This is our last integrated Canadian oil company, and we are not going to allow the company to be taken over. Actually the president of Canadian Oil, Mr. Rea had made a public appeal; he said, "This is the last Canadian company, let us save it." Suppose that we had had a more responsible government, an NDP government, and suppose they had stepped in and not let the deal go through, then what would have happened? If the provincial, or even better the federal government had stepped in and stopped this company going to the United States, if they had done this, the partners and innocent customers of Rennie and Co., who knew nothing of this would have lost a fortune. The stock was at $48 and it would have gone right back to $25 or $26—they would have lost perhaps $5 million or $10 million, and we would have had another Prudential scandal. The Premier would have said, "Well, after all, it is the public's fault; if they want to invest, they want to take chances, they have to run the risks."

At this point, in the scandal, the exchange was aware that there was something going on, and Mr. Wookey had a bit of a problem. But he solved the problem, he is a very clever man. He came to the stock exchange and he presented to them a letter from Mr. Grafstrom, dated September 11, 1962, which

guaranteed, over the Shell signature, Rennie and Co. from any loss in Canadian Oil. And really, as Mr. Wookey pointed out at the time, there was nothing to worry about, Shell Oil was promising that if anything went wrong they would buy the stock, anyway, so the partners were not running any risk. The only people who were running the risk were Shell Oil Co. The only thing that was wrong was that the letter was a forgery. The letter had actually been written in October, after the whole thing was over. It was prepared in order to deceive the Toronto stock exchange.

However, something went wrong. Shortly after he gave the exchange the letter, Wookey realized the mistake he had made and the terrible implication of the letter in that he had proved that he had advance knowledge of Shell's offer, which he was swearing up and down that he had known nothing about, he had just bought the stock by coincidence. He suddenly realized he had got himself into a trap, and under these circumstances he found it easier to admit the forgery rather than the swindle, so he admitted it; he said, "It is not true, the letter was prepared later." He admitted it was a forgery. The government certainly knew the letter was a forgery. In a statement released September 20, 1963, the present hon. Speaker of this House, Mr. Fred Cass, described the letter as, and I quote, "a spurious document, written, designed and calculated to deceive the Toronto stock exchange."

No charges were laid, however, despite a very interesting letter which was sent by Mr. Kimber to the Attorney General. It was kind of The Attorney General's Department to assist me with preparing all these materials as these letters were in its files. I hope the employee who did assist me got permission. It is dated March 8, 1963, and addressed to the Attorney General, and it is signed by Mr. J. R. Kimber. A portion of the letter reads as follows:

> If it was your view that the penalty imposed by the Toronto stock exchange was not sufficient in this matter, some thought might be given to the aspect of the matter set out on page 19 of the report where Wookey and Grafstrom used a fictitious letter to justify their position before the exchange. It may be that the use of such a letter is in fact a forgery and could be subject to criminal proceedings.

As you can see, Mr. Kimber has watered down Mr. Bray's letter a little bit but he still has it in there: "It may be that the use of such a letter is in fact a forgery and could be subject to criminal proceedings." However, he does begin the letter by saying, "If it was your view that the penalty imposed by the exchange was not sufficient."

Well, the Attorney General thought the penalty was sufficient. And what was the penalty? The penalty was a $15,000 fine to cover a $5 million theft, plus a breach of trust. And they did not even assess the fine against the people who had stolen the money. The fine was not assessed against the culprits, it was assessed against Rennie and Co., including all its innocent and its already-robbed partners. Is this justice? They stole $5 million, therefore we will fine someone else.

Incidentally, later on, one of the robbed partners, Mr. Phillip Archer Shea, sued Mr. Wookey and Mr. Anderson in Montreal, where Mr. Archer Shea was living. He won a $100,000 judgment, and of course he was suing for his portion of the money that had been made in this little swindle, and which was stolen out of Rennie and Co. He won a $100,000 judgment when Wookey and Anderson did not appear in court to fight the case. But he now must sue again in Ontario in order to collect his judgment.

Well, Mr. Wookey is aware that Mr. Shea is short of funds, and just a few weeks ago, actually on December 14, 1967, Mr. Wookey sent a letter to several of his former partners, in which he said, and I quote Mr. Wookey:

> I have received information which indicates that Mr. Archer Shea was promised financial assistance by certain individuals in respect of the proceedings he launched against us. If this is so, it is no concern of mine, and if anyone cares to back Mr. Archer Shea in this litigation, that is *his business*—

His business is underlined. This is Mr. Wookey's underline by the way.

> However, I intend to make it *my business* [underlined] to find out when Archer Shea has to give evidence under oath in our Ontario court, whether any such individual has an arrangement with Mr. Archer Shea to share the spoils in return for such financial backing. My lawyers tell me that any such arrangement would be liable in damages.

It is an unusual case, indeed, in which the law is used only to protect the guilty.

There was another rather strange occurrence in this case involving our present

Attorney General. The Attorney General held another investigation into one of Wookey and Grafstrom's companies, a company called Seniority Investments, following a complaint from one of their former partners. Perhaps we should not be surprised if the Attorney General found nothing wrong, and I do not wish to digress off into this side matter which is not directly related to the Canadian Oil case. But there is one very curious postscript to the Seniority case. The partner wrote The Attorney General's Department on December 11, 1964, as follows, and I quote:

> You will recall that the writer testified in an investigation into the affairs of Seniority Investments Limited and various other companies at 145 Queen Street West, on January 30, February 3, and February 4, 1964. This is to request a transcript of the writer's testimony on those days. The writer would be pleased to receive this transcript, and your statement of account for the same at your earliest convenience.

Now, let me stress, he was asking only for his own evidence, not the transcript of all the evidence; he was asking for his own evidence, which, of course, he was prepared to pay for.

He received this rather strange reply, signed by the Attorney General, dated December 28, 1964:

> I have considered with the chairman of the Ontario securities commission your request to Mr. Callahan of December 11. This investigation has been completed and I have received the report of the investigators. As I have advised you on an earlier occasion, no further action is necessary by this department, and since this is the case, I do not feel that I can accede to your request for the disclosure of your evidence.
>
> Yours faithfully,
> Arthur Wishart.

This does seem odd. Perhaps the answer to the Minister's strange refusal to release this sworn evidence lies in another letter which I have here. This is also addressed to the Attorney General. It is dated August 24, 1964. I will quote from the letter:

> The parties named in the subpoena to the investigation included G. H. Rennie and Company, I. R. Wookey, and V. F. Grafstrom, as well as others. In my testimony, I have evidence which, if followed up by your department, would prove conclusively that there were illegalities in the takeover of Canadian Oil Company by Shell Oil and in the business practices of Rennie, Wookey and Grafstrom.
>
> I am moved to conclude, but do not like to think, that the apparent inaction of your department is the result of political expediency, or protection of the member of the Legislature to whom my testimony referred.

Well, I would like to ask the government, who is the member of the government referred to? And why would they not release the evidence?

Now all good mysteries should end with a teaser. And so shall this one. Granville Patrick Harcourt Vernon is a reputable lawyer, and his address is 57 Glengowan Road. His office is at 330 University Avenue. This man—and let me stress that he is a reputable lawyer, and I am not suggesting any wrongdoing on his part whatsoever—was a director of Continental Marble, one of Grafstrom and Wookey's companies. On September 25, 1962, the Canadian Oil story broke; the next day Mr. Vernon resigned from the Grafstrom-Wookey company. Why? Mr. MacDonald did not bother to ask.

It seemed to me, the juxtaposition of dates might have some connection, so I wrote a letter to Mr. Vernon and asked him, and unfortunately he did not reply to me. Of course, I have no way of compelling him to answer, as Mr. MacDonald did, but the situation in this case is perfectly clear. The government, for certain unknown reasons, at which we can only guess, has failed to lay proper charges in the case of forgery and other criminal acts. If it still refuses to lay the proper charges, it cannot expect the support of any honest man.

Now it is interesting how one piece of skulduggery leads to another. The name Granville Patrick Harcourt Vernon is a rather unusual one, and I could not help noticing it. One of my hobbies is going through old papers as you have discovered—which has got me and other people in all sorts of trouble—and one of my hobbies is going through lists of shareholders. You find the most interesting information by going through such lists. And going through a list of shareholders, I could not help noticing the name Granville Patrick Harcourt Vernon as one of the founding shareholders of Northern Ontario Natural Gas Company. Well, just intrigued by this, I thought that this company perhaps deserved a little more attention than it has received in the past and, although I know the Northern Ontario Natural Gas problems have been discussed in the Legislature before, once again I would like to add one or two little facts which the members have not previously known.

These enlarged photographs, gentlemen, are recent pictures of one Ralph K. Farris. Mr. Farris was sentenced on April 24, 1964, to nine months definite and three months indefiinite for perjury in connection with Northern Ontario Natural Gas. On September 4, 1964, the present Attorney General said further charges against Mr. Farris would not be proceeded with as long as Mr. Farris was in his then serious state of health.

On January 28, 1965, Farris lost his court appeal and went to jail. After five months spent in the hospital part of the jail, he was released because "he was dying of cancer", and for that reason the other charges were not proceeded with. You may recall the court cases were used as an excuse by this government to suppress all discussion at the time in the Northern Ontario Natural Gas scandal. Being particularly dubious about anything the Attorney General says, last month I arranged for an investigation to see whether Farris really had been dying of cancer. I quote from the Vancouver detective's report:

> Farris was released on parole due to medical reason. However, it was his brother who was dying and did die late in 1966 of cancer.

Mr. Farris made a magic recovery on the day of his discharge from prison, and he has been active in business since that time. I am not particularly interested in dragging him back here to face the charges, but I am interested in how he was able to avoid justice through his connections with the Conservative Party. I am curious as to whether the Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond), or perhaps the Minister of Reform Institutions (Mr. Grossman), or more likely the Attorney General decided he was dying and should be excused.

The Northern Ontario Natural Gas report is a fascinating one, and I hope you have all read it. I find it interesting that it took the Attorney General so many years before he finally produced it for the Legislature. Actually, the explanation is a very simple one—the government has had so many embarrassing reports that it just forgot about this one. Then, last month I wrote the Attorney General asking him about the date of release of the Northern Ontario Natural Gas report and so he finally produced it here for this Legislature. The report is a very interesting document. Perhaps the government will recall they lost three Cabinet Ministers at the commencement of its preparation. Shall we try for one more?

While I am on the subject of finance, let us look at another example of corporate theft; this time, by some of our very best citizens. They broke one Ontario law in the process. I am sorry the Provincial Secretary (Mr. Welch) is not here. The Provincial Secretary rose in the House a few days ago and said he did not think it would be in the public interest to prosecute these men and I wondered at the time if he had confused the public interest with that of the Conservative Party. The details are rather interesting.

The situation is a very simple one, gentlemen. There are some thousands of companies in this province in which the directors hold a large proportion but not all of the issued shares. The minority shareholders have a right to expect that the company treasury will be managed for the benefit of the company and all of its shareholders and not used as a private hoard to benefit only the directors or other companies which they control. As one assurance towards this end, The Corporations Act, section 306, which is the one I quoted the other day, reads as follows:

> A corporation shall hold an annual meeting of its shareholders or members not later than 18 months after its incorporation and subsequently not more than 15 months after the holding of the last preceding annual meeting.

And, of course, the purpose of this is that at the annual meeting the directors must tell what they have done with company money and they can be called upon to account for their actions. As an example of how flagrantly this law can be flouted, I would now like to tell you the details of the Peller Brewing Company. There are many others.

Apparently the Provincial Secretary did not even bother to contact Peller's during the many years in which Mr. W. E. Drewry, secretary of both Peller's and of Canadian Breweries, annually sent a return to the Provincial Secretary in which he quite openly stated that annual meetings had not been held since 1954. He was breaking the law but here is one more Minister who does not take his responsibilities too seriously.

Peller Brewing Company, incidentally, does not make beer. Until 1954 it was a fine, small Ontario brewery. In that year, Mr. E. P. Taylor and his Canadian Breweries bought control of the company and purchased most of the stock. Several hundreds of shares, however, remained in the hands of the public. Mr. Taylor, to show us how the free enterprise system works in this province, immediately closed this successful brewery because he believes that competition is wasteful. Incidentally, it is amusing to see how

zealously our Provincial Secretary protected Mr. Taylor's name the other day and insisted that he was not on the board of directors of Peller's. Well the facts are perfectly clear.

Edward Plunkett Taylor for over 12 years was in control of Peller's and for 12 years the Provincial Secretary knew that annual meetings were not being held, and for 12 years the public shareholders were systematically robbed. I must say in some sorrow that Taylor and his crew did not even use the finesse shown by Wookey or Grafstrom or Farris. These gentlemen at least attempted to conceal their machinations.

No, ladies and gentlemen, the directors of Peller's, and these are the same men who direct Canadian Breweries—

Mr. Speaker: Order please! I would ask the member respectfully to refrain from referring to the members as ladies and gentlemen and to direct his remarks to the chair, if he would.

Mr. Shulman: Yes, I would be delighted. You are quite right, perhaps they are the wrong words.

Mr. Speaker, the directors of Peller's, and these were the same men who direct Canadian Breweries, just took the money—the sum was $1,248,961—and transferred it into another company which they controlled. I wrote them about this last month and wanted to know what had happened. They said it was a loan, a $1 million loan for over 13 years. I asked them what interest rate was being paid. They said, "Oh well, no interest is being paid." They did not feel that Peller needed money so they did not feel it necessary to pay interest.

I want to point out that that $1,248,961 invested conservatively in government guaranteed bonds would have earned almost a million dollars in interest during this time. Properly invested, if they had sought proper advice, I am quite sure it would have earned many times that figure. But they took that money. They say it was loaned. They never paid a cent of interest in all that time.

I do not know what the Provincial Secretary would call this but I call it corporate theft. What is most upsetting is that this government refuses to prosecute these men even though they know they are breaking the law. The Provincial Secretary says it is not in the public interest. What a strange view he has of the public interest.

Now let me turn my attention to a lighter subject, our Minister of Health. The Minister is not now in his seat, we seem to be losing them all, one at a time. I shall begin by reading a letter sent out by his department to all Ontario doctors on October 6, 1967. This is on the stationery of The Ontario Department of Health, medical services insurance division, 135 St. Clair Avenue West, Toronto 7, Ontario. It is dated October 6, 1967. It reads:

> To all doctors, especially their secretaries. The enclosed OMSIP handbook has been specially prepared to help you. It should enable you to quickly find the answers to your questions about OMSIP either for yourself or your patients. Pages 28 and 32 are lined for special memorandums such as your bookmaker's phone number.
>
> Sincerely,
> Dr. J. S. W. Aldis,
> Executive Director.

Well, I was a little puzzled when I received this letter myself. In the light of this official sanction of bookmaking are we to understand that the Minister of Health is giving us a preview of a change in the Ontario law re off-the-track betting or, more likely, is he merely confirming our opinion that the present Attorney General is not sufficiently competent to control that aspect of law breaking? I am sorry the Minister is not here so he can enlighten us as to what is the—

Mr. Speaker: I do not like to interrupt the member but he is not using the proper terminology here. We refer to all members as hon. members, and the Ministers of the Crown as the hon. Minister. If you please.

Mr. Shulman: I would be delighted.

Hon. S. J. Randall (Minister of Economics and Development): Just send your money and see what happens.

Mr. Shulman: In any case, perhaps it was a little unkind of the hon. Minister to state his views in an official document which was to be read in this House.

It is a sorry fact that in this province the hon. Minister of Health is responsible for air pollution control. I note with interest that he has followed good Conservative doctrine in connection with the Dunnville disaster by setting up a Royal commission to stall off or subvert the moment of truth.

Perhaps at this time we should re-read the hon. Minister's own words on the subject of a commission to look into the problem of air pollution. I quote from the hon. Minister's speech of March 27, 1962:

> On the matter of commissions I have no hesitation in saying nor am I the least bit ashamed to stand up in this House and state my policy or my belief unequivocally that I am opposed to government by commission. We have too many commissions governing this province of Ontario now and I hope that every hon. member on every side of this House will recognize the fact that, if are to preserve what we believe in as democracy, we will do everything we can to abolish commissions rather than establish new ones. I do not think we need a commission and even if a select committee of this House recommended it, I still say to you that I do not think we need a commission to do this job.

I do not suppose we should be too surprised to see a little flip-flopping on the hon. less-responsible side of this House.

It is interesting to see how well the hon. Minister of Health looks after his own department. Two weeks ago in this House I asked the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. MacNaughton) if officials of The Department of Health had ordered the civil service investigators off the grounds of the Whitby Ontario Hospital during the course of an investigation.

It was a little difficult to get an answer out of the hon. Minister. We had to do a little prodding. He did not want quite to answer that, but finally he did, rather reluctantly, admit the facts and the hon. Minister of Health was then quoted in the Toronto press as saying he knew absolutely nothing about the matter. I have no hesitation in believing that he told the truth. Perhaps a little more diligence in his work is called for.

Now I have a far more serious matter to discuss in connection with the hon. Minister of Health. During the last election campaign, it was drawn to my attention that The Department of Health was paying only $3 a day for maintenance of mentally ill patients in boarding homes. I made a speech about this and I rather unwisely mentioned the name of my informant, a Mrs. W. Uberlah, of Richmond Hill. Within two days of my speech, two things happened. The hon. Minister of Health announced that his department was raising the payments to $4 a day, and simultaneously Mrs. Uberlah was informed that her home was to receive no further patients.

I would like to read into the record portions of an article from *The Liberal*, the Richmond Hill paper, which well sums up the situation. Let me say by way of digression, that I am one of the few NDPers who believes that there is a difference between the Liberals and the Conservatives. I hope that they will prove me right.

Where, in affluent Ontario, are sick, elderly people swept into a corner and left with only the barest creature comforts to wait out the ends of their days? In Toronto, that is where. And in Richmond Hill.

This is a halfway house, one of the many which came into being in 1964, when the government passed an Act to relieve mental hospitals of overcrowding. In theory, the homes are intended to condition ex-mental patients for a return to the community. In actuality many of them have become dumping grounds where patients who have been ill for years, forgotten by relatives and friends, are left to sit out what remains of their lives, sunk in apathy. They just eat, sleep and sit, said Werner Uberlah, who with his wife, has operated the halfway house in Richmond Hill for the past year. Just over a year ago they began operating as a halfway house with 11 patients from the Lakeshore psychiatric hospital.

In April of this year the Uberlahs purchased the house which they had been renting for $200 a month, but which the landlord had neglected to keep in good repair. However they soon found that the $3 per day allowance which they received for the care of each patient was not sufficient to keep things going.

"I have an accountant who keeps the books," stated Mrs. Uberlah. "They show we lost $3,000 last year."

The deficiency was made up from Mr. Uberlah's income as a butcher.

Realizing the financial slide they were on, Mrs. Uberlah sought help from various authorities. At Queen's Park she was received graciously by the then York North MLA, 81-year-old Lex Mackenzie, who passed her on to someone else. And thus it went, going from person to person but getting assistance from none.

Eventually, someone suggested that she contact Dr. Morton Shulman, former Metro coroner. When she asked him for help, Mrs. Uberlah reported that Dr. Shulman was aghast that homes were expected to care for patients on $3 per day. In the midst of an election campaign for a seat in the provincial Legislature, Dr. Shulman approached Dr. D. G. Cormack, director of the province's mental hospital branch, in September, complaining about the inadequacy of the daily allowance. He also, naturally enough, referred to the matter during his campaign and on October 7 it

was announced by Dr. Cormack that the daily rate was to be increased to $4.

While a dollar increase is welcome news to the Uberlahs, as no doubt it was to others in the province, caring for the 5,000 patients now in halfway homes, they have a distinct impression that the publicity has been bad for their business. Very shortly after the story was featured in the papers, two patients were removed from the Uberlah home and have not been replaced with others. When Mrs. Uberlah complained and asked for replacements, it was suggested that she should take in boarders instead of ex-mental patients.

What to do? Mrs. Uberlah, who besides nine patients has two children of her own to care for, aged eight and ten, is just about ready for a breakdown herself.

On Mrs. Uberlah falls the entire burden of cooking, cleaning and doing the laundry for this houseful of 12 people. Not unnaturally she is thin and exhausted looking. All of Mr. Uberlah's spare time is spent on maintenance work around the house.

During the summer, Mrs. Uberlah's patients were able to go for walks about town, attend baseball games and the like, but they had no money for shows, bowling or such. Last winter, White Cross volunteers from the CMHA visited the home twice a month and took the men out for the evening, events which were much looked forward to. However, no volunteers have entered the home since last spring, and Mrs. Uberlah was advised that because of lack of volunteers, the work was being curtailed.

"I have not been to a show for 12 years," reports Mrs. Uberlah. Unless she pays someone $1.25 an hour to stay with the men, she cannot leave the house herself, even to do the shopping. She and her husband have no privacy and are unable to invite friends in. Her two children are also unable to bring playmates home and have been taunted at school with jibes that they live in a nut house.

The patients Mrs. Uberlah has now are all between 50 and 67 years of age. One has been hospitalized for 18 years and two speak no English. Last year the patients were younger men from 22 to 39, and with these she was able to converse and advise. Several eventually obtained jobs in the area and were eventually discharged.

Mrs. Uberlah feels there is little hope or expectancy that her present patients will recover. They are visited by a member of the hospital staff about every three months, but no treatment is provided. When Mrs. Uberlah reported that one patient suddenly regressed noticeably, nothing was done. "They do that," she was told.

Mr. Uberlah suggested to the authorities that a workshop should be set up for the men, and offered to supervise it. The offer was not taken up. However, such a workshop was subsequently set up at the hospital. Mr. Uberlah states that quite obviously he is subsidizing the province in caring for the patients. "They will not send them to a house unless the husband has an outside job," he points out. Maintaining the patients in hospitals costs about $15 a day.

I talked to the Uberlahs in their crowded little kitchen while Mrs. Uberlah prepared two sandwiches and a thermos of coffee for her husband to take to work with him. After he left, we sat at the kitchen table and continued our talk. As I rose to leave the kitchen clock said a quarter to 12.

"What will you give them for lunch?" I inquired.

"They will have soup," she said (a pot had been simmering on the small kitchen stove throughout our conversation), "bread and butter, an apple or other fruit and tea. Tonight they will have a big meal."

This, then, is what our affluent society holds for the old, the sick and the helpless.

Not really much of an improvement over the Indian tribes who left their aged with a blanket and pipe of tobacco, is it?

For the benefit of the Prime Minister who came in a little late, this is a quotation from the Richmond Hill paper, not my words.

On November 10, 1967, I wrote to the hon. Minister of Health requesting that he look into the problem, as I presumed that this mean form of revenge had taken place at a lower level of his department, and I hoped that he was unaware of it. Unfortunately, I was wrong. The hon. Minister of Health replied as follows:

> I have looked into this matter very thoroughly and I can assure you that there is no revenge. It has been decided now by the staff as it had been felt almost from the time that Mrs. Uberlah's home was established as an approved home, that it is not satisfactory, and that Mrs. Uberlah is not well situated for looking after such persons. I would emphasize it had nothing to do with her complaints about the per diem rate, because we have had that complaint from almost all our homes.

The week after I wrote, the hon. Minister of Health had all of the patients removed from the Uberlah home—every one. They came without notice one afternoon in a station wagon and a car, the patients were sleeping, they insisted on waking them and removing them immediately depite the fact that some of the patients objected.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): That is The Department of Health; always moving in the dead of night.

Mr. Shulman: These were the actions of a mean, petty, small mentality.

Let me stress that in the close to two years that Mrs. Uberlah's home was open, until the day I made that unfortunate speech during the campaign, there had been no problem found with her home. The day after her name appeared in the press as criticizing The Department of Health, her home became unsatisfactory. If changes were required in the home, they would have been made. But none were ever requested. They did not want changes, they wanted to give a lesson to everybody else—keep quiet or else. So what happened to Mrs. Uberlah? Of course she cannot get boarders up in Richmond Hill. She lost the home, she lost her savings. This Department of Health is unwilling to do anything for her. It is an absolute scandal.

Worse was yet to come. The owners of the boarding homes all received their extra dollar for the month of October. Then, when the election was safely past, the rate was again reduced to $3 a day, and the extra October payment was deducted from the following cheque.

Mr. Lewis: They are a very cynical group.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Are you not proud of being a Tory in that Robarts government?

Mr. Shulman: The hon. Robarts government. These actions are so irresponsible there can be only one consequence. If this government and this Premier have any sense of responsibility, it and he must demand the resignation of the Minister of Health.

Mr. MacDonald: Vicious discrimination!

Mr. Shulman: If the Minister had any sense of responsibility he would have offered it months ago.

Mr. Lewis: Years ago.

Mr. Shulman: Now I would like to turn my attention to The Department of Public Welfare and specifically to the children's aid societies.

An hon. member: Why are the Ministers not here?

Mr. Shulman: Well they all have to be here, so each will have his turn.

Mr. MacDonald: They got notice on October 17 that this was coming.

Mr. Shulman: They shall all have their turn, I assure you.

The recent publicity of the Timbrell case cast some doubts on the methods of children's aid societies despite the findings brought in by the hon. judge. The findings will be discussed by one of our other members in some detail later on, I will not go into that at the present time. The case which I wish to discuss here today is, if possible, even more serious inasmuch as it involves the sending of a healthy infant or rather infants to a backward, riot-ridden country. Perhaps, worse, the head of the responsible children's aid society then lied publicly in an effort to cover up true facts.

The situation with adoptions is that there is a tremendous shortage of bright, healthy, blue-eyed girls. I am quoting Lloyd Richardson, executive director of the Metro children's aid society—but adoptive handicapped children, that are racially mixed, emotionally disturbed, retarded, or older children, are very difficult to place. The welfare of the child must be the first consideration and if a home cannot be found here in Ontario, I am sure we will all agree that it is better to send the child to another country if a private home is available rather than place the child in an institution.

If, on the other hand, a healthy, blue-eyed baby boy and girl are sent off for some mysterious reason to an influential family in Peru, while many childless couples here in Ontario await such children, then there is something seriously wrong. It is even more serious when this act is perpetrated with the connivance of this government.

The child I am going to discuss was born to an unwed mother in the Northwest general hospital on May 17, 1963. It was an exceptionally fine white baby boy with blue eyes and there would have been no difficulty finding a home for him in Canada or in Ontario. The gentleman who handled the adoption was one W. Ward Markle, executive director of the Catholic children's aid society of Metropolitan Toronto and I have here an original letter signed by Mr. Markle. It is on

the stationery of the Catholic children's aid society of Metropolitan Toronto. It was dated December 17, 1963, and it reads as follows:

To whom it may concern:

This is to advise that Mr. and Mrs. C.P.S., 760 M Street, Lima, Peru, have our permission and approval to take under their care in Peru W.K.T., a permanent ward of this society.

(signed) W. Ward Markle.

Attached to the letter is the birth certificate of the child.

Now, prior to this adoption taking place, it had been drawn to the attention of the hon. Mitchell Sharp in Ottawa who wrote back as follows:

I have now had an opportunity to discuss with my colleague, the Secretary of State for External Affairs, the matter of the adoption of a Canadian child by Peruvian citizens.

Mr. G. Ben (Humber): With blue eyes!

Mr. Shulman: To continue:

I find that the law relating to adoptions comes within provincial jurisdiction, and The Department of External Affairs in Ottawa has no say in the matter. Their only concern when it is known that a passport is being sought for an infant in order to permit him to be adopted in another country, is to ascertain that the adoption is being handled by an agency authorized under the provincial law and that the appropriate branch of the provincial government has approved the adoption.

In the case of W.C.T., the adoption was arranged by the Catholic children's aid society of Metropolitan Toronto, and it was expressly approved by The Department of Public Welfare of the Ontario government. In the circumstances, the passport office of The Department of External Affairs had to issue the passport. I understand that it is open to the Ontario government and Legislature to adopt any measure concerning the conditions surrounding the adoption of children in Ontario by persons of another country.

I am very sorry indeed that I am unable to be more helpful. I do appreciate your concern, however, and am taking the liberty of forwarding your letter to Mr. Leonard Reilly, the provincial member for Eglinton, with the request that he take this up with The Department of Public Welfare of the Ontario government. He will, no doubt, be writing to you in the near future. If I can be of assistance at any time in matters which come under the jurisdiction of the federal government, please do not hesitate to get in touch with me.

Let me say that the hon. Mr. Sharp behaved quite properly here and within the law as it now stands.

On March 26, 1964, the hon. member for Eglinton (Mr. Reilly) then wrote as follows on the stationery of the Ontario legislative assembly, quote:

Recently I reecived a letter from the hon. Mitchell Sharp telling me about the problem of adoption of a Canadian child by a Peruvian citizen.

I have written to the Deputy Minister of Provincial Affairs asking him to look into the matter for you. You will no doubt hear from the department soon.

This was followed by a letter from Mr. James F. Band, Deputy Minister of The Department of Public Welfare, who wrote as follows:

Mr. Leonard Reilly, MPP Toronto Eglinton, has heard from the hon. Mitchell Sharp, Minister of Trade and Commerce, of your concern that Canadian children were being adopted outside the country.

You would likely be aware that on frequent occasions this department advertises children for adoption through the province in order that every effort may be made in removing parentless youngsters from institutions or foster homes to homes of their own.

In all cases, the prospective adopting home is carefully considered by the children's aid society concerned, and if it appears that the child's best interest will be served, the adoption is completed. I may say in passing that I am most appreciative of your interest in the well being of children in this province.

With best wishes.

That letter from The Department of Public Welfare is like the answers we get from the hon. Minister of Transport—lots of words, but we do not get any information and, I might say, like those from many other hon. Ministers in this House.

Despite the government having received advance warning about that adoption, the child was sent to Peru. About that nation, let me quote from *Time* November 3, 1967:

Peru seemed like a nation under siege last week. In Lima, gangs of young toughs

> roamed the streets raiding small shops and overturning tables and racks. Hundreds gathered nightly in the Plaza San Martin and staged noisy anti-government demonstrations. In Arequipa, university students threw up barricades, and fought out with police until the government finally suspended constitutional guarantees locally. In other cities and towns all over Latin America's fourth largest nation, strikes and violence threatened to flare out of control.

One fantastic aspect of this adoption was that there are thousands of starving, homeless, parentless children in Peru itself. But as the prospective adopting parents pointed out, they are not white.

Last October, the press printed some of the details of this case and interviewed Mr. Ward Markle about it. He stated that: 1. The child had been sent to Peru with the knowledge of the mother; 2. The Peruvian adopting parents were related to the child; 3. The child was ill and so could not be placed in Canada. All three statements are lies. The mother was interviewed and stated flatly that she was not informed that her child was being sent out of the country.

The parents were interviewed and they and the mother denied having any relatives in Peru, while the adopting parents in Peru were phoned and denied being related in any way to the child. The child was seen by several people at the time of adoption, when it was six months old and it was perfectly healthy. At birth it was a completely normal child with the exception of a slight shortening of one muscle in its neck, which is a very common condition. It is easily remediable and it was remedied within the first few weeks of life.

After these facts were brought to my attention, I wrote to Mr. Markle in an effort to find out if there was a logical explanation which would obviate the necessity of raising this matter publicly. In his reply, instead of giving any explanation, he said:

> We are aware of the identity of the individual who violated recognized ethical standards, and the law pertaining to interference of wards of a children's aid society. In the latter, our solicitors are currently considering legal action.

That was his explanation. It is just as though it came from the other side of the House—"we do not give explanations; if you criticize us, you must be wrong."

In this mystery, I am not so much concerned with fantasies of Ward Markle as I am with the failure of this government and this particular Minister to protect this newborn child. Goodness knows how many others have been shipped out of Canada. I say to you through the Speaker, hon. members, if you cannot carry out your duties and responsibilities make way for a government which will.

There is another serious matter which comes under this particular department, and that is the sad plight of those persons who are totally disabled and who are patients in a chronic hospital. I practiced medicine in west Toronto for 17 years and never learned this. It is amazing how people sail along in their own little lives and we do not realize what is happening within a few blocks of us. I was shocked to learn that as soon as a person receiving disabled person's allowance is admitted to a chronic hospital, such as Runnymede or Queen Elizabeth, his pension is immediately cut off and he does not even receive a comfort allowance.

Some of these poor people do not even have the few pennies necessary to purchase a newspaper or paper and pencil. In fact, in one hospital which I visited in my particular riding, if they cannot afford the money to pay for their own laundry they are forced to wear an ugly hospital gown.

Some of the cases are almost unbelievable; I am going to give you one example here. Mr. Peter Craftchick worked for the CPR from 1943 until 1966. He had an excellent work record, no absenteeism, no trouble at all. In 1966 he developed heart disease which completely crippled him, and he was forced to be confined to the Runnymede chronic hospital. The man has been informed by the CPR that as inasmuch as he worked for the company for only 23 years, he is not entitled to any pension, as there is a 25 year minimum.

The Ontario government has refused him a disabled person's allowance because he is confined to a chronic hospital. Mr. Craftchick has absolutely no income to pay for such necessities as razor blades and laundry, although the CPR has done one thing for him, I must give them credit; they have offered him a free travel pass.

This case was a flagrant example of corporate and governmental heartlessness in this affluent province. I wrote to the CPR in the hope there might be a little compassion in the president of that body. Vice-president Mr. L. R. Smith replied:

> We certainly appreciate Mr. Craftchick's position, but I am sure you realize the

necessity for the pension committee setting a requirement.

They will not give him a penny. The members on the opposite side of this House do not care to bring in a law so that people like him will not be in a horrible mess like this. This is not an outstanding example. Beside Craftchick in his ward, which contains ten or 15 beds, there are three other people who I spoke to in exactly the same horrible situation.

One was a man with disseminated sclerosis who has been in that hospital, I believe, for 17 years. He is now 35. He has been there since he was 18. He cannot walk, he cannot use his legs at all; he cannot talk and one hand is completely paralyzed. He can use two fingers of one hand with which, with help, he can use a pencil. He picked a piece of paper out of the garbage to write a note, which was brought to me by one of the nurses. It said:

> Please do something for us. One of the members of the government has been on the board of directors of this hospital for the past 15 years. We have spoken to him many times; they will not do anything. We have not got a cent, we cannot buy anything. Come Christmas time they all come round and give us a Christmas parcel; the rest of the year we are forgotten.

He went to the Minister, the Minister says they will not do anything. Well, the Minister is in the House now. I hope, Mr. Minister, that the Legislature is not quite as heartless as you have been in the past, as the CPR has been, and at least a comfort allowance will be awarded to Mr. Craftchick and the many others in his unfortunate position.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a matter of personal privilege. The hon. member in his usual manner, in a very shotgun approach, and in order to throw a lot of names into the hopper in a very indirect way and sometimes in a direct way, spoke of the case of Ralph Farris. He suggested that perhaps the Minister of Reform Institutions could make some explanation as to why Mr. Farris was paroled.

I might tell him that in his usual fashion his research only went so far as he thought it would be convenient for himself. Mr. Farris was sentenced to nine months definite, three months indeterminate. He was admitted to Guelph on February 10, 1965, and was released by the national parole board, over which we have no control here, on July 1, 1965.

Mr. Shulman: I thank the Minister. May I also point out the quotation of the hon. Attorney General, and I quote him: "No further charges will now be proceeded with as long as Mr. Farris is in his present state of health." Pass that one off—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Now we are speaking about something else.

Mr. Shulman: —to the national parole board.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: You do not even deal with your own parole board, so they would not have done otherwise.

Mr. MacDonald: The Minister is just nit-picking.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Why doesn't the member apologize?

Mr. MacDonald: Apologize? It would be much more appropriate that this government should resign.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Shulman: I hope I am not upsetting the other side.

Let us look at the Hydro and The Department of Economics and Development. This matter was touched on by the hon. member for Humber the other day, and I must say that I agree with his remarks at that time but I would like to elaborate a little further.

The hon. Minister had given approval for the Hydro to begin construction in the spring of a multi-million-dollar thermal generating plant at Nanticoke which will burn United States coal at the rate of 720 tons per hour or 60,000 tons per week. According to a Hydro spokesman, this coal contains 2 per cent sulphur and so will produce 1,200 tons of sulphur dioxide air pollution weekly, or 60,000 tons per year. The seriousness of the situation becomes apparent when one appreciates that last year the whole of Metro Toronto only produced about twice this amount of sulphur dioxide air pollution.

The plant will produce one million gallons of dioxygenated super-heated water per minute, which will be discharged into Lake Erie, and the government has already been warned by the chief of the government's fishery and wildlife branch of the effect that this water will have on the game fish spawning areas that lie in its immediate path. Long Point Bay, which will receive the warm water

from the power plant, still supports more angling than any other area of the province. Three thousand, five hundred square miles of the rest of Lake Erie is already dead because of oxygen starvation. *The Wall Street Journal* says fish will languish and die. There will be an explosive growth of slimy, green algae and the water will no longer be able to cleanse itself of sewage and similar filth.

What is so upsetting is that this Conservative-produced disaster is completely unnecessary. The heated water can be cooled by including one or more cooling towers in the new plant. The water that has been heated up in the condenser would pass through the tower where it would be exposed to cooling air before being returned to the lake, and the fishing grounds would not be destroyed. This may not matter to the Conservatives but it matters a great deal to us.

The Vermont Nuclear Power Corporation already is prepared to build such towers. Portland General Electric Company will be building such towers in Oregon to get under a temperature ceiling set in that state. These companies are aware that even one or two degrees of additional heat can upset the entire plant and animal life of a body of water.

It is rather interesting that when I made the original complaint to the head of the Hydro, that officer said it will only make a difference of a half a degree or so. What he does not realize is that half a degree is going to mean the difference between whether there are fish there or not. Starved of oxygen that has been driven out of the water by the added heat, useful bacteria cannot carry on their usual cleansing actions in breaking down human wastes and other organic matter. The polluted, warmed, low-oxygen environment then becomes ripe for rapid growth of slimy green algae. The fish's digestion and other life functions falter as the water's oxygen content dwindles. Even where fish can tolerate the warming of naturally chilly water, the change can prevent spawning and egg hatching.

It is rather interesting that the Americans on the other side of Lake Erie are showing a little more sense, a little more concern for what is happening to that lake than our government is on this side. The Air-Water Pollution report which I receive twice a week—date of the most recent one which came in today is March 4, 1968—shows what the Americans are doing from their side of the lake, as they care even if we do not. And the heading is as follows:

> POLLUTION CONCERN BRINGS DELAY IN LAKE ERIE OFFSHORE OIL DRILLING
>
> Complaint of possible additional pollution of already heavily burdened Lake Erie has brought deferment in plans of Ohio to lease some 352,000 acres in Lake Erie for oil well drilling. Natural Resources Department last week decided to hold up advertising of bids on the acreage in line with a resolution introduced in the Ohio House of Representatives. The Ohio acreage is about one-third of some 1.2 million acres in Lake Erie slated to be leased for oil drilling purposes by Ohio, New York and Pennsylvania. There has been no reported change in plans by Pennsylvania regarding its 480,000 acres, and by New York with its 380,000 acres. This would be the first leasing of United States waters in the Great Lakes for oil and gas drilling.

And it goes on explaining that they are going to do this because they are afraid that drilling might result in pollution of Lake Erie. I would suggest to the hon. Minister involved that perhaps he should show a similar concern.

There is another problem in addition to the heating and the pollution of the water. And the other problem is that sulphur dioxide —which does not seem to be of too much interest to the Conservative government— mixing with water vapour which will drift into Dunnville, will add sulphuric acid mist to the present contamination. This new air pollution will most certainly kill areas that the fluorine has damaged but has not completely destroyed. The new plant is eight miles upwind from the site of a new 200-acre provincial park at Selkirk—

Mr. J. N. Allan (Haldimand-Norfolk): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order—

Mr. Speaker: Point of order.

Mr. Allan: Mr. Speaker, I object to the words "pollution in Dunnville" being used; there was no pollution in Dunnville, has not been. He is referring to a different area altogether, and I object to him using the word Dunnville.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Shulman: When I was in Dunnville some six weeks ago, the farmers there were under the strange misapprehension—and I must accept the hon. member's word—that their land was being polluted, but if the member says their land is not being polluted, I am sure they are mistaken. There are a few

cows dying, a few crops failing, but undoubtedly this is not from pollution.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Shulman: As I was saying, Mr. Speaker, the new plant is eight miles upwind from the site of a new 200-acre provincial park at Selkirk; and about three miles upwind from the Haldimand county park. The Ontario government has spent about $100,000 building a provincial park about three miles away at Rockhouse Point, and the Ontario society for crippled children is located at Morgan's Point within convenient fall-out distance. To further aggravate the situation, there is at present no known local facility for the disposition of the fly-ash this plant will produce.

This disastrous course of events is completely unnecessary. The plant should be built using atomic power, as has been done in England, where the construction problems have all been worked out. This type of power plant equipped with cooling towers does not pollute its surroundings. To begin construction in 1968 of coal-powered hydro plants shows an absolute ignorance of the problems of pollution.

An hon. member: The Minister of Health is an expert on pollution.

Mr. Shulman: However, let us for some reason accept that this government does not wish to put up atomic power plants and the Hydro does not want atomic power plants. They have another alternative which for some reason they are completely unaware of. I would like to read a communication which I have from Union Electric Company, 315 North Twelfth Boulevard, St. Louis, Missouri, dated September 28, 1967, and it is comforting to find that there are power-producers in other parts of this continent who are a little more aware of the possibility of preventing pollution than our own Hydro and the hon. Minister responsible. I quote:

> The Union Electric Company will install a full-scale system for the removal of sulphur dioxide from the emisison of coal-fired steam generators, Charles J. Doherty, president of the company, announced today. The system will be built at Union Electric's Merimack plant at South St. Louis county. Preliminary research in combustion engineering's laboratories and pilot plant tests indicate that the system will remove 83 per cent of sulphur dioxide and all but immeasurable quantities of sulphur trioxide. It also removes 99 per cent of fly ash from flue gases. The removal of 83 per cent of sulphur dioxide is the equivalent of burning fuel with a sulphur content of 0.5 per cent.

Which of course is what we should be doing in the first place.

> We are very hopeful that this project will result in significant progress toward air pollution abatement. If this new system operates as effectively as we think it will, it could be installed in connection with large coal-fired boilers. Detailed engineering work on the Merimack installation is underway. Construction is expected to begin in mid-November and completion is scheduled for September of 1968. On that schedule operation of the system would begin in October of next year and the company's anticipated final evaluation of the system's effectiveness would be offered later in 1969.
>
> The combustion engineering system involves the use of crushed dolomite—a rock similar to limestone—and the installation of scrubber equipment to clean the gases leaving the boiler. The dolomite is pulverized and air injected into the furnace where it reacts with part of the sulphur dioxide. Before going to the stack the flue gas is passed through the scrubber, where further reaction takes place with the sulphur oxide. The sulphur compounds which result from this reaction precipitate out as solids and are removed in the scrubber along with fly ash. The solid residue is transferred to a settling tank where it is partially separated in the water, and is then conveyed to a disposal area. Combustion engineering has been developing pollution control technology for about 10 years.

It seems strange that the government was not aware that if they did not want to use modern methods of atomic power, that they could use scrubbers. It did seem odd that they were not aware of modern scrubbers which have no problem. But the explanation is really very simple, because the Minister does not really believe in such a thing as air pollution. I have some interesting correspondence here which I think the House may find—if it was not sad it would be amusing.

This is a letter sent to the hon. Premier of the province of Ontario, Queen's Park, Toronto, Ontario. It is dated September 25, 1967. I am going to read the whole letter because it is of some interest. But first I just wish to read one paragraph from it:

> Air pollution is causing a serious threat to our son's life. He developed croup last fall and spent three days in an oxygen tent

> in sick children's hospital. The doctors told us we should leave Toronto if he gets croup again this fall, because croup is caused by the noxious contents of air over Toronto. We have waited to make our decision until the provincial election campaign in the hope that there will be some indication that something is being done about the serious problems we face—

and so on, and so on.

Well, she got a reply from The Department of Economics and Development. The letter is signed by John R. Mason, executive assistant, and I quote:

> I sympathize with you on the condition of your son which your doctors claim is due to air pollution. I cannot argue with your medical advice but I wonder now how children developed croup when we had no air pollution. You would be interested to know that Dr. Matthew Dymond, Minister of Health, had legislation enacted to counteract and control air pollution during the last session of the Legislature. This becomes effective January 1, 1968.

If it has become effective it has not become very apparent to anybody in this province.

And this really explains the government's failure to take any action to prevent the Hydro from polluting the whole Lake Erie basin. They just do not believe it. They think it is all a figment of our imaginations.

Mr. Ben: They do not care.

Mr. Shulman: They do not care. Well, I would like now—

Mr. MacDonald: Playing games with human welfare!

Mr. Shulman: Well, I would like now to turn my attention to my ex-superior, Dr. H. B. Cotnam, in the Metropolitan Toronto coroner's office. Today I will not go into that office in detail, but I wish to tell you about one case which is really quite disgraceful. Mr. Harold B. Rider was 41 years old when he was believed to have died in a hotel in Toronto last September.

A post mortem was performed at the coroner's office and a copy of the report was forwarded to his wife, Mrs. Violet Rider. The post mortem report showed that the deceased was five foot ten inches and weighed 180 pounds. Mrs. Rider was a little puzzled because she knew that her husband was five foot eight inches and weighed only 165 pounds. She was understandably a little upset and so she went to see Dr. Cotnam, and he interviewed her in the presence of two men whom she was led to believe were detectives. Dr. Cotnam explained that Mr. Rider's body had not been found until some days after death and that the variation in size was due to post mortem changes.

Well, Mrs. Rider was not completely satisfied because it did sound a little odd and so she came to see me. The gain in weight was remotely possible, but I do find it a little hard to accept the growth in height as a post mortem change. So I have done a more complete investigation.

Fortunately Mr. Rider was a cab driver, so current pictures and statistics were available. I have them here available, and I would be glad to supply them to the hon. Premier if he would care to order an investigation or the hon. Attorney General if we still have the same Attorney General.

Let me stress that the post mortem was done by one of Canada's best pathologists, who is always extremely careful in his measurements and description of a body so that the post mortem results are quite certainly accurate, although the question of whose body was autopsied is another matter.

The body on which the post mortem was performed had blonde hair. Mr. Rider's hair was dark brown. The body had no scars. Mr. Rider had a prominent scar on his hand. The body had no abnormalities on the lung. I have a report from the Gage Institute, which shows that Mr. Rider had considerable lung scarring from old disease. The body had a normal stomach with no scarring; Mr. Rider had a duodenal ulcer for which he was being treated at St. Michael's hospital. The body had no appendix; Mr. Rider never had an appendectomy. And finally and perhaps most telling, the body had been circumcised; Mr. Rider had never been circumcised.

Mr. Ben: The hon. member is splitting hairs!

Mr. Shulman: From these facts it is quite clear that whoever that post mortem was performed on, most certainly it was not Harold E. Rider, and even Harold Cotnam should have realized it.

Mr. Ben: Were they both male?

Mr. Shulman: He was right that much. Anyone can make a mistake. What is inexcusable in this case is the supervising coroner's refusal to admit the facts, and his attempt to cover up the case with his clumsy explanation to Mrs. Rider.

Either they have bungled by switching two bodies and doing a post mortem on the wrong one, or else the body found in that hotel was not that of Harold E. Rider, and the post mortem was performed on some visitor to his room. In either case, we deserve better from our supervising coroner or his successor.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, may I ask that the hon. member adjourn the debate? I would like to ask His Honour to enter the House and give Royal assent to the bill that was given third reading yesterday.

Mr. Shulman moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

The Honourable, the Lieutenant-Governor of Ontario entered the chamber of the legislative assembly and took his seat upon the Throne.

Hon. W. Earl Rowe (Lieutenant-Governor): Pray be seated.

Mr. Speaker: May it please Your Honour, the legislative assembly of the province has, at its present sittings thereof, passed a bill to which, in the name and on behalf of the said legislative assembly, I respectfully request Your Honour's assent.

The Clerk Assistant: The following is the title to the bill to which Your Honour's assent is prayed:

Bill 24, An Act to amend The Municipal Act.

Clerk of the House: In Her Majesty's name, the Honourable, the Lieutenant-Governor doth assent to this bill.

The Honourable, the Lieutenant-Governor was pleased to retire from the chamber.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member who had the floor seems to have disappeared.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Call the press gallery!

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Well, I would assume that he does not understand that the first order of business would be called as soon as His Honour left the chamber; so I will not take advantage of his ignorance of the rules and I will move the adjournment of the House.

Before doing so, I would say that tomorrow we will resume this debate.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 5:50 o'clock, p.m.

No. 17

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

First Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Thursday, March 7, 1968

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1968

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Thursday, March 7, 1968

Third report, standing committee on standing orders and printing, Mr. Hamilton 525

Fourth report, standing committee on private bills, Mr. Carton 525

Sandwich, Windsor and Amherstburg Railway Act, 1930, bill to amend, Mr Wishart, first reading 525

Judicature Act, bill to amend, Mr. Wishart, first reading 526

Control of fumes from smelters, bill to provide for, Mr. Martel, first reading 526

Brucellosis Act, 1965, bill to amend, Mr. Stewart, first reading 526

Question to Mr. Brunelle re control and fluctuation of water levels by INCO, Mr. Sopha 527

Question to Mr. Gomme re co-operation of counties in a road study, Mr. Deans 527

Questions to Mr. Brunelle re provincial parks, Mr. Paterson 528

Questions to Mr. McKeough re corporation employees holding public office, Mr. Worton 528

Questions to Mr. Dymond re Porcupine psychiatric hospital, Mr. Ferrier 529

Question to Mr. A. F. Lawrence re explosives used in mining, Mr. Martel 529

Questions to Mr. Gomme re rental housing, Mr. Braithwaite 530

Question to Mr. Stewart re synthetic dairy products, Mr. Innes 530

Questions to Mr. Yaremko re emotionally disturbed children, Mr. Lewis 531

Questions to Mr. Grossman re Mrs. Viola MacMillan, Mr. Sargent 531

Questions to Mr. Wishart re the Don jail, Mr. Sargent 532

Questions to Mr. Bales re the Toronto subway, Mr. Sargent 534

Question to Mr. Bales re Ontario unions paying dues to parent U.S. unions, Mr. Sargent 534

Question to Mr. Robarts re TV coverage of Legislature proceedings, Mr. Sargent 534

Resumption of the debate on the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Shulman, Mr. Apps 535

Recess, 6 o'clock 564

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, MARCH 7, 1968

The House met at 2.30 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: Once again today in the galleries, we are pleased to have visitors: In the east gallery from St. Ambrose separate school, Toronto, and Three Valleys Drive public school, Don Mills; and in the west gallery, from St. Timothy's separate school, Don Mills, and Deer Park junior high school, Toronto.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Mr. M. Hamilton from the standing committee on standing orders and printing, presented the committee's third and final report which was read as follows and adopted:

Your committee recommends that copies of the *Canadian Parliamentary Guide*, the *Canadian Almanac* and *Canada Year Book* be purchased for distribution to the members of the assembly; that each member be given a year's subscription to the *Labour Gazette* and the *Municipal World* and that each member be entitled to order through the office of the clerk of the legislative assembly and additional publications or periodicals to a value not exceeding a total of $18 for such additional material.

Your committee recommends that the fees, less the cost of printing, be remitted with respect to the petition of the city of Belleville for a private bill, such petition having been withdrawn.

Mr. G. R. Carton from the standing committee on private bills, presented the committee's fourth report which was read as follows and adopted:

Your committee begs to report the following bills without amendment:

Bill Pr6, An Act respecting the county of Renfrew.

Bill Pr15, An Act respecting the board of the combined Roman Catholic separate schools of Renfrew.

Bill Pr19, An Act respecting the town of Bowmanville.

Bill Pr49, An Act respecting Carleton University.

Your committee begs to report the following bills with certain amendments:

Bill Pr17, An Act respecting the city of Barrie.

Bill Pr50, An Act respecting Lake of the Woods district hospital.

Your committee would recommend that the fees less the penalties and the actual cost of printing be remitted on Bill Pr20, An Act respecting Owen Sound Young Men's and Young Women's Christian Association.

Mr. Speaker: Presenting reports.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

THE SANDWICH, WINDSOR AND AMHERSTBURG RAILWAY ACT, 1930

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Sandwich, Windsor and Amherstburg Railway Act, 1930.

Mr. Speaker: Might I ask the Minister the seconder of the motion?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, it is the Minister of Reform Institutions (Mr. Grossman); I am sorry I did not have it noted.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, I would like to read the brief explanatory note I have. This is a single section amendment to the Act. The explanatory note is as follows:

At present, by reference to The Municipal Act, notice of personal injury or property damage caused by the operation of the Sandwich, Windsor and Amherstburg Railway must be given to the railway company within seven days, and the action is barred unless brought within three months from the time when the injury or damage was sustained.

This special limitation period applies only to this railway company, while the limitation period, in all other such cases in Ontario, is one year. The amendment is to place this

railway company in the same position as similar companies engaged in like activities within Ontario. It makes it clear that the one year limitation period applies to this railway company.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): It is not a year with respect to the municipalities?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: No, I know the limitation period has various limitations in other damage actions. With respect to railway companies, it is one year.

THE JUDICATURE ACT

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Judicature Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, the two amending sections provide:

First, that the special examiners in the courts may be appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor in council instead of by the Supreme court judges. This is in line with the thinking of the judges in this matter; and the second amendment would permit the destruction of old records in the Supreme Court and in the county and district courts.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): It is certainly shaking this up.

Mr. G. Ben (Humber): Mr. Speaker, may I ask a question?

Mr. Speaker: Not on the introduction of the bill. On the second reading there will be plenty of opportunities.

CONTROL OF FUMES FROM SMELTERS

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to provide for the control of fumes from smelters.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Martel: On The Fumes Control Act, 1968, the purpose of the bill is to require every smelter that smelts or roasts nickel, copper, or iron ore to adopt and carry out a plan that comprises the best practical means for controlling or preventing the discharge of noxious or offensive gases or fumes; or where discharged to render them harmless, or inoffensive. Application for the approval of the plan is made to the Ontario municipal board, notice thereof being given to all interested government departments and municipalities.

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I may have the consent of the House to introduce a bill which is not on the order paper to indicate notice for introduction? If I have that consent, I would be pleased to go ahead and do so.

Mr. Speaker: Will the Minister please proceed?

THE BRUCELLOSIS ACT, 1965

Hon. Mr. Stewart moves first reading of an Act intituled, An Act to amend The Brucellosis Act, 1965.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, in introducing this bill, there are some points of clarification that I would like to mention.

In this instance, we are introducing an amendment to The Brucellosis Act which was introduced in 1956. This Act has performed a useful and valuable service to our agricultural industry. It has enabled us to bring under complete control a livestock disease that, over the years, has created severe hardship for many livestock producers.

Prior to and including the 1940's, and 1950's, brucellosis more commonly known as Bangs disease or contagious abortion, caused heavy economic losses to many cattle owners in Ontario. These losses resulted from the harmful effects of the disease, which included abortion, sterility, and reduced milk production in milk animals.

In 1956, the government of Ontario, in an effort to rid the industry of this disease, introduced The Brucellosis Act, which provided for the compulsory calfhood vaccination of all female calves in the province. In addition, the province assumed the responsibility for the payment for veterinary services involved in vaccinating these calves, and for the compensation of cattle owners who might lose calves from an allergic reaction resulting from vaccination.

This compulsory calfhood vaccination was the first step in the battle plan to control brucellosis, and to reduce its instance to a point where it would be financially feasible for The Canada Department of Agriculture to undertake an eradication programme. As a result of the vaccination programme, the incidence of the disease was sharply reduced, and in 1958, the federal eradication programme was initiated.

This federal programme operated with the provincial plan, involved the blood testing of susceptible cattle, the identification and slaughter of reactors, and the payment of compensation for the slaughtered animals. This double-barrelled federal-provincial programme was so successful that by September, 1964, the last area in the province was declared certified under the federal brucellosis control area plan. With all areas in the province achieving this certification status, it was decided to discontinue the compulsory aspects of calfhood vaccination, but to provide facilities for a voluntary programme.

This was achieved by repealing the original Brucellosis Act and the passing of The Brucellosis Act of 1965, which was proclaimed on January 1, 1966. With the federal eradication plan being a continuing one, and with the incidence of brucellosis now at such a low level, it is now the opinion of this government that there is no longer any justification for us to continue to pay for the vaccination of calves, or to award compensation to cattle owners who may lose calves as a result of vaccination. This is the purpose and intent of the amendment set forth in this bill.

Now I hasten to reassure the hon. members of this House that this does not mean that a cattle owner will be cut off from his service. Livestock producers will still be able to have their calves vaccinated by a veterinarian appointed under The Brucellosis Act, although the farmer will be responsible for paying the veterinarian for those services.

The veterinary services branch of the Ontario Department of Agriculture and Food, which administers this Act, will continue to distribute vaccine to veterinarians and to provide them with vaccination certificates and identification tags. Because the serum and the tags are provided free of charge the only cost to the livestock producer will be for the services of the veterinarian.

Mr. Speaker, we believe that this legislation, first enacted in 1956, has served the farmer well. It has fulfilled in every way the goals for which it was intended; it has brought this disease under control and for all intents and purposes has eradicated it in this province.

Mr. Sopha: Before the orders of the day I have a question of the Minister of Lands and Forests.

Would the Minister inform the House whether his department is taking any steps to change in any way the legal basis under which rights are purported to be exercised by the International Nickel Company of Canada to control and fluctuate the water levels in Armstrong and Ministic Lakes in the district of Sudbury?

If the answer to the foregoing is in the affirmative, then would the Minister tell us whether riparian owners on these lakes have been consulted about this change?

Is the Minister aware that the rights purported to be exercised by the International Nickel Company of Canada Limited, to control and fluctuate the water levels in these lakes are now the subject of a cause of action brought by a riparian owner now pending in the Supreme Court of Ontario?

Hon. R. Brunelle (Minister of Lands and Forests): Mr. Speaker, in reply to the hon. member for Sudbury: In reply to his first question, my department did have under consideration taking steps to change the legal basis for the rights mentioned. However, any action in this regard is to be withheld pending further information on what other rights might be affected.

In reply to the second question, the answer to this question is provided by the answer to the previous question.

In reply to the third question, yes, I am aware that an action has been brought against the International Nickel Company of Canada Limited.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Highways. Could the Minister explain his remarks made while addressing the Ontario good roads association convention in Toronto on Monday as quoted in the Hamilton *Spectator* of March 6—that is yesterday? He said, in reference to a road study: "It would go hard on any county which did not co-operate in the study."

Hon. G. E. Gomme (Minister of Highways): Mr. Speaker, I did not make the remark as quoted in the question. However, what probably is referred to is the following, which is an extract from that portion of my address, requesting the counties' co-operation in updating the need for study, which was:

> This re-examination is urgently required by my department so that the government may insure the proper priority for realistic needs of the county road system within the total provincial expenditure programme. Obviously, the counties that do not choose to participate may find themselves in an unfavourable position.

In brief, I was pointing out that we must have an updating so that we will know the present needs and be in a position to do whatever possible in conjunction with the counties to fulfil this. Therefore, those counties who do not undertake this study can not be expected to have complete and up-to-date information.

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): Mr. Speaker, I have two questions for the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests. To expedite the business of the House I might read them both at the same time.

It is true that Ontario Provincial Police staff will not be posted to our small and medium size provincial parks this summer, as in the past? If true, what efforts have been made by the department to ensure proper policing of these parks?

And the second question: Is the Minister contemplating changes in The Provincial Parks Act that would allow his department to pay municipal taxes or grants in lieu of taxes to municipalities in which the provincial park is located?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: In answer to the hon. member for Essex South. On his first question, the status of service by the Ontario Provincial Police to the provincial parks will be the same in 1968 as they were in 1967. There was one alteration made in 1967 whereby one of the small or medium sized provincial parks, at Holiday Beach, was affected. The one constable stationed at that single park previously was withdrawn in 1967.

My staff informs me that the police service given to that particular park in 1967 by the OPP was, if anything, better than that they previously received when an officer was stationed at that point.

In reply to his second question about provincial parks, this matter of taxation to municipalities is under review.

I would like to remind the hon. member that in the provincial parks where services are provided The Department of Lands and Forests pays for the cost of these services.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Education (Mr. Davis), I wish to hold over my two questions to him.

Mr. H. Worton (Wellington South): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

In December 1967, Maurice Collins, formerly a bus operator employed by the London transportation commission was elected as an alderman in the city of London. His election was contested in the courts under section 35-1 (Q) of The Municipal Act which bars employees of the corporation from holding public office.

In view of the recommendation of the select committee of the Ontario Legislature on The Municipal Act and related Acts established in 1961, and in view of the representations made by the Ontario division of the Ontario union of public employees, will the Minister conduct a complete revision of sections 35, 36 and 198 (a) of The Municipal Act in order that a person is not disqualified from holding public office under the present conditions of these sections?

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I realize this matter is of concern to the hon. member for Wellington South, and indeed it has been a concern of mine during the last several weeks, since it was drawn to my attention. Of course, it has been drawn to the attention of all members of the House because there was a communication received, I assume by all members, a copy of a letter to the Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) from the Canadian union of public employees dated March 1, so we are all involved in this.

The member refers to the result of a particular case which, I suppose, we might call the Collins case. There was a committee appointed by the government composed of representatives from my Department of Municipal Affairs, The Department of Education, and the civil service commission. The committee was established to inquire into the advisability of municipal employees becoming eligible to hold office.

The terms of reference of the committee, and I do not think these have been put on the record, and perhaps this is a good point to put them on the record, were as follows:

The committee would inquire specifically into:

(1) The consideration of the best interests of the public in having any employee of a municipality, or a local board, serve as a member of the municipal council, or any local board, and to determine appropriate safeguards respecting conflict of interest.

(2) The means by which the knowledge and abilities of an employee of a municipality, or a local board, may, in the public interest,

be made available in elected or appointed office.

(3) The extent to which other persons presently disqualified by statute should be permitted to participate in public office, and to determine appropriate safeguards respecting conflict of interest.

(4) The consideration of the application of these matters to governing bodies of universities.

(5) Such other matters as may be pertinent to the inquiry.

Mr. C. W. Yates, Q.C., who is the general municipal counsel in my department, was appointed chairman of that interdepartmental committee, and he, as members may know, has been suffering a rather serious illness, although we hope to have him back before too long.

Because of that illness, the committee's work has not gone on at the pace anticipated, and they have not arrived at conclusions which I think we might have expected them to by this period in time. This was drawn to my attention two weeks ago, and I requested the Attorney General to make available a senior solicitor from his department to chair this committee, because I felt it needed a lawyer to chair the committee.

I am pleased to advise the House that Mr. F. W. Callaghan, the senior Crown counsel, has been appointed chairman and the work of the committee is now proceeding again.

This subject, Mr. Speaker, is, of course, a complex one and a rather contentious one. I think it may be that the committee will want to refer to the McRuer Royal commission on civil rights before making a recommendation. I do not know whether in those 550-odd recommendations, there are recommendations relating to this particular matter, as there may well be.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): The Minister has had two days to read it.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I do not read quite as quickly as the hon. member for Grey-Bruce.

I think, however, those matters have to be taken into consideration, and I cannot assure the House, Mr. Speaker, and I cannot assure the hon. member, that a complete revision, as has been suggested to sections 35, 36 and 198 of The Municipal Act, will be presented during this session of the Legislature. I must say to you, quite frankly, I doubt very much if it will be.

Mr. Worton: Mr. Speaker, if I might inform the Minister: Last December I asked for an approval from his department on a similar case of a man who worked for a board, and that was the reason for asking this question. The Minister's department gave me to understand that this man could have the approval to run for civic office, and I feel that there is a conflict between his statement and the question.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, in answer to the supplementary question, and I assume it was a supplementary question, I am not familiar with that particular case, but I would be glad to look at it.

I assume, you see, in the case of Mr. Collins that we did not disqualify him, the House did not disqualify him. Someone, a defeated opponent, as I recall, brought action to disqualify and it may well have been that the department said, "unless somebody brings an action, he is there." But I would be glad to look into that.

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Health.

Has a psychiatrist been appointed to the northeastern Ontario psychiatric hospital in Porcupine?

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, yes.

Mr. Ferrier: Mr. Speaker, may I ask a supplementary question?

What is the name of the psychiatrist?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, I do not know.

Mr. Martel: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Mines.

What is the principal explosive being used underground by International Nickel Company of Canada in Sudbury?

Is this explosive banned in any mining country of Europe?

If it is banned elsewhere, what is the reason for this action?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence (Minister of Mines): Mr. Speaker, I am informed that the principal explosive being used underground in Sudbury is a factory mixed blasting agent, consisting of an ammonium nitrate and fuel oil mixture called ANFO. The proportion is about 95 per cent ANFO.

In answer to (b): Is this explosive banned in any mining country of Europe? The answer to that is that the large explosive supplier in Sudbury, the chief inspector of

explosives for the federal government and my department, are unaware of a ban in the use of a factory-mixed ANFO where explosives are used anywhere in the mining countries of Europe.

If my hon. friend has any further information on that, we would like to hear it from him.

Regarding (c), the question was: If it is banned elsewhere, what is the reason for this action? Well, in answering (b), there is no further answer necessary in respect of (c).

Mr. Speaker, while I am on my feet, and I want to stress that this statement has no relationship whatsoever to the questions asked by my friend, I thought that in view of the concern shown in this House and elsewhere in respect of mining safety, I should assure the House that the explosion that took place this morning in Sudbury at about 9.10 a.m. at the plant of the Sudbury International Nickel Company, did not take place in the mine, according to the preliminary information that we have received.

It took place in the company's employment and medical centre at about 9.10 a.m.

The explosion occurred in the waiting room near the medical examination area. There were no injuries, according to our information so far. The windows and doors were blown out. There was damage to the concrete floor.

There were engineering people working below, but our preliminary investigation shows that the explosion was as a result of a bomb that was placed in the centre of the floor, probably two sticks of dynamite and a fuse.

Mr. G. W. Innes (Oxford): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Highways:

1. What construction company was engaged to construct the uneven and bumpy sections of the $17,000,000 per mile portion of Highway 401 from Highway 27 to Avenue Road?

2. Is this condition due to faulty construction, or the type of material specified by the department?

3. Was this section covered by bond sufficient to cover rectifying this condition?

4. If it is the material, will the department change the specifications for future projects?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Speaker, I will take this question as notice. I have the answer to a question submitted yesterday from the hon. member for Etobicoke (Mr. Braithwaite). It was in four parts:

1. On 150 Rangoon Road – the leased period, one year definite, and on a month to month basis therafter, if possible. Anticipated rental to be received should be in the range of $185 to $200 per month.

On 37 Summerfield Crescent–the leased period, ten months definite, anticipated rental to be received should be in the range of $175 to $190 per month. The exact amount these properties will be rented for will not be known until all offers resulting from our advertisements have been received by the regional property management section.

2. We did not contact the welfare department of Metropolitan Toronto. However, discussions were held with the Ontario housing corporation some months ago and it was resolved that they would be interested in relocating as many houses as possible. Due to the housing shortage in the Metropolitan area we did not anticipate any difficulty leasing these houses, and elected to follow department policy relating to surplus property until such properties are removed or demolished to facilitate highway construction.

3. Yes. The Ontario housing corporation has relocated 41 houses to date to the Bramalea area.

4. Since these houses were turned over to the Ontario housing corporation, this information should be properly obtained from the corporation.

Mr. L. A. Braithwaite (Etobicoke): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister. Has the Minister's department any plans for the transfer or the rental of any surplus houses to the Metro welfare department? Is there any particular reason why this could not be done in view of the distinct shortage mentioned by the Minister and the emergency cases that do come up?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: We have no plans.

Mr. Innes: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Agriculture and Food. In view of the apparent anticipated entry of synthetic dairy products on the market places of Ontario, is the department doing any research in this regard so that the public will be able to assess the true food value such as available calcium, lactose and other ingredients?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, the answer is definitely "yes". I am sure all dairymen share the concern that the hon. member for

Oxford has expressed in asking this question. The dairy research section of the economics, co-operatives and statistics branch of our department is currently co-operatively involved in several research projects and one of these is designed to study the competitive potential of non-dairy and partly-dairy substitutes for milk. A good deal of work is being done, as well, by the staff of the dairy foods service bureau and the dairy science department at the Ontario Agricultural College of the University of Guelph.

We are informed that several studies have been undertaken by the Ontario milk marketing board itself, or by agencies commissioned by the board to delve into this very complex and aggravating problem. I am sure that when all of these reports are in, Mr. Speaker, and the results are assembled, we will be in a much better position to keep the general public well informed on the relative food or nutritional values of these products, or the lack of such value in them.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Social and Family Services. In view of recent statements by both directors of Metropolitan Toronto's children's aid societies that they cannot cope with present financial arrangements under The Child Welfare Act for payment of residential services for emotionally-disturbed children, has the Minister under consideration the full assumption of costs directly by the province?

Hon. J. Yaremko (Minister of Social and Family Services): Mr. Speaker, the position of the government was fully set out in the white paper tabled in the Legislature by the hon. Minister of Health on January 27, 1967.

Mr. Lewis: May I ask a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker? Does the Minister realize that none of the aspects of that paper affecting this question have been acted on in the more than a year that has passed since its tabling?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, that is not a question; that is a statement.

Mr. Lewis: It is a question.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: That is a statement.

Mr. Lewis: Well, answer the statement.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: At some time in the future, the member should justify his statement that none of the provisions have been carried out and the relevant departments will be able to reply. In the future, if the hon. member promises to make the supplementary question a question, I will accept the same; but no more statements, please.

Mr. Lewis: I make no promises to the Minister.

Mr. Sargent: I have a question for the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions. Of the thousands of women confined to jail in Ontario, will he furnish a list of how many other inmates receive as comparable an early release as Viola MacMillan? And, too, will he advise why Mrs. MacMillan did not go to an ordinary jail, without such special comforts as television and so on, like any other person who breaks the law?

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): Mr. Speaker, that is not the way the question has been given to me and I think your copy will probably say the same thing.

Mr. Speaker: I would point out that the question as submitted by the member had a first question. I ruled that it had already been asked at least twice and answered at least twice.

Mr. Sargent: Not properly!

Mr. Speaker: I asked him to delete that, and the Minister's office was advised that the question would start with question 2 which has more or less accurately, been given by the member.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I would agree with you, sir, that it is more or less accurate. I will deal with both questions at the same time, because the way I have it here, the first makes no sense without taking into consideration the second question. Perhaps it will also deal with the supplementary questions which the hon. member probably has prepared as well.

Mr. Sargent: That kind of did it.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: In the first place, Mr. Speaker, there are not thousands of women confined to jails in Ontario. All women serving—

Mr. Sargent: But there have been.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Of course, I do not know. Mr. Speaker, I do not know how far back the hon. member wants me to go—100 years or 50 years.

Mr. Sargent: The more the better.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: All women serving indeterminate sentences are transferred to the Mercer complex. As of March 3, 1968, there was at this complex a total of 118 women. I made a full, complete and detailed statement in this Legislature on Monday of this week and I refer the hon. member to this statement. It is printed in *Hansard* on pages 386 to 390, and includes the answer to the question from the hon. member of Beaches-Woodbine (Mr. Brown) which also refers to this matter. However, for the hon. member's benefit, I repeat very emphatically that Mrs. MacMillan's appeal was processed in the same manner as all other prisoners' and the decisions were based on the same policy established for all other prisoners.

Mr. Sargent: Will the Ministed accept a supplementary question?

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Ask him if he read the Windsor *Star* editorial.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Please read it to me.

Mr. Sargent: If you had read the Windsor *Star* editorial, you would answer my question.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: But I did not read it.

Mr. Sargent: Is she being released because of psychiatric or health reasons, or what are the reasons?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, again I refer the hon. member to that statement; I covered this specific question in that statement the other day. If he would please refer to that and is still not satisfied, and he wants to ask another question on some other date, I would be glad to answer him.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Provincial Treasurer. Would the Minister reveal the total cost of the printing of the three volumes of the Royal commission report entitled *Inquiry into Civil Rights;* and 2. How much money was paid to Mr. Justice McRuer and how much was paid to each of the other commissioners? How much money was paid to the consultants of the commissioner and to their research counsels and staffs?

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Provincial Treasurer): Mr. Speaker, with your indulgence I would like to propose to the hon. member that he place his question on the order paper. It is going to take quite some time to obtain the information. I have some doubts as to whether all the bills are in yet. It seems to me that it is an appropriate question for the order paper, if I might put it to you that way, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Sargent: Why did the Minister not make that reply?

Mr. Speaker: I might, at this stage, say that yesterday I advised the House that yesterday and today I would take all questions which came in and allow them to be asked at this period in order that I might see if the members of the House wish to abide by the rules which were so well placed before us the other day. It was obvious yesterday, and it is also somewhat obvious today, that the members are placing questions before the orders of the day which might well go in the notice paper. So I shall, I hope, from now on endeavour, if the members will not conform to the rules, to see that the questions are handled as they should be. Will the member carry on with his questions?

Mr. Sargent: Sorry, Mr. Speaker. This is a question for the Attorney General.

(1) In view of the Minister's statement yesterday that 151 inmates of Don jail are being held without bail being set, will the Attorney General furnish, to the House, a list of those inmates for whom bail has not been set? (2) Why? (3) How long have they been held? (4) Would the Attorney General furnish a list of the inmates who have been held longer than two months awaiting trial?

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, in view of the remarks you have just made, I think certain portions of this question dictate that the question should go on the order paper—the list of persons; how long they have been held? I would have to get this information in any event from my colleague in The Department of Reform Institutions. I am not at all certain that the names of inmates should be set forth or that any purpose is served by this or that it is proper.

I do not think that I should ask The Department of Reform Institutions to submit that. These people are entitled to at least some anonymity since they are in custody.

As to the second part of the question—why has bail not been set? My statement yesterday I think indicated that there were 151 persons in all. Surely the hon. member must realize that the reasons why they were dealt with as they were in the matter of bail was a matter for the presiding judge or magistrate.

Mr. Sargent: I certainly did not realize that.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Well, I might explain to the hon. member then.

The reasons why in each of these cases included such things as the nature of the crime committed, the character of the individual, the possibility of his remaining in the jurisdiction, the question as whether he was likely to commit such a crime again if released and numerous other things which I might recite.

In order to get an answer for the hon. member as to why each of these various persons was refused or granted bail, it would require me to go to the court to interview, I presume, the presiding judge or magistrate in each case. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that this would be an impossible thing to do and that such a question is not properly asked in this House.

Mr. Sargent: Would the Minister accept a supplementary on this? He must understand that I went to the governor at the jail and his instructions were not to deal with me at all. Not to give me information.

My question is this. The Minister says anonymity is important. I agree, but how are we to find out which people need to be helped? The Minister defeats the whole purpose. I know he wants to be fair.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order! The member has asked his question. He will now be seated while the Minister makes his answers.

Mr. Sargent: How do you overcome the anonymity factor when we cannot find out, if we do not get it directly from the jail?

Mr. Speaker: Order, order! The member will resume his seat. The Minister may comment on it or not as he wishes.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, I think I said on the question of names that if the hon. member is interested in a particular individual he knows to be there I think he could inquire and get information.

Mr. Sargent: How does the Minister know? How does he find out what is going on?

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I think there are other individual rights here to be considered; the right of the individual not to have it broadcast that he is serving a term if he does not wish it.

Mr. B. Newman: The right to receive assistance—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, the legal aid officers are in there.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I will allow my colleague to answer further.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, if I may. Every inmate in every institution in this province knows what his rights are under legal aid and in every institution and every county jail there is a sign posted prominently telling him what to do if he wants legal aid.

The hon. member must know the information which the hon. Attorney General has asked my department to provide and which the hon. member asked the governor to provide in respect of numbers we will get him, but this will take some time. It will not take too much time. We will tell him how many are being held, for how long a period of time and how many are being held without bail and that sort of thing. But certainly he does not expect the governor of the jail to hand this out freely.

His question properly should be asked, as it has been asked today, on the floor of this House. He will get an answer from the Minister. Certainly we would not divulge the names of the people. There are many people in Don jail who are as yet, innocent and being held pending trial. There are a lot of implications to this.

You will get the information to which every member of this House is entitled, and that is the number who are there, how long they have been there, how many there are without bail at any given time and that sort of thing, but as the hon. Attorney General has also said, we cannot give the information any more than the hon. Attorney General can regarding names.

Mr. Sargent: Will the Minister accept a supplementary question after?

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I have not even answered the first one, as to why the judge did not grant bail.

Mr. Sargent: Would the Minister be agreeable to us interviewing the prisoners down there?

Mr. Speaker: Order! The member for Humber has a point of order.

Mr. Ben: Will the hon. Speaker please give me the citation in the rules of procedure

in this House, and the citation in May which entitled the Minister of Reform Institutions to stand up in this House and answer the question that was directed to the hon. Attorney General?

Mr. Speaker: I will be pleased to take the member's submission under advisement. The member for Grey-Bruce will proceed with his questions. I think he has explored this problem—this particular question—far enough today and—

Mr. Sargent: This is so important, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order!

Mr. Sargent: Would he allow a—

Mr. Speaker: Order! I have just said that I think this matter has been explored sufficiently today. If the member will consider the answers which have been given to him today and has other questions for tomorrow morning I am sure they will be answered.

Mr. Sargent: Thank you Mr. Speaker. A question for the Minister of Labour.

(1) Will the Minister advise how many subway deaths there have been in the past three years; and (2) Has the The Department of Labour considered the feasibility of barriers or sliding walls to protect the public welfare before the trains stop?

Hon. D. Bales (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, The Department of Labour is primarily responsible for occupational safety and construction safety and certain other specific areas of public safety. Its jurisdiction does not include the regular day-to-day operation of the Toronto transit commission. Therefore, I am not in a position to answer the hon. member's questions. I think it might be more appropriate if he referred them to the Toronto transit commission which is responsible to Metropolitan council for the operation of the system.

Mr. Sargent: A question for the Minister of Labour. Will the Minister furnish a list of the numbers of unions in Ontario who paid dues directly or indirectly to parent unions in the United States, and advise the amount of money involved in the transfer of funds from the Ontario locals to the United States headquarters?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Speaker, I am afraid that I do not have the information requested as it is not available to me. In order to obtain it, The Department of Labour would have to carry out a survey of hundreds of union locals across this province.

Mr. Sargent: What is wrong with that?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Aside from the expense, to the taxpayer, I would say it is not in order for the department to involve itself in this way, in what is essentially a matter of internal union administration.

If the hon. member is concerned about safeguards for union members themselves, as to the manner in which their dues payments are spent, section 63 of The Labour Relations Act requires a union upon the request of one of its members to furnish the member with a copy of the audited financial statement of its affairs.

Mr. Sargent: Finally, an easy one for the Prime Minister. In view of the fact that the suggestion has been put forward to televise the House of Commons proceedings, will the Prime Minister inform the House if he has considered television coverage of the proceedings in this House?

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, there is no consideration being given to that at the present time.

Mr. Speaker: The member submitted two further questions, does he wish to deal with them today or have them held over?

Mr. Sargent: A question for the hon. Attorney General. Will the Attorney General tell the House what civil rights equality we have when two men are fined $100 and costs or 30 days in jail and the man who has the $100 in his pocket goes free and the man who has not spends 30 days in jail?

Will the Minister qualify how the amount of money you have in your pocket decides that one man goes free and another goes to jail?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: This is a question which surely is hypothetical. It calls for a philosophical opinion. I could answer the hon. member at length for an hour, discussing the possibility of obtaining absolute justice.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that by the rules which are set forth in May's procedure, page 352, this is a question which is hypothetical, calling for an opinion, and such a question should not be asked, although I could answer at length, for perhaps an hour.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The first order, resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the amendment to the motion for an address in reply to the Speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor at the opening of the session.

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): Mr. Speaker, hon. members, before resuming my brief, noncontroversial speech, I would like to refer back to something that I said, or rather did not say yesterday, but which is commented on by one of the hon. Ministers, and which is reported in today's *Telegram.*

And for the benefit of those of you who have not yet read the *Telegram,* I will read the appropriate quote. The headline is: "Step Outside, Shulman: Rowntree."

> . . . Mr. Rowntree carried his condemnation of Dr. Shulman to the 85th anniversary dinner of the institute of chartered accountants of Ontario where he was guest speaker last night.
>
> . . . Mr. Rowntree added: "Let him make those statements outside (the immunity from lawsuit provided by the Legislature) and I'll take some of those hundreds of thousands he talks about in his book. Do you think I would be here if I had made $1 million?
>
> Mr. Rowntree accused Dr. Shulman of starting a rumour that he (Rowntree) had made $1 million.

Well, the only explanation I can possibly think of, Mr. Speaker, is that the hon. Minister was not here to hear the speech, because I have not as yet got around to this particular hon. Minister, but I hope today that, perhaps, we can do so.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Has the hon. member got his $1 million with him?

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Don't repeat the idle threat to step outside, the Minister has been throwing that around for 15 years. Everybody has on that side of the House.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, I want to assure the hon. Minister that, at no time, did I start a rumour that he had made $1 million. I am quite sure, I can assure him, I have the feeling that he has not.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: The member has been name-dropping the figure of $1 million for the last—

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, I must inform the hon. Minister that he is quite incorrect. I have never used that figure in this House or outside the House, I have never suggested that "our Mr. Rowntree" made any sum of money at all.

An hon. member: Giving himself airs!

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the member would proceed with his speech on the Throne debate.

Mr. Shulman: As to stepping outside and making the comments which I have made in here, I would be delighted to do so. On one very small condition though, and I will come back to that shortly.

I was speaking about the hon. Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Randall) when we adjourned the debate yesterday—I see we have lost him unfortunately—and I just wish to sum up the Nanticoke development. I feel that this is possibly the most serious thing that I discussed yesterday, because if it goes ahead, it is going to mean literal disaster for a very large area of our province.

I want to stress that if the hon. Minister allows the Hydro to continue in this course, the name of the hon. Minister of Economics and Development will go down in Ontario's history as the man who destroyed Lake Erie and devastated our national heritage.

I said yesterday when I did not have time to conclude, that I was going to read, in full, the letter from which I had read one paragraph, which very well sums up many of the problems which we in Ontario have, as a result of our present government.

It was sent by a Mr. and Mrs. Gerrard Hennessey of 339 Belisle Street, Toronto 7, to the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts), and I will read it in full:

> To the Hon. John Robarts, Premier,
> Government of the province of Ontario,
> Queen's Park, Toronto, Ontario.
>
> Dear Mr. Robarts:
>
> Five years ago, my husband and I came to Canada to get married and start our life together. He is from England and I am from Alaska, so Toronto seemed just about perfect as it is almost equal distance from both sets of in-laws.
>
> We have had two children in Canada, a boy and a girl. Now with heavy hearts we

have reached the sad decision to leave Canada within the year. We are both valuable people to the Canadian economy, we did not have to learn English or be retrained in order to contribute. I am a teacher and my husband is a communications technician. We are well paid. Our joint incomes total over $17,000 per year.

Why are we leaving Canada?

1. We cannot afford to buy a house. The frustration of having children and not being able to provide them with a permanent place to live, is one of the severest problems we have found. We cannot buy in the suburbs because we would then need two cars and two hours more to get to work.

We can see no concrete efforts by the financial community, the building industry, the real estate business or the government to alleviate the housing problem.

2. Child care is too expensive for working mothers and believe me, mothers have got to work. Sloppy, lazy, dangerous baby sitters at minimum rates are not the answer. A good dependable baby sitter or housekeeper is much too expensive for most mothers.

3. Air pollution is causing a serious threat to our son's life. He developed croup last fall and spent three days in an oxygen tent at sick children's hospital. The doctors told us we should leave Toronto if he gets the croup again this all because the croup is caused by the noxious contents of the air over Toronto.

We have waited to make our decision until the provincial election campaign in the hope that there would be some indication that something is being done about this serious problem we face.

However, with your campaign in full swing, it is obvious you do not intend, or are unable to institute the sweeping changes in the nature of society that would be required to solve our problem. Many of our friends are agonizing over similar decisions.

Neither your government, nor the federal government, have any business enticing families from other countries until the problems of overcrowding have been solved. You, especially, have no right to entice people who cannot even speak the langage to come to a land with such crushing problems.

There is still some time left in your campaign, Mr. Robarts. We hope you will come up with a sleeper just before election that will give some promise for others who still have the heart to give Canada a chance.

Very truly yours,
Mr. and Mrs. Gerrard Hennessey.

In fairness, I would like to read the reply. In fact, I received two replies. The first one is from The Department of Economics and Development and signed by the executive assistant, Mr. John R. Mason:

Dear Mr. and Mrs. Hennessey:

Your letter of September 25 addressed to Prime Minister Robarts has been sent to this department in the hope that we can provide you with information, particularly since one of your problems is a matter of housing.

I must confess I was surprised at your observation that with your present income you cannot find a home. The newspapers are filled with advertisements for homes which could be handled on that money, and while it may be a matter of location, the shortage of housing is primarily confined to the middle income families. I cannot agree that there is not any effort on the part of the government, or the industry to relieve the situation, and you will be interested to know that two housing corporations in the province, combined with numerous private enterprises, are working very hard to obtain some relief.

Money for mortgages is in short supply, but in spite of this, the Ontario housing corporation is providing homes under the new HOME programme, and these are for families whose income is between $6,000 and $10,000. The most recent announcement by OHC covered over 70 acres to be developed near Flemingdon Park—row houses, apartment housing and condominium. This is just further evidence of what we are doing. The Malvern project has been covered by the press quite recently and we are now waiting for the architects' and surveyors' reports.

Most projects will contain HOME properties. I sympathize with you on the condition of your son, which your doctors claim is due to air pollution. I cannot argue with your medical advice, but I wonder now how children developed croup when we had no air pollution. You will be interested to know that Dr. Matthew Dymond, the Minister of Health, had legislation enacted to counteract air pollution during the last session of the Legislature. This becomes effective January 1, 1968.

I could write at length on your observations of bringing workers to Ontario, but if you realize that industrial promotion is the offsetting factor in increased taxes, you will understand that if we are to keep our factories running, we need the skills of many people, and the local supply is lacking. We must go abroad in search of more technical people. We have estimated each man in Ontario contributes $600 in direct and indirect taxes to the provincial government. These are contributions which pay for our schools and education and the high standard of living that we enjoy here.

I felt that you might like to have some facts on the opportunities of this province and I have enclosed our latest pamphlet on housing and I hope that you will find it valuable.

The Henesseys were a little upset with this letter, as I suppose most of us are, and they replied, after the election, to Mr. Mason, on October 26, 1967:

Dear Mr. Mason,

We are shocked at the lack of contact with reality exhibited by your letter of October 24, which was a reply to our letter to Mr. Robarts about housing. We hope that the detailed information below will help you to understand the realities of this situation in which we find ourselves in Toronto in 1967.

First: let us consider the housing problem. Incidentally, our rent has gone up twelve per cent since our last letter. Included in the attached budget is the amount of $185 for housing expenses such as rent, hydro, heat, beyond which we cannot spend without infringing on some other items. We are also expected to do all decorating and repairs as well as maintenance of the house.

Our bank manager tells us that we should not buy a house. After the detailed scrutiny of our budget, the sales manager, of H. Keith Realtors Ltd., of Toronto, tells us we cannot afford to buy a house nor will we be able to in the foreseeable future. He recommends that we continue to rent our present house. He says that any house within a reasonable distance from our work by public transport, that does not require extensive and expensive repairs, is beyond our ability to pay.

If we were to buy a house too far from work, we would have to buy a second car, which would be beyond our ability. We read with interest the booklet that you enclosed on the new HOME plan. Unfortunately, we cannot afford a home mortgage either. If we took a loan to get the $1,250 down payment required, we would have to pay this back for three years at $40 per month. Heat and hydro would be about $30 per month, and principal, interest, taxes, and services would cost $170. This totals $240—about $55 more than we can afford. We dispute strongly your untrue statement that the housing shortage affects only the middle-income families. First, it is not a housing but a money shortage we face. Also, have you forgotten that low-income families exist? Home ownership is impossible for about 90 per cent of Ontario families. Do you really think that this indicates that the government's activities in the housing field are adequate?

Second: We don't appreciate your flippant remark about how children developed croup before the days of air pollution. Lung cancer was around long before the advent of the cigarette, but few authorities would dispute that smoking has made lung cancer more prevalent. Should you wish to check on this further, we suggest that you make a tour of the hospital for sick children, tracheitis ward, croup ward, at about 3 a.m. during the next air inversion in Toronto. Take a good look at the children struggling for breath in oxygen tents, and the serious cases that have to breathe through tubes coming out of their necks.

Third: We are flabbergasted by your explanation of the economics of immigration. Our point in mentioning the importation of families is this: no one seems to be able to solve the housing problem for the low-income and middle-income families—that is, most of the population. Therefore it is immoral for any government to entice any family from abroad, until it has adequate housing available at moderate cost. It costs the government more than $600 to maintain one child in school for one year. New Canadian children cost more than this because of the language problem. Because of inadequate housing, new Canadians must live in overcrowded unsanitary conditions.

The social and medical implications of this overcrowding as well as lack of adequate food, clothing, and medical and dental care, caused by over-spending on housing, is going to cost the government of Ontario much more than the $600 per

year that it receives from the average worker that you mentioned.

How long will it take to balance out the $2,400 it costs the government to teach him English? What irks us most is that we could go out tomorrow and borrow enough money to buy a mink coat or a Cadillac, but we cannot get a mortgage for a home. It seems that here in Ontario the luxuries are easy to obtain and the necessities are impossible.

Very truly yours,
Mr. and Mrs. G. Hennessey.

This was written by a man who in all his life, I am sure, never voted NDP. He came over here because in this province the Conservatives were in power and have promised great opportunities for all.

Here is a family that earned $17,000, and they could not manage and had to go back to England. Why does the government not do something about it?

Mr. G. A. Kerr (Halton West): Poor souls! You do not need two cars.

Mr. Shulman: Well, this was the end as far as The Department of Economics and Development was concerned. There were no further letters from them. However, I am delighted to say that The Department of Social and Family Services did write another letter after the election, to Mr and Mrs. Hennessey. It is signed by the Minister himself and perhaps I could read it to the House.

Dear Mr. and Mrs. Hennessey,

The office of the hon. John Robarts, Prime Minister of Ontario, has asked that I reply to the item in your recent letter relating to child care. I appreciate the problem of looking after children when mother is working. There is legislation—The Day Nurseries Act—to encourage the establishment of both municipal and private day nurseries. It has recently been amended to provide provincial contribution of 80 per cent of net operation costs of public nurseries, and for those children in private nurseries whose parents cannot afford it, the full cost.

There are some 400 licensed day nurseries in Ontario and the number is rising. This province is one of the few jurisdictions on the continent to offer public financial support to a day nursery programme. I am sure that you realize that all rapidly growing industrial nations face much the same sets of problems. It is my hope and my belief that Ontario is well to the forefront in new approaches to improve the quality of life for our new residents.

Yours sincerely,
John Yaremko,
Minister of Social and Family Services

It was a lovely letter. Unfortunately, the Hennesseys were not satisfied, so they replied and I will read the reply to the Minister: To the Hon. John Yaremko, Minister of The Department of Social and Family Services, Toronto, Ontario, October 27, 1967.

Dear Sir,

Thank you for your letter of October 24 in reply to our letter to Mr. Robarts. If we had to wait until our children were old enough to attend nursery school, that is two years, we would all have starved. Our oldest child was two in January of 1966, and our youngest will not be two until December, 1968. I have worked steadily since September 1964, taking five weeks off to have our youngest baby. There is not any provincial subsidy for the care of infants.

What about the sole support of the mother? As a guidance counsellor for one of the adult education centres I can tell you that many mothers put their children in physical danger because they cannot afford proper care. The Protestant children's homes, who have done a remarkably good job in this field in North York, and East York, have had their budgets cut this year.

My own children are well cared for by a competent person to whom we pay $55 per week. How many working mothers can afford that? Ontario may well be to the forefront in nursery care in North America, Mr. Yaremko, but, do not think this means that your office is doing an adequate job, which should be to provide care for children of working mothers so that we can prevent permanent psychological and physical damage to their children. If we do not do this, we will pay for it in the next 40 years in correctional and rehabilitational costs.

The U.S. is just now facing up to the social and economic problems that its negligent attitude toward children has caused. You cannot close your eyes to the needs of the infant whose mother must go to work as you have been doing. These children do exist, Mr. Yaremko, and they need proper care, more than children over two do.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Let us have a vote.

Mr. Shulman: To continue:

> We still maintain that your government has no business enticing people to this country, when because of the high cost of living the mothers must work and there is no adequate care for children, especially the ones who need it most, the ones under two.
>
> Very truly yours,
> Mr. and Mrs. Gerrard Hennessey.

Hon. J. Yaremko (Minister of Social and Family Services): What was the family income in that case?

Mr. Shulman: $17,000!

Mr. Kerr: A lot to complain about! Where are they now?

Interjections by the hon. members.

Mr. Shulman: They told me they were leaving for England, I have not heard—

An hon. member: —to socialism.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: That is more than 99 per cent of my constituents have.

Mr. Shulman: That is the very point they were making, that 99 per cent of the people cannot afford the proper amenities of life, 99 per cent.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Yet 99 per cent of my constituents own their own homes and raise many kids.

Mr. Shulman: If they are doing so, Mr. Speaker, and I speak truly to the hon. Minister, it is not because of the steps taken by this government, but in spite of them.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: This is the province of opportunity.

Mr. Shulman: For you people, yes, for the rest of the population, no.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: For all!

Mr. Shulman: There are even exceptions on this side of the House.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Shulman: Now let me turn my attention to the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Bales). It is unfortunate that I have returned to Minister after Minister and they are not in the House, it just seems to be the pattern. Now, the hon. Minister of Labour appears to have departed.

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): They are much busier than you—

Mr. Shulman: Too busy to come to the House apparently.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Shulman: One year ago, there was a fire in the workmen's compensation board hospital in Malton. I am sure we all recall the hon. Minister's words at that time in which he assured the House that the hospital was as fireproof as any building can be. I presume, of course, that he meant it was as fireproof as any building can be that has been built by this government.

In the fire which destroyed that fireproof building, an immigrant Italian workman, one Francesco Gualtieri, was the sole support of a crippled sister, unable ever to work because of polio. There are two other brothers in the family, but one was severely injured in the same accident as the deceased and is still off work, while the other earns only $80 per week and has a large family of his own.

Everyone naturally believed that the workmen's compensation board would make some financial arrangement to assist Gualtieri's crippled living dependant. Our generous workmen's compensation board put the family in touch with their insurance company, and finally they produced the generous offer of $2,000. Now a $2,000 annual pension, in my opinion, would have been a small but acceptable settlement. The offer was not quite that, however. It was not $2,000 annually, but a $2,000 final settlement, of which $500 was to be deducted for funeral expenses. They were to be given $1,500 cash.

The Gualtieri family approached me, and on February 1, 1968, I sent the following letter to the hon. Minister of Labour:

> You may recall that there was a fire at the workmen's compensation board hospital in which Mr. Francesco Gualtieri was burned to death. Mr. Gualtieri was the sole support of a crippled sister residing in Italy, and she is now in extreme financial difficulty. The workmen's compensation board has now offered a lump settlement to the Gualtieris of $1,500 plus funeral expenses. This offer would appear miserly from the most uncompassionate

employer. Coming from the workmen's compensation board in the rich province of Ontario it is absolutely incomprehensible. If you have the slightest compassion, I request that you personally intervene to see that this poor girl receives a suitable pension.

The hon. Minister, the workmen's compensation board and the insurance company make Scrooge and Marley look like symbols of generosity. Gentlemen, I ask you, what is a man's life worth in this rich province of opportunity?

Mr. Speaker: I must call the member's attention to the proper form of addressing the members of this House through the Speaker, and I would ask that he continue to address them so.

Mr. Shulman: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, I shall attempt to follow your direction.

In the workmen's compensation board hospital fire many men were injured. The board has treated the injured in the same generous manner with which they have treated the dead.

Mr. James Lynch of 188 Bold Street, Hamilton, almost died as a result of suffering burns to the whole left side of his body and his left arm. His scars are so ugly that he will never be able to wear a bathing suit again or expose his body in any way. The workmen's compensation board insurance company, represented by the Underwriters Adjustment Bureau Limited, have now made a generous offer of compensation to Mr. Lynch. I will read it to the House:

> I, my heirs, administrators, executors, successors and assigns hereby release and forever discharge the workmen's compensation board et al., (their heirs, administrators, executors, successors and assigns hereinafter called the releasee) from any and all actions, causes of action, claims and demands, for damages, loss or injury, however arising, which heretofore may have been or may hereafter be sustained by me in consequence of fire which occurred March 31, 1967, at workmen's compensation hospital at rehabilitation centre.
>
> And for the said consideration, I further agree not to make any claim or take any proceedings against any other person or corporation who might claim contribution or indemnity under the provisions of any contributory negligence legislation from the person, persons or corporation discharged by this release.
>
> It is understood and agreed that the said payment, or promise of payment, is deemed to be no admission whatever of liability on the part of the releasee, the workmen's compensation board et al.
>
> And I hereby declare that I fully understand the terms of this settlement; that the amount stated herein is the sole consideration of this release, and that I voluntarily accept said sum for the purpose of making a full and final compromise, adjustment and settlement of all claims for injuries, losses and damages resulting or to result from said accident.

In return for signing this release, the workmen's compensation board have generously offered to pay to Mr. Lynch the lump sum of $30.

Some hon. members: Shame, shame!

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): You know you should scrap that whole board.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: No wonder they run out when they hear stuff such as this.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Half your people are out.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: Just take hold of that workmen's compensation board and rattle it a little.

Mr. Shulman: Every member sitting on the government side of the House should be ashamed, Mr. Speaker, of the actions in this particular case. I have received dozens of spontaneous complaints from workers who have felt that they were mistreated by the workmen's compensation board. Looking into these complaints, I have been shocked by action after action of this board.

The board issues a magazine called *The Compensator* and it is a "puff sheet" which is used to praise the Premier and various officials who are responsible for the compensation board.

An hon. member: Particularly the chairman.

Mr. Shulman: Particularly the chairman. But it is an interesting magazine to read, however, because they do say some interesting things, occasionally. In the current issue, the February issue, they praise themselves on several pages for giving injured workmen:

"Speedy justice, humanely administered." They go on to say that board decisions are made less on points of law than on real justice. They claim that: "Doubts are resolved in favour of the workman."

Today I am not going to take your time by detailing 20-odd of these cases, but I do wish to present two to give an example of just how heartless and inhumane the workmen's compensation board can be and to show how justice is not humanely administered, nor are doubts resolved in favour of the workman.

Incidentally, this House is not going to have to hear all of them. I have about 30 and before this session of the Legislature is over and at the appropriate time, I will detail every one of them, to the shame of many members in this House. I am sure that members sitting behind me will have many further cases to add to it.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: The member means they are the only ones that are right.

Mr. Shulman: No, we are the only ones who care. That is the only difference. Mr. Speaker, we in the Opposition and in the official Opposition receive these complaints. I am convinced that the members on the government side also receive the complaints. This is a widespread scandal throughout the province, and the fact that the government has done nothing about it is an absolute disgrace.

The members over there say they do not get any of these complaints. If this is so, we can only assume that over a period of time the workers have found where they will get effective action.

Mr. Kerr: Nonsense. I get a lot, but I solve them.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Joseph Cutajar is a 30-year-old Maltese immigrant who has an unusually good work history. He has worked steadily since 1957 in Canada, and in fact even when he had a fractured hand some four years ago at United Co-operatives of Ontario, his place of work, he had a cast applied and went back to work. He did not miss a day.

For three and a half years, Mr. Cutajar worked for this particular firm, called United Co-operatives of Ontario—35 Oak Street in Weston—until on September 29, 1966, he fell down a staircase at work and he injured his back.

Let me state at the outset that there is no question as to whether and what injury occurred. The compensation board does not challenge the fact that the accident occurred; they do not challenge the fact that Mr. Cutajar's back was severely injured. From the day of his accident right up to today he has not had one pain-free day. X-rays taken immediately after the accident showed a relatively normal spine but with a possible disc forced out of place. X-rays taken only a few weeks later, in January of 1967, showed marked lumbar degenerative changes. This had occurred in these very few weeks.

Mr. Cutajar was treated with physiotherapy and was fitted with a brace which he has worn since that time.

On July 2, 1967, his family doctor, Dr. Jerry Zadyko of Annette Street—a good Conservative I might point out—told him that he would never again be able to do heavy work. Dr. Zadyko contacted United Co-operatives and asked if they could find light work for Mr. Cutajar, and they said they would try.

On July 4 he went back to work and he was given the job of chipping floors with a 12 lb. hammer. After a very short time, he found the pain was unbearable and he was unable to continue with this work so United Co-operatives fired him. They said it was really just light work and a healthy investigator from the compensation board went to United Co-operatives and he wielded Cutajar's hammer for two or three minutes with no discomfort at all, and the investigator agreed with United Co-operatives that this was light work.

Mr. Cutajar's compensation was then reduced to $16.48 per week, and he came to me at this point. I was a little innocent then, and I was sure there had been a misunderstanding so I got in touch with the compensation board and said we wished to appeal the ruling. On December 5, 1967, I went with Mr. Cutajar to the workmen's compensation board and we were heard by the appeal board.

Before going I wanted to make sure there was no error, so I got in touch with Dr. Zadyko, who was still looking after Mr. Cutajar. He confirmed that Cutajar was severely injured, was not fit for anything but the lightest work and would never be able to do regular work again, would never be able to maintain the same position either sitting or standing for any period of time ever again.

Despite the clear-cut facts in this case, the appeal tribunal denied Cutajar's appeal and rejected his claim out of hand.

Is this speedy justice humanely administered with doubts resolved in favour of the workman?

The interesting thing about this case, and half a dozen others, is that in each of these cases I have had a certificate from the doctor looking after the workman saying, "yes, these are the facts, the workman cannot work," and the compensation board will not even believe the doctors. There is not any doubt here. If there was a doubt, fine, resolve it in favour of the workman, but here there is no doubt. The doctor gives a certificate and the compensation board says it does not matter, we are not going to pay him.

There is a further horror in this case. Mr. Cutajar carried United Co-operatives long term disability protection plan, the cost of which had been deducted from his pay in the years that he worked there. After being turned down by the workmen's compensation board, he naturally applied for his insurance benefits, but of course he was refused on the grounds that his case was a compensation one and therefore was excluded from the plan. There are your insurance companies again.

Mr. E. A. Winkler (Grey-South): United Co-operatives!

Mr. Shulman: That is right. It is a private company.

Two weeks ago Mr. Cutajar was seen by one of Canada's best orthopedic specialists. He hold him he could not work and would have to be re-admitted to hospital for further treatment. Yet the workmen's compensation board still will allow him only $16.48 per week. If the hon. Minister of Labour were in this House, Mr. Speaker, I think he should hang his head in shame.

The second case is, if possible, even more flagrant. This man's name is Bronco Tepuric, and I draw this case particularly to the attention of the member for Sudbury. Mr. Tepuric lives at 276 Sixth Street in New Toronto. Mr. Tepuric worked for the International Nickel Co. in Sudbury from 1950 until 1963.

Examinations of his chest when he first went to work were completely normal. He was X-rayed then; we have the report. The area where he worked in INCO was badly polluted with sulphur and other fumes and beginning in 1957 he began to suffer from bronchitis, which by 1962 had turned to asthma. Let me say that even the workmen's compensation board does not challenge the medical findings.

Most important, I have a letter here from the Sudbury doctor who was familiar with the patient and all his circumstances. His name is Dr. M. Fostiak, 51 Elgin North, Sudbury. It reads as follows:

> Mr. Bronco Tepuric has been suffering from bronchial asthma of mixed type due to polluted air at the place of his employment.

A clearer cut case could hardly be imagined, yet let us hear what the review committee of the workmen's compensation board decided. Mr. Tepuric's claim was rejected because, and I quote:

> There is nothing in the history of claimant's employment with the International Nickel Co. to suggest any undue or prolonged exposure to noxious fumes. Claimant's condition is one that is not uncommon among the general public.

Is this resolving doubts in favour of the workman?

These cases are not unique. I have many, many more and you are going to hear the details of all of them before we are through with this session of the Legislature. It is time that Ontario had a humane workmen's compensation Act whose first concern is the workman's welfare, not the employer's purse.

Before leaving the subject of the workmen's compensation board, I just would like to bring out one other matter which came up this morning in my office, and which every doctor, I am sure, in the city is aware of. The real basic problem arises I think because the rates at which the various firms are assessed are decided primarily by the number of claims and the severity of those claims; in fact not only primarily, but almost completely. The result is that firms do not wish their workers to receive compensation.

Now I am sure every doctor in Toronto and throughout the province has had dozens of claims where a man has been injured at work. The employer will phone and say, "Well, we do not want to put him on compensation; let him come in and sit or lie there in the office. We will pay him. We do not want the compensation board to know about it."

The whole system is wrong, because it is to the employer's benefit not to let the compensation board know of the accident. Then if later on trouble arises from the accident, that worker has not got a chance.

I have another case—I wish I had the details here but I will bring it up again—where a man had exactly this incident occur. He was given $100 cash by his Toronto employer so as not to report the accident to the compensation board.

He then developed further trouble, which obviously was going to be very serious trouble, and it had to be reported to the compensation board because it appeared as though the man might be going blind from the accident. As a result of reporting to the compensation board and letting the compensation board know about the $100, the man was then fired. This is compensation the way this government runs it, and it is no good.

I would like now to turn briefly to the hon. Minister of Transport (Mr. Haskett), and I am delighted that we finally have a Minister who is here, partially at least.

Mr. Sargent: He is always here.

Mr. Shulman: I do not intend to deal in detail with this particular hon. Minister's department which, unfortunately, is one of the less competent in this government. There are very serious matters that have to be discussed in this particular department, matters like compulsory automobile inspection, but I think the proper time to bring those matters up is in the estimates.

However, there is one matter which is relatively unimportant in the context of this department but it has become urgent, and I am bringing it up today, as I told my former boss at other times, in the hope of preventing a future death and, perhaps, this particular Minister will listen better than the last one.

Last week in the House, I asked the hon. Minister about the new rule which has been brought in by his department, instructing driving instructors that they must disconnect safety controls when people are taking driving tests.

And the hon. Minister replied in answer to my question that there had only been five complaints from driving instructors and as such—I hope I have summarized his answer fairly—he did not intend to change this rule.

Again I must point out, Mr. Speaker, through you to the Minister, that obviously the driving instructors, just like the workers, have a better idea where to write to get action, because I had received letters up to that time from 16 driving instructors while the Minister had only received five.

And I thought, perhaps, just to lay the information before this House. I will read one of these letters, which will explain the problem.

This particular letter is from a man who lives at R.R. 1, Stoney Creek, Ontario.

Dear Dr. Shulman:

As owners and operators of driving schools in the Hamilton and surrounding area, we received a letter from The Ontario Department of Transport, copy enclosed, sent to all driving instructors ordering us as of March 1, 1968, to disconnect the dual controls with which our cars are equipped.

This is so contrary to all publications and statements the same Department of Transport has made regarding driver safety and accident prevention, that we feel something is wrong somewhere.

The reason given, that people supposedly feel on their own when taking a test is, in our opinion, not the real reason for this change, but let us assume it is. Is this then a good enough excuse to allow student drivers to go hitting other people's cars, knocking over pedestrians or causing maybe fatal accidents?

When one does his test for a pilot licence, also accompanied by a government examiner, dual controls are most certainly not removed for the obvious reason of saving lives. In different countries in Europe, Holland for one, one is not allowed to appear for a driver's test unless in a vehicle equipped with dual controls or equipped with a hand brake, located in such a position that the examiner "can at all times easily reach it." Human lives apparently still count in those countries.

It has been argued by Department of Transport officials that "when people go for their test they are supposed to be ready." If this is so, why then still insist on examing them and why then do a certain percentage still fail? Examiners are under order that no more and no less than 30 per cent should fail.

That is an interesting side issue.

The use of the dual controls has more than once been a ground for dispute, because lately some examiners have flatly refused to use them and have deliberately allowed student drivers to run into other cars.

The examiners then stated that they did not have to use the dual controls. When asked what they would do if a child was in danger of being run over, they would then say, "Oh, if there is personal injury, we will use the duals."

> How, however, can anyone say beforehand whether or not there will be personal injury? The Department of Transport treats this all very casually and always comes out with "We are not responsible anyway."

And there we are. That is the real reason behind all this, the responsibility.

Yet The Highway Traffic Act states that the owner of a vehicle is responsible, but is it also not true that someone who has the means and the ability to avoid an accident but fails to do everything in his power to prevent it, is guilty of negligence?

Is it fair to hold the owner responsible when he is not in control of the car? Is not even in the car? And to top it all off is denied the right to install equipment for the purpose of protecting himself and others? That people or even the examiner himself may get killed in the process seems immaterial.

Mr. Sargent: Time, time!

Mr. Shulman: If this happens, we have at least the consolation to know that the student driver had a feeling of being on his own.

Mr. G. Ben (Humber): I am curious. Are not the very instructors who are complaining about the removal of the dual safety controls in the car, the ones that recommended these pupils to the department as being ready to take an examination to acquire a licence?

Mr. Shulman: The examiners do recommend, and this is quite true, but on the other hand I think all of us must be aware that these are still new drivers who have taken a a certain number of lessons, and the number, of lessons, of course is not up to the examiner. The number of lessons is up to the pupil and at any time, as you well know, sir, the pupil may try his test with or without the blessing of the examiner.

Mr. Ben: I would think that the driving instructors would be rather stupid to let them take his car to be driven in the test by a pupil he knew was not sufficiently well trained or prepared to operate the car.

Mr. Speaker: Would the members please discontinue their private conversation and direct their remarks through the chair?

Mr. Shulman: I agree with the principle of what the hon. member has said. On the other hand, as I have already pointed out, many of these drivers obviously are not ready whether recommended or not because 30 per cent of them are failing.

Mr. Ben: That is a thing the member ought to pursue.

Mr. Shulman: I also wish to read into the record, a letter which has been sent to The Department of Transport, dated February 19, 1968, and signed by 13 different driver-examiners but which, apparently, had not reached the hon. Minister before answering my question. It is addressed to:

> The Minister of Transport,
> Ontario Department of Transport,
> Parliament Buildings,
> Toronto, Ontario.
>
> Dear Sir:
>
> Having received a letter—

Hon. I. Haskett: Did the member say driver-examiners?

Mr. Shulman: Private teachers. To continue:

> Having received a letter from Mr. W. J. MacIntyre, director, driver branch, of your department, dated January 31, 1968, ordering all driving instructors in Ontario to disconnect the dual controls, we herewith wish to inform you:
>
> (1) That we question the authority of any government department to order anybody, at any time and on any grounds at all, to disconnect or make inoperable any safety device which is installed for the sole purpose of preventing accidents and loss of life.
>
> (2) That we question the right of your department to refuse for a road test, any motor vehicle which has passed, not only our required safety regulations, but in addition also a strict safety check by the police department.
>
> (3) That we question the right of your department to refuse for a road test, any motor vehicle on the grounds that a safety device has not been disconnected.
>
> (4) That we refuse to comply with this order.

There is a recent cutting here from the Toronto *Daily Star* reading as follows:

> STUDENT DRIVER KNOCKS DOWN TWO—FAILS HIS TEST
>
> A student driver knocked down two people at the Downsview driving centre yesterday. He was in a car with dual controls but they were disconnected in accordance with a recent order. The driver failed to get his licence.

I have, in addition to all this, a brief aimed to reduce traffic accidents by adequately regulating upgrading driver training schools, presented to the Minister, Department of Transport, province of Ontario, by the Canadian regional director, national professional driver education association incorporated, president of the Central driving school, Toronto, Ontario.

This was presented in Toronto on January 26, 1968. It is rather lengthy and I will not take the time of the House by reading it into the records.

The Minister has a copy of it but one of the most important points in this brief again, is that unless this rule that the hon. Minister has brought in is rescinded, there are going to be deaths at that driving testing centre.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Shulman: The member would be surprised, one never knows what will sell.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Shulman: Now I would like to continue my brief, non-controversial speech by turning to the law society.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): What about the medical school?

Mr. Shulman: Oh, I will get to that. I have been aware for some time of the very poor situation in the discipline committee of the college of physicians and surgeons, and that would take two or three days. I will reserve my discussions of that body until the estimates of The Department of Health come up later in the session.

Mr. Sargent: Is he not a member?

Mr. Shulman: Oh, yes. I am a member. However, I have had a recent experience with the law society which indicates that its discipline committee is also set up, not for the benefit of the public, but rather to protect the profession.

I think this will indicate that the time has passed when the professions can be allowed to discipline themselves. There is trouble in the nursing profession, there is trouble in the medical profession, there is obviously trouble in the legal profession.

Justice McRuer—I would like to make a few comments about his report later on. It is a great and wonderful report. He has made a suggestion—made one suggestion for which I would like to take a little credit. For some six years now I have been recommending publicly that all of these boards have a non-professional member or members present to give the public a voice on them. I am delighted to see that particular recommendation has been put into the report.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Shulman: Yes, as a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I would like to reply to the hon. Minister. Yes, I did help the Chief Justice. I had the pleasure of presenting a brief to him and am delighted to see that a number of my points have been incorporated into his report.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I guess as a Liberal appointee, this one will be considered more non-partisan.

Mr. Shulman: Yes, he was a non-partisan judge which is sort of unusual to be found on that side of the House.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: He was a Liberal, that makes it okay.

Mr. Shulman: If he is Liberal, I would expect he would be far less partisan than if he were Conservative.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, the reason this particular matter which has to do with the law society arose, is because of the government's hatchet man, one Charles Dubin. Mr. Dubin is a lawyer of great talent who has been employed by the Conservative Party on a number of embarrassing occasions when it was necessary for them to run for cover.

Mr. Farquhar Oliver, then leader of the Liberal Party, said in 1954 that Mr. Dubin "should get a title from Queen's Park for the work he did for the provincial government" in covering up the highways scandal. This was when some good Conservative construction companies worked together with highway department employees to defraud the people of Ontario of some millions of dollars.

Dubin was named special counsel for the Ontario Attorney General to handle the project, and he made a cosy arrangement with the companies whereby they pleaded guilty, had their wrists gently slapped, and carried on.

Charles Dubin is the man who, by some strange coincidence, became defence lawyer in the northern Ontario natural gas scandal and, at that time, he was quoted in the October 26, 1964, *Globe and Mail* as saying,

and I quote him, "It is no offence for a person in office to receive a gift".

He thinks bribes are perfectly all right, provided they are received by his Conservative friends and clients. Charles Dubin is the man who was chosen by the Conservatives to act as defence counsel in the Spence inquiry and he there advised the leaders of the Conservative Party to walk out of the court and remain out of the court, thereby showing his contempt for the judicial process.

Charles Dubin is the man who, subsequent to this, made a speech to the law society in which he spoke of the deep inequities of Royal commissions and then proceeded to conduct the Parker commission in a way that even embarrassed his fellow counsel.

At one point, even the good Conservative judge was moved to remark that he would have to protect the witness against Dubin. In any case, I do not want to discuss Dubin today, although I am curious about one thing and that is how much of that $48,000 which the hon. Provincial Treasurer mentioned the other day, they paid to Mr. Dubin for his services.

He broke every rule in that hearing that I would regard as ethical, and I am curious as to how much the government had to pay for that supreme service.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Shulman: Well, I am really not, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Lewis: What in heaven's name is the relevance of that?

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, since this matter has been raised by the hon. Minister, let me say that I have come here as a member to represent all the people in my riding, not any special group. I have not come here as a member of Jewish extraction nor am I ashamed of that.

Let me say that Mr. Dubin's standing in the Jewish community has nothing whatsoever to do with the services which he has performed for the Conservative government, and once again may I suggest that the hon. member opposite has spoken without thinking.

In any case, to get back to the law society. On October 23, 1967, I wrote to the discipline committee about one specific action of Charles Dubin's. During the Parker commission hearings, I supplied copies of my brief to the three newspapers on the condition that they be used only for accuracy checks when printing excerpts of my testimony.

Mr. Dubin took advantage of his position on the board of directors of the Toronto *Telegram* to procure their copy of my brief, which he used openly when preparing his case and in my cross examination.

This was, of course, unethical although perhaps not by this gentleman's standards and I requested that he be accordingly disciplined by the law society. On November 28, 1967, I was informed by the secretary of the law society that they had examined my complaint and found no evidence of unethical conduct on Mr. Dubin's part.

They did not, however, go through the formality of hearing my evidence, nor that of any of my witnesses. I thought that this was a little odd, but that, perhaps, it was because of Mr. Dubin's political connections. However, since that date, the following letter has come into my hands written by Donald S. MacDonald and let me assure the House, this is the Liberal Donald MacDonald from Rosedale, who is the federal member of Parliament, not our Mr. MacDonald.

The letter is written on the stationery of the House of Commons; it is addressed to Mr. G. A. Martin, Q.C., head of the discipline committee of the law society, and it is in connection with a complaint against a relatively unknown lawyer, a Mr. Fogler, who had recently been dismissed by the law society.

I quote:

> It seemed to me somewhat extraordinary that the discipline committee would hear and dismiss a complaint without examining any of the documents, or hearing for the complainant any of the circumstances out of which the complaint arose.

This, apparently, is the normal pattern of hearing complaints by the discipline committee of the law society. They hear the lawyer who has been accused. They do not bother to hear evidence against him and they say, nothing is wrong here.

Hon. members, through you, Mr. Speaker, this is a disgrace; if these professions are allowed to misgovern themselves, the time will come when there will be a public scandal of tremendous proportions. In the public interest, we must set up a public body to be responsible for disciplining the professions because they are unwilling to do the job themselves.

And let me say at this time, I think that these bodies should contain a majority of members from the various professions. The suggestion made by the hon. Mr. McRuer

that the discipline committee contain representatives of all professions is a wonderful suggestion. If the government brings in this suggestion, the abuses which we have seen will disappear very quickly.

And now, let me continue my talk with a brief reference to that sterling character, the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Wishart), the gentleman who is responsible for truth, law and order in this province. Unfortunately, is also not present in this House.

Last April, after I was discharged from my position as chief coroner, reports appeared in the press to the effect that the research into traffic deaths by Dr. John Porter had been discontinued. The Attorney General made haste to deny this, and he is quoted in *Hansard* on April 24, 1967, as follows:

> Dr. Porter has not been removed from the study, in fact the study has been enlarged and he is continuing in it. All the material from each of those inquests is being made available to Dr. Porter, who will carry on his study.

The hon. Minister repeated this on May 5, 1967, and I quote:

> At the same time, every facility is being afforded him to continue his research into traffic deaths/fatalities.

Sad to say, the hon. Minister appears to have been mistaken on both occasions. I have been in touch with Dr. Porter, and since the day of my discharge on April 8, 1967, instead of being enlarged, the study was cancelled. Furthermore, in direct contrast to what the hon. Minister said, not one iota of material has been forwarded to Dr. Porter.

Frankly, I do not expect very much in the way of accuracy from this government, however, the hon. Minister is the chief law officer for this province, and he is supposed to set some sort of model to be followed. He has deliberately misled this Legislature.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Oh no! The member cannot say that!

Mr. MacDonald: Why not? He just provided the evidence.

Mr. Shulman: He has deliberately misled this Legislature and should be dismissed forthwith.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Along with all the rest.

Mr. Shulman: And let me say that deliberately misleading this Legislature, in my opinion, is not nearly as serious as failing to carry out changes which could prevent deaths in this province.

Let me say a few words about the hon. Prime Minister of the province, who is also not in his seat, and about Prudential Finance. I must say that the Premier, the hon. Premier, has appeared very sensitive on this subject.

In fact, I have an affidavit here which indicates that he quite lost his temper in Ottawa last October and shouted at a group of Prudential creditors, and I quote:

> You people put your money in Prudential and I do not intend to do a thing about it. I am sick of Prudential. I have been met by a group of you in every city in Ontario.

The Premier has good reason to be sensitive about this subject, because a number of Prudential notes were sold by the use of his name. I would like to read into the record, the following letter, and I quote:

February 14, 1968.

Dear Dr. Shulman,

As my representative at Queen's Park, I would like to tell you how and why I purchased Prudential Finance notes. I read the glowing epic account of money to be made by buying the notes. I therefore called at number 2 King Street East to make inquiries.

I was shown into the office of Mr. Lapowsky. After listening to the usual salesman's praise of the fabulous returns from Prudential Finance, I ask for the names of the directors. In surprise Mr. Lapowsky said, "Surely you know the names of the directors!"

I replied that I had never known of the company until I read the advertisement. For some time, Mr. Lapowsky fumbled among the papers on his desk. I had not intended to buy at once, and I got up with the intention of leaving. Mr. L. then handed me the sheet which I am enclosing, with the names of the board of directors.

As I glanced over it, Mr. L. said, "You will know those names."

"No," I replied, "there is not a name there that is familiar to me."

"Surely you know the name of Cecil Carrothers?"

"No, who is he?" I replied.

Mr. L. looked down at me with withering contempt, and pointing with his finger read:

"Cecil B. Carrothers, QC, London, Ontario, senior partner in Carrothers, Fox, Robarts, Betts, Menzies, and MacLennan. Mr. Carrothers is a business partner of Premier Robarts of Ontario," said Mr. L.

I was sure that the Premier of Ontario was beyond reproach, and so I bought the notes.

Yours truly,
Margaret Wood,
62 Vernon Street.

This is not the only reason that the Premier has cause to be embarrassed, for he, the hon. Premier, was the lawyer who arranged the incorporation of Prudential's subsidiary, Prudential Family Credit, in December 1967.

Furthermore, in October 1959, when Prudential was already in sufficient financial difficulty to offer the infamous Mr. J. B. Brien a five per cent commission if he could raise some funds for the company, the hon. Mr. Robarts, then a Minister of the Crown, interviewed the executors of the estate of A. T. Taylor, in his role as solicitor of the estate.

He explained that Prudential was reorganizing its capital, and if I may quote Mr. Robarts' partner, Mr. Carrothers, and I took this quote out of the hon. Provincial Secretary's files, and I quote:

To provide for additional common shares which will eventually be offered to the public.

As a result of this interview with the hon. Prime Minister, he was not then the Prime Minister, the executors consented to reclassification of the particapating preferred shares to common stock. The subsequent meeting of the shareholders of Prudential Finance on November 14, 1959, which carried out this reclassification of the stock, took place in the hon. Prime Minister's office.

It is also highly significant that on November 24, 1959, Prudential Finance was sent a letter, stating that its request to split—

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Mr. Speaker, I do not follow the statement made, and I question it, as to its accuracy, that a meeting was held in the Prime Minister's office, about Prudential Finance.

Mr. Shulman: To answer the question, the office of Robarts, Betts, MacKenzie, Carrothers, as arranged by—of course he was not the Prime Minister then.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: The member read it, and he has smeared the Prime Minister. The way that he reads it, and presents the case, he smears everybody.

Mr. Shulman: I would like to answer the hon. Minister through you, Mr. Speaker, that this is written as John Robarts, and in order to reply to the request that I call everybody here honourable, whether I think that they are or not, I preceded that before each of the names as they come up.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: The member has inferred to me that this was in the Prime Minister's office.

Mr. Shulman: If there is any doubt in the Minister's mind, and I speak through you Mr. Speaker, as there seems to be so much doubt and fuzziness in this particular Minister's mind, let me make it quite clear, this action took place before the Prime Minister was the Prime Minister, and the office referred to was in London, the office of the hon. Mr. Robarts, or whatever I may call him—

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): I would ask that the hon. member be requested to have stricken from the record the words, "this meeting was held in the hon. Prime Minister's office."

Mr. Speaker: I believe it would be proper, that such remarks, if those, in fact, were the remarks of the member for High Park, that they should not be part of the records of this House. If they be so said. Will the member for High Park advise the House if he has it printed there exactly what he said?

Mr. Shulman: I have it here printed, and may I read it word for word?

The subsequent meeting of the shareholders of Prudential Finance on November 14, 1959, which carried out this reclassification of the stock took place in Mr. Robarts' office.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: That was not how the member said it. He said the hon. Prime Minister's office—

Mr. Shulman: I was told that I could not refer to him as Mr. Robarts.

Mr. MacDonald: May I speak on a point of order?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Continuing my point of order, the hon. member, when he spoke—and I think that the records will show this—said that the meeting, and I quote: "the meet-

ing was held in the honourable the Prime Minister's office."

Mr. MacDonald: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, our difficulty here is a very simple one. I hope that those on the other side of the House are not going to complicate this situation. We will get down to the details of this at another time.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Well the fact—

Mr. MacDonald: At least six or eight times, the Speaker or the Deputy Speaker, has risen and reminded a new member of the House that he should not refer to anybody other than as the hon. member, the hon. Prime Minister. If the hon. member with the floor used a name as is done by many new members inadventently, he was reminded that he must not use the name. So what the hon. member for High Park is doing instead of reading "Mr. Robarts," which is in his text, he is using the term Prime Minister.

Now the hon. Minister shakes his head.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: I sure do.

Mr. MacDonald: If the hon. Minister had been here yesterday, he would know what took place, but the problem is that the hon. Minister—and many others as the seats indicate—are not here so they do not know what is happening. But this is the explanation, and I would suggest, Mr. Speaker—

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: That is a matter of a fair interpretation.

Mr. MacDonald: —if I may speak without being interrupted.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: The member for York South may proceed.

Mr. MacDonald: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think that this difficulty would be overcome if the rule were clarified that if a person was reading a record with regard to something that took place in such-and-such an office, and it is in a permanent record, then he is entitled to use the name even though it is that of an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Provided that he add some qualifying words such as "in his private capacity" or whatever.

Mr. MacDonald: He said 1959, I can understand the reasons for the Minister's sensitivity, but we will get around to the reason for that later.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: This man is smearing—

Mr. Ben: Mr. Speaker, I have heard your ruling on this side.

Mr. Speaker: I believe that the member for High Park should be accorded a little more courtesy.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Not so long as he smears everybody.

Mr. Ben: I heard your ruling on this and I have been listening rather attentively to the hon. member who is speaking. If my memory serves me correct he made the statement "the hon. John Robarts"; and then he added, "he was not then the Prime Minister."

Mr. MacDonald: That is right, that is right.

Mr. Ben: But your ruling was that if the statement was made, as is alleged, by the hon. Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs then it should be stricken off. Fine. If it was made the way it was alleged, it will be stricken off, so why argue?

Mr. Speaker: I believe that the member for High Park should be extended a little more courtesy in view of the fact that it is his maiden speech.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Not so long as he smears everybody.

Mr. Speaker: If it was so stated as the hon. Prime Minister indicating that he was the Prime Minister at the time, it should be stricken from the records. However, I believe that the intention was not such and that he did, in fact, state that he was not the Prime Minister at the time.

I would ask the member for High Park to proceed.

Mr. Lewis: Uneasy lies the head of the Minister!

Mr. Shulman: Just to remove any doubt, Mr. Speaker—

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: I will just take the member out in the hall.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Would the member for High Park please continue with his speech?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, just to remove any doubt I would like to repeat one phrase here—"In his role as solicitor for the estate"

in case there is a great deal of doubt over there.

I would like to go on to something else which is even more significant. On November 24, 1959, Prudential Finance was sent a letter from the Provincial Secretary's office stating that its request to split its common shares 100 for one was refused by the Provincial Secretary as a matter of departmental policy. They had requested permission to split the stock so they could sell it to the public. On November 24, 1959, this request was refused.

Exactly 10 days later The Provincial Secretary's Department ignored its own stated policy and its own letter which it had sent out, and gave Prudential everything they had requested, including the 100 for 1 split.

It is an interesting mystery and is worth looking into why the Provincial Secretary's office would make such an interesting change so rapidly without any correspondence. I can tell you how it occurred. Again, going through the hon. Provincial Secretary's files has been most instructive.

After receiving this letter the Provincial Secretary's office received a visit from one David Ongley, a rather prominent Conservative and somehow he managed to persuade them that Prudential should be given what they asked. If this had not taken place the serious troubles that took over and followed upon this, beginning in 1959, would not have occurred.

Let me get this quite straight so there is no confusion. I am not suggesting that the hon. Prime Minister did anything illegal, unethical or improper. What I am saying, is that because his name was attached to this company, innocently or otherwise, we as a Legislature owe it to him and to the people of Ontario to do something for the people who suffered because his name was used.

These are the facts. In the light of these facts it is incumbent upon us to take some action to help the Prudential noteholders who have had their savings stolen from them, if for no other reason than to maintain the good name of this province. And, of course, primarily in the name of simple humanity and justice.

Mr. Speaker, today I had not really intended to deal with The Department of Commercial and Financial Affairs. The matters which I wish to discuss there largely have to do with insurance and it would take some hours, or perhaps some days, to deliver all the material necessary. I think perhaps the proper place for most of that is in the departmental estimates.

However, because of comments that have been made by the hon. Minister today I think perhaps I should make some comment about his department because I would not want him to feel left out. Since my party has assigned me to criticize this particular department I really think I should say something flattering about this particular Minister who, I see, has left his seat. We are losing them all.

I thought and thought of what I could say today that would be flattering about this particular Minister. I really spent a great deal of time upon it and I could not really decide what I should say. So rather than saying something that he might object to—because he objects, apparently fairly easily, to things that I have said—perhaps instead of that, I will read what someone else has said about him—an editorial which was written about him during the recent election campaign. I am sure that he will be flattered by this. It is in the *Packet and Times,* in the Orillia newspaper, and the heading is: "Mr. Rowntree did not help!"

This is in the form of an editorial:

> Mr. Rowntree handed Orillia, Simcoe East and his own Conservatives the biggest slap in the face in years when he turned up for his meeting with the Tory executive apparently operating under some difficulty. At least nobody could make out what he was trying to say.
>
> The tapes made by CFOR were apparently the funniest things in years. It is lucky for Rowntree that the station manager was kind enough not to use these tapes. Maybe they could rent them out for LSD parties. Things have really reached a bad state when a local candidate has to go around apologizing for Cabinet Ministers. Gordon Smith has our sympathy.

An hon. member: Straight gutter. Who wrote that?

Mr. MacDonald: Does the member say what is written in the *Packet and Times* is gutter? Is that what he is saying? Mr. Speaker, is the hon. member saying the editorials of the *Packet and Times* are "gutter"?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: Is the member sure he can?

Mr. Shulman: Following the election—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Shulman: I am coming to the point of this garbage. Following the election, the Minister's speeches did not improve perceptibly. On October 19 last he is quoted in the Woodstock *Sentinel Review* as having amazed his audience with a bitter attack on Woodstock Mayor, James F. Hutchison, who had committed the cardinal sin of not attending a speech which the Minister gave in Woodstock. At that time he was quoted in reference to the increasing New Democratic support as telling the audience that—and I quote the hon. Minister: "Not to divide the forces of decency, to know the common enemy and to make sure these subversive elements do not upset the economy of Ontario."

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): That sounds like him all right. That is the garbage that—

Mr. MacDonald: He is the man who accuses others of smearing.

Mr. Shulman: I had no intention of reading these. This is not in the printed material which I had released. I had no intention of reading these matters into the record, Mr. Speaker, but the comments made in and outside of the House by this particular hon. Minister needed some reply.

In connection with the insurance system, I do wish to point out that the present auto insurance system—

Mr. MacDonald: That is where your fellows are.

Mr. Shulman: —is completely unsatisfactory because there are thousands of dissatisfied victims. Later I shall be presenting a detailed suggestion that our automobile insurance system be changed to a system of compensation, regardless of fault, with a policy automatically given to every licensed driver and paid for partially by an increase in the gasoline tax—perhaps completely.

This will not only remove the unfortunate situation where people are injured and can receive no compensation, but will also free our police from their most onerous, time-consuming and useless duty, and will unclog our needlessly choked courts. The saving in time and dollars will be worth many millions. The prevention of human misery will be immeasurable.

Before concluding my remarks in reply to the Speech from the Throne I wish to say what will probably be the most important thing I shall ever say in this House. I am going to make a plea to this government which I hope will be joined in by all members of this House from all sides. The plea which I wish to make is in reference to those British citizens of Indian origin who are now trapped in Kenya. There are very few occasions in one human being's life when he can do a truly great humane act, and today our hon. Prime Minister has this opportunity.

The background is this. Many years ago there was a tremendous labour shortage of skilled labourers in Kenya. The British government invited—they advertised in India—many thousands of workers to go to Kenya, initially to work on the railroads, and subsequently to manage the stores and make their lives there.

These people are an industrious group. Their crime rate is practically nil, their unemployment rate, up until now, has been entirely nil. They are a clannish group, like the Chinese. They look after their own. They are a group that any nation would be proud to have living amongst them. A horrible thing has happened in the country where they had lived for the past many years, however. New laws have now been passed which at first forced the many thousands of them in government service out of service. Now, far worse, there are laws going into effect which will force those who are in private business out of their own businesses. They will not be allowed to carry on as petty artisans and as storekeepers as they have for generations. It is with great regret that I say it is only 31 years since we saw a similar law enacted in Nuremburg.

These people at first thought they had a safety valve; that they could go to England, but that safety valve, that place of refuge, has been now closed to them. The rest of the world is also closed to them.

When a horrible thing happened in Hungary some ten years ago, the hon. Prime Minister sent one of his Ministers, who is present here in the House, to Austria to encourage and to help people to come from that country here. He is responsible for saving, if not the lives, at least the futures, of so many thousands of Hungarians who had nowhere to go. At the present time our federal government who, of course, have the prime responsibility for immigration, have a team in Nairobi who are trying to do something for a small number of these Asiatic Kenyans.

I am giving my plea to this government that we, as a House—and I hope that this can be done politically—express our desire to have a group of these people come into Ontario; and express our wish to the federal

government that these visas be granted and that we send the hon. Minister or other trained personnel to Nairobi to encourage, I would say, a group of 10,000 of these people to come here.

We will never regret it. They will be an asset to our province, to our city, to our country. I put this forward and this is the one thing in my speech which I hope will be agreed to and supported by everyone in this House. It has to be done now; they have no way of earning a living unless something is done and there may very well be a slaughter such as occurred of the Arabs in the neighbouring country of Tanzania. If we do this we shall set an example which the rest of the world may very well follow and may solve the entire problem. It is something we will be proud of for many many years.

I would like to make a brief comment on the McRuer Royal commission inquiry into civil rights, the document of which I am sure everyone in this House is proud. I am particularly proud, particularly in relation to the section which has to do with coroners.

These are recommendations, 194-208, which if brought into effect would solve most of the problems facing the coroner systems in Ontario today. I am very pleased and proud that many of these recommendations were in the brief which I presented to Mr. McRuer. I hope that the government will take rapid action in bringing these suggestions in the report into law.

I would like to make just a brief comment about the private members' hour, I should say farce of the private members' hour. The private members go through the motion of drawing up bills, presenting bills, bringing them into this House, talking about them for 15 minutes and then forgetting about them.

Yet these are bills, some of which I have heard already, presented from all sides of the House, and some of these bills are supported by members of all sides. We have heard bills brought in by the Conservatives which surely the Liberals and ourselves would support; and I am sure that there are bills that have been brought in by our party that will be supported by the official Opposition, and by the government. Similarly there are bills that have been brought in by the official Opposition which will certainly receive our support and I am quite sure will receive the support of many members in the other side of the House. Yet none of these bills ever comes to a vote.

Now if we are going to continue with the private members' hour, surely we must allow the bills to come to a vote; give the hour time in proportion to the various parties, in proportion to numbers in the Legislature. But let each bill come to a vote. If the government does not wish the bill to pass, they have enough members to vote it down. Otherwise we are just going through the motions and wasting our time and the time of this House.

To conclude, I wish to make a few remarks about the Parker Royal commission. I do not intend to again go into the many details of the matters considered by the commission. I am quite sure that everyone in this chamber has long ago made up his mind on all the matters that were argued before Judge Parker.

There are, however, two things which are far more important than the peripheral matters which have received so much discussion. These two are the roles of the coroner and the judge in our society.

Before going into these two matters I wish briefly to tell of the denouement of one of the cases because time has a funny habit of establishing where truth lies. One of the important cases investigated by the commissioner involved the death of a woman following faulty surgery. I had run into some difficulties with the hon. Attorney General, because I had complained that the doctor's drinking habits were pertinent and should be brought out at the hearing and that four out of five members of the coroner's jury were patients of the doctor involved.

The commissioner gave these arguments short shrift. I quote from page 78 of his report:

> There is no doubt that the composition of the jury left something to be desired, but the evidence indicates the jury was not biased, was not improper and that the foreman was not currently a patient of the doctor involved.

Then it goes on further in quoting Dr. Shannon:

> The man had been suspended by the college of physicians and surgeons for a period of six months but he had been restored and when the college restores someone's licence, they are very sure things have been corrected.
>
> Consequently, it seems to me that Dr. Shulman's allegation that something was not explored that should have been, is not supported by the evidence. If, as he says,

he based his allegation on this fact, then his premise was false and the allegation untrue.

Judge Parker, unfortunately, and I say unfortunately in the fullest sense here, was just as incorrect as the college. The doctor about whom I had warned so strongly, so strenuously, continued to drink excessively. Finally, yesterday, his family made arrangements to drive him to Toronto for admission to a hospital for treatment of his problem. On the way here, he shot himself.

If the supervising coroner, or the higher officials, had done their jobs a little more conscientiously, instead of, perhaps, from lowest motives hiding the truth, this doctor would have received treatment three years ago, and might very well be alive and in practice today.

I am not using the name of the doctor; I do not wish it. His name was not used at any time in the hearing and I do not wish to cause suffering to the family.

On a more amusing note, I would like to draw your attention to page 54 of the report. There is one particular case, and I really throw this in for amusement value and to give some indication of the way in which the commission was conducted.

In one particular case, in which a certain hospital death had occurred, an investigation was taking place. The Ontario hospital commission sent up an independent expert, a gentleman with many initials after his name —his name was Dr. MacGregor—to hear the evidence and give independent evidence as to the situation at the hospital. He was an official independent expert from the Ontario hospital commission.

I quote from the report, page 54:

> Dr. Gordon Campbell, a surgeon from the MacGregor clinic in Hamilton gave opinion evidence as to the equipment facilities . . .
>
> Also appearing as an expert, but having been called in as a friend of the doctor who owned that particular hospital and as a private expert to give his own opinion, was Dr. Roderick Gordon—

He also had some initials after his name and I thought it might be amusing to the House to hear how the good commissioner referred to Dr. Gordon.

This was in the next paragraph:

> Dr. Roderick A. Gordon, BSc., MD, FRCP (Canadian), FFARCS, FACA, professor of anaesthesiology at the University of Toronto, consultant of the Canadian forces, a member of the medical council, on the staffs of the hospital for sick children, and women's college hospital and Sunnybrook hospital, after hearing the evidence—

This sums up the report. As to the role of the coroner, there are two very opposing views.

The position that I took in my role as chief coroner, and which has caused so much controversy, was that the job of the coroner was to expose unsafe conditions and make recommendations to prevent future deaths. This view has been violently opposed by many officials and official bodies who feel that the duty of a coroner is simply to determine the cause of death and nothing more.

This issue is one of basic importance, because in many fields, if the coroner does not do the job of exposure and prevention, there is literally no one else willing to do so. And I would like to give you one example:

There was a child named Christopher O'Kelly who died in this city four years ago, following a tonsillectomy operation. And up until the time of Christopher O'Kelly's death, inquests were not held into this type of death.

Three or four, or two to four deaths from tonsillectomies were occurring in Toronto every year; they were all really occurring from the same reason; each hospital was making the same mistakes other hospitals were making, and nobody communicated, nobody was aware, nobody exposed.

The coroner who conducted this particular inquest, and did a very good job, I may say, was one of the men on my staff, and he did a complete, front-page exposure which upset so many people. He pointed out the errors that every hospital in this city was making in caring for children after tonsillectomies, because no one should die following a tonsillectomy. And as a result of Christopher O'Kelly's death, the rules in every hospital in Toronto, and I believe in many outside Toronto, were changed. Since that time, there has not been a death following tonsillectomy in Toronto or in this surrounding area.

Mr. MacDonald: Far more important than the whole Parker commission report.

Mr. Shulman: But this is really what it was all about, even if the commissioner did not discuss this aspect of it. This is what a coroner should be doing. Now it does not matter who is the chief coroner, or who is the supervising coroner, rules should be laid

down, and the coroner knows that this is his function and that no one will interfere with this function. All of the other matters of personality, and who was right and who was wrong, is so unimportant in comparison with this type of thing.

I call on the government to bring in legislation, affirming this role of the coroner as modelled on the English law, as a public servant working to prevent unnecessary deaths.

The other matter which is almost as important, involves the role of the judiciary in our society. And one of the hon. members has said how disturbed he was to hear the judiciary being criticized, and I am just as disturbed. But during recent years, last year especially, there have been strange things happening in our courts.

We have the Truscott case, and I do not know whether the Truscott boy was guilty or innocent, but I must accept that he was guilty —the Supreme Court finally decided that he was—but one thing there is no question about, he originally received an unfair trial.

We had the Bernard Mask case where a man could have pleaded, "guilty" and received a fine of $28 but made the mistake of pleading, "not guilty" and was fined $500 for the same offence.

We had the Timbrell case—this will be discussed in further detail in here. I need not say anything about Judge Landreville. Finally, we have the situation with Judges Spence and Parker who were put in untenable positions.

Basic responsibility must lie with our governments. No judge should ever be injected into a political dispute, or put in a position where he might be forced to come under criticism, if public respect for the judiciary is to be maintained. And, similarly, no judge should allow himself to be so used.

However, even more important than the use of judges for political purposes, is the question of who is appointed as a judge in the first place. As things now stand, the only real apprenticeship required is to be a political workhorse for the party in power.

Surely it is time in this country that we can make our most important appointments in a less crass way. Surely it would be better to entrust the nomination of our judges to the benches of our law society, with final decision—

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): No, never!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Shulman:—made by the government. And as I have already pointed out, this body is not flawless.

Mr. Sopha: The Attorney General (Mr. Wishart) is a bencher—he would appoint himself.

Mr. Shulman: But I do believe I still think the final decision should be made by government. But I do believe that the law society would do a far fairer job than any government could do simply because the political aspect would be removed. One of the hon. members has suggested that the benchers would end up as judges, but I am not sure that this would not be a better system than we now have.

I have just one final remark before I close. One of the hon. Ministers has asked me to step outside. I believe by that, he wanted me to step outside and repeat everything I have said here in reference to him. The last thing in the world I wish to do is to become embroiled in another lawsuit, if for no other reason, that this would stop all discussion of the matters which I have raised in this Legislature, besides the personal wear and tear.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Shulman: However, there is one matter which I have raised today which is very close to my heart, and that is the matter of Prudential.

So I am going to make a suggestion to the hon. Prime Minister. I will repeat anything I have said about any Minister in this House, word for word outside, but, if the libel suits they bring then fail—if they succeed I will pay and we will hear no more of it—but if they fail, I ask him then to take the steps which this party has suggested for the benefit of those people who lost in Prudential.

Hon. D. Bales (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I understand an area of responsibility associated with me has been under question in this House this afternoon. And I would like to put a question to the hon. member for High Park.

My question is simply this, he has mentioned a group of people who may be suffering because of their claims in reference to the workmen's compensation board. I would ask him to give me a list of those 20 or 30 people that he mentioned, and give it to me today so that we may deal with those matters directly with the board. I may say to him that I want to deal with them just as I have done with the one case that he has referred

to me. If he will give me those, I will see that they are dealt with now.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Shulman: Will the Minister accept the 150? I will supply mine today. Will the hon. Minister accept them from the rest of the members?

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the hon. member for York South refers many questions or cases directly to the board. If he wishes to refer them through me, it is quite all right. I presume he has followed the former practice for many years, just as other people have in this House—I did it when I was a private member, and I received good co-operation—I am sure he has too.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, may I reply—

Mr. Speaker: Order please! Would the member for High Park be willing to comply with the request of the Minister of Labour?

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, I have already referred each of these cases to the board, but I would be glad to give a list to the hon. Minister.

Mr. Lewis: The Minister has favouritism with the board?

Mr. S. Apps (Kingston and the Islands): Mr. Speaker, or Mr. Deputy Speaker, may I, along with the other members of this Legislature who have taken part in this debate, extend my congratulations to the Speaker, through you, sir, on his election as the Speaker of this House? As he has no doubt already found out, his is a difficult job, but I have no doubt that he will perform his duties fairly, efficiently and well.

At the same time, Mr. Speaker, may I also add my congratulations to you on what I consider a very well deserved appointment. I would also like to take a moment at this time to record my thanks to the people of Kingston and the Islands for their support during the recent election which was held on October 17, 1967.

I appreciate very much the confidence that they have placed in me, in giving me the privilege and the opportunity of representing them again as a member of the Progressive Conservative government in this Legislature.

In answer to a question put to me the other day by the hon. member for Sudbury (Mr. Sopha), I feel that the answer has been probably given to him as a result of what happened last night, and it will probably be further confirmed when the final results of what is going to happen on Saturday night, are tallied. So there should be no real problem from there on.

Second, the question that I put to the hon. member, the hon. leader of the NDP (Mr. MacDonald), which was not answered, although I must say it was answered in part. In reading over what he did say, I feel that probably the description could be obtained, or given, to any municipality or any city in this province.

It is my feeling that those areas of potential growth are not confined to the larger areas of this province, and it would take, I think, more wisdom than is contained among all the members of the Legislature in this building, to determine what areas in the province are going to be areas of potential growth and what areas are not.

There are many small areas throughout eastern Ontario particularly, like Napanee, Gananoque, Kingston, that I feel are areas of potential growth. Each of them has special facilities to offer to industries, and each of them should be given an equal opportunity to obtain these industries.

Approximately five years ago, I stood in this Legislature and asked that the Ontario government give serious consideration to the building of a bridge from Cape Kingston to Wolfe Island, and then to Cape Vincent on the American shore. I gave some reasons why I felt such a bridge would be of great benefit to the whole surrounding area.

I was gratified to learn some time later that the De Leuw Cather Canada Limited had been commissioned to make a financial feasibility study of such a bridge. This report, I believe, is almost completed and we in Kingston are waiting optimistically for its publication.

The hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. MacNaughton), and the Minister of Highways (Mr. Gomme), know from their many discussions with delegations from Kingston and Frontenac county, of the importance that the people of our area attach to such a project.

We believe that the building of this bridge would be the greatest single thing that this government could do to improve and expand the economic, recreational and tourist potential of this historic area of eastern Ontario. It is interesting to note that the two ferries now travelling between Kingston and Wolfe Island carried, during 1967, an excess of 160,000 vehicles and 112,000 pedestrians.

These figures, I am sure, would be only a small percentage of the potential traffic that would use such a bridge. It is also worth noting that the Thousand Islands bridge carried over one million vehicles this year. Apparently, there is some consideration now being given to the necessity of adding an additional span to this bridge in order to carry the peak loads of traffic.

A second bridge at Kingston would relieve, to some extent, the number of cars using the Thousand Island bridge and would make it unnecessary to add another span. In addition, profits of the Thousand Islands bridge, I am advised, could be used to help pay the carrying costs of a new Kingston to Cape Vincent bridge.

Mr. Speaker, the time for action is now. The feasibility study shortly to be released, I hope, will be the first step in making the Kingston, Wolfe Island, Cape Vincent bridge a reality.

Kingston is fortunate in having a great university located within its borders. Last fall, Queen's University celebrated the 125th anniversary of its founding. The contribution it has made to the people of Ontario in almost every field of education has been tremendous. And it, along with other universities in this province, has played its part in the rapid expansion that has taken place in the university enrolment, and the building of new facilities that this enrolment has made necessary.

Located, as it is, in the centre of a fine old residential area of the city, its expansion has been made possible only by the purchase of many of these residences. Being a tax exempt organization, every new acquistion by the university has resulted in a reduction in the assessment, and consequently in tax revenue available to the city. This has increased the tax burden being shouldered by the remaining property owners who feel, and rightly so, that the providing of existing and future services for the university, should not be reflected in their tax bills.

I believe they are justified in their complaints. Over the years this has resulted in a certain animosity being built up between the university, and many of the citizens of Kingston. This is regrettable because Queen's University has made, and I am sure will continue to make, a tremendous contribution to Kingston educationally, culturally and financially.

There are very few organizations in our city that do not benefit from the contribution Queen's personnel make on their behalf. We are fortunate in having Queen's in Kingston; we are glad it is there. We must, however, solve the one problem that has caused hardship to many of our citizens. We must have a more equitable distribution of the cost of providing municipal services to Queen's University, and relieve our property owners of the necessity of shouldering the whole burden of providing and maintaining these services.

Many people in Kingston benefit financially from Queen's. No one will deny that; the great majority of propery owners who must pay taxes on their own homes do not. The Smith report has recommended that universities should pay municipal taxes.

I believe that this recommendation is a sound one and is one that is vital to the growth of the city of Kingston, particularly as the university's expansion and growth has only been accomplished at the expense of taking over some of the best residential property in the city.

I realize that exceptions should not be made for certain areas, and that anything that is done about this problem I have been discussing must be done on a province-wide basis. This provision in the Smith report should be given first priority.

Universities today do not benefit only the area in which they are located. Enrolment at Queen's comes primarily from areas other than Kingston. The benefits of the education the students receive are enjoyed by all the people of this province.

It follows that all the people of this province should bear a share of the cost of providing the services that are now looked after entirely by the taxpayer of Kingston and, similarly, by the taxpayers of other areas which have universities within their borders.

An hon. member: That is true.

Mr. Apps: These municipalities must be given the right to tax university property. In return, this money should be reimbursed to the university as an addition to the operating grants now being provided by The Department of University Affairs.

I believe that this is a logical and reasonable request, and I would hope that legislation to this effect will be forthcoming during the session of this Legislature. The same careful examination must be given to all tax-exempt properties within municipalities.

The Smith report again makes definite recommendations on this type of property. The city of Kingston has a committee working diligently on this whole situation as it affects Kingston, and I know that the information

and recommendations that this committee will bring forth, will point out, extremely well, the onerous burden that tax-exempt property has imposed on our citizens.

A total of 26.05 per cent of the overall assessment of the city of Kingston is tax-exempt, and this is considerably higher than any other municipality in this province. It highlights, I think, the number of federal, provincial and university buildings and institutions in the area.

How this has come about I am not quite sure; perhaps this has been the result of the good representation we have had over the years; perhaps we are a focal point in eastern Ontario, the hub of the whole district and a very desirable place in which to live.

However, be it as it may, our taxpayers are being asked to pay too much for the facilities that these institutions need to have, the benefits of which are enjoyed by all the people of Ontario. It is my understanding that the federal government now pays a grant in lieu of taxes of approximately 75 per cent of what the municipal taxes would be on their buildings.

As a temporary measure, I would suggest to the Provincial Treasurer that a similar grant be paid by the provincial government which could cover 75 per cent of the tax-exempt assessments of those provincial facilities in all municipalities that at the present time, are paying no municipal taxes at all.

Such a grant would relieve the tax burden on many people who can ill-afford to pay it, and it would be an effective interim measure to help maintain and reduce the spiralling municipal taxes imposed on our home owners, until a complete study on all tax-exempt property can be made.

Mr. Speaker, last Thursday evening, I had the pleasure of attending a reception given by the province of Ontario in honour of a young Canadian who has brought fame to herself and to her country during the recent winter Olympic games—Nancy Greene and members of the Canadian ski team for whom this reception was held. Nancy won the Olympic gold and silver medals in the skiing competitions. This was without a doubt a tremendous achievement, rarely equalled by anyone. As a matter of fact, the only comparable feat as far as Canada is concerned, is that achieved by Percy Williams, who won two gold medals for Canada during the 1928 summer Olympics.

Nancy Greene has been enthusiastically welcomed home by many government dignitaries from the Prime Minister of Canada down, and rightly so. Her victories are a good example of what Canadians can do in international competition when they are given a little bit of encouragement and financial help in the form of scholarships, and in particular athletic scholarships, which to some people seem almost like a dirty word.

I have mentioned this several times in this House before. Our universities in Ontario must be prepared to accept students on athletic scholarships provided they can pass their entrance qualifications and then maintain their standing while they are there. This, by the way, is already being done in British Columbia. Does anyone know how many young athletes in Ontario accept athletic scholarships from universities in the United States? Perhaps it would be a good idea to find out, for it must run into hundreds, and perhaps even thousands.

The future quality of our amateur sports insofar as international competition is concerned depends on our willingness to provide athletes, such as Nancy Greene, with financial help.

I might say here that Nancy Greene has done more for the young of this country than any government, I think, in this whole country combined. She is a tremendous example of a fine young Canadian girl and I feel that we can have many more of these provided we give the necessary help. Let us build up the calibre of athletics in our universities. Let us stop the migration to American universities. Let us, indeed, encourage our athletes in a tangible way.

Are we not a little bit ashamed when we think of what athletes such as Nancy Greene have done for our country, and then realize how little we do as a government to help them achieve what they have done? There are many young athletes in this province who, if given an equal opportunity to that which is offered to athletes of other countries, will do just as well and better.

Mr. Speaker, in this regard may I read a section of the report of the Ontario Legislature's select committee on youth, as found on pages 159 and 160, which has this to say about athletic scholarships and I quote:

> Many young people who have developed not only an avid interest in sport but attained high skills in one or more athletic areas often have excellent academic records. Yet our universities have not accepted the principle that such persons should be considered as scholarship material.

The committee has in mind those students with academic records that make them eligible to enter almost any university in Ontario. Besides being good students academically, they are outstanding in sports activities. The failure of Ontario universities to permit capable students to receive scholarship money on the basis of athletic skill is costing the province a high price. For as a result of this situation many of these bright, talented students accept athletic scholarships from United States universities.

It is a delusion to believe that these students are likely to (a) receive inferior education at those American universities, such as Princeton, Harvard, Michigan, Dartmouth, Minnesota or other fine educational institutions in the United States; or (b) return, in the majority of cases, to this country once they receive their education across the American border.

What is happening is that many good Canadian students—the number is significantly large, according to members of the physical fitness branch of the federal government and others—are being lost to this country because our educational policy refuses to recognize sports proficiency, an important commodity to this country as well as any other. Not only is sport a commodity of major importance in the vocational field for young Canadians, but it is an asset that in no way impairs academic ability, or indicates a lack of it.

Canada cannot afford to lose a single Canadian student with high academic potential for any reason that can be overcome by a small monetary inducement such as a sports scholarship. From evidence submitted in this report, our country is spending thousands of dollars annually in providing incentives to induce many educationally unqualified and relatively unskilled immigrants to come here from foreign lands. When they arrive more money is spent to try to train them to meet language and modest employment requirements. Yet at the same time, no effort is made to keep well-trained Canadian athletic students in their mother country. This is an incongruous situation, to say the least.

Yet athletic scholarships make sense and have important commercial overtones. The young athlete improves his education, he is able to go to a Canadian university and his special talents in sports are not lost to another country.

There are many reasons to believe that the future high calibre of athletics should be identified with the universities. To effectively raise the standards of physical fitness, quality of sport performance and inspire good athletes to stay in this province, money should be provided for athletic scholarships in Ontario.

And the select committee recommends that athletic scholarships be accepted by our universities for outstanding athletes who have the academic qualifications for university entrance; and a survey should be taken by a provincial youth department to assess the loss to this province of university calibre students as a result of the inducements of American college sports scholarships.

Mr. Speaker, with this in mind, I propose that the province of Ontario, through the appropriate department, and I am not quite sure which one that may be—it may be The Department of Education – provides 50 athletic scholarships to universities in Ontario for promising young athletes who can meet the admission standards of our universities.

Along the same lines, recreational facilities in our Ontario universities must be improved to a standard comparable to that of our academic facilities. Universities used to provide these recreational facilities on funds donated by alumni, or from some special benefactor.

This help now, apparently, is not forthcoming in the same degree. It is now quite apparent that recreational facilities must be financed on the same basis as academic facilities, with the universities themselves establishing the priority as to what is required and when.

And I would recommend strongly, Mr. Speaker, that The Department of University Affairs implement the same grant structure for athletic recreational facilities as they now have for academic facilities, this being, at the present time, 85 per cent of the total capital required.

As a matter of fact, the time may soon come when an even higher percentage is required for both kinds of capital expenditures.

Mr. Speaker, in summing up these remarks, I have tried to emphasize once again the importance of the Kingston, Wolfe Island, Cape Vincent bridge to the development and overall economy of Kingston and district.

Second, I have shown that it is most important that tax-exempt properties in municipali-

ties should be required to pay their fair share of taxes for municipal services, and this is particularly appropriate in the city of Kingston which has such a high percentage of tax exempt property.

Third, I have urged the province of Ontario to provide athletic scholarships for young athletes, and finally I urge upon the province of Ontario to provide the same grants for athletic and recreational facilities in the universities as they now do for academic capital expenditures.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to spend a few minutes in outlining to this House some of the things that have happened in the city of Kingston over the past four and five years.

Listening to some of our hon. friends opposite, one would get the impression that our government has done very little for the people of Ontario during that period of time. The member of the Liberal Party and the member of the New Democratic Party expounded to some length about the fact that the government of Ontario does nothing for eastern Ontario, and listening to them you would feel that we are a very much neglected part of the province.

It seems a little bit incongruous when you look around the representation on this side of the House from eastern Ontario. Something must have been done down there to warrant the return of so many members from eastern Ontario.

To give an example of what I feel has been happening in my riding which I classify as part of eastern Ontario, I would like to tell you some of the things that this government has done in co-operation with the people of Kingston to make my city of Kingston and the Islands a better place now than it was four and five years ago. Like the hon. member for High Park (Mr. Shulman), I am going to start to single out various departments and show what they have done on behalf of my people in Kingston and the Islands.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): You must be a good boy.

Mr. Apps: First of all I would like to start with The Department of Highways. I might mention that I hope that the new Minister of Highways is as good a friend to Kingston and the Islands in the next four years as the previous Minister of Highways was in the previous four to five years.

Mr. J. H. White (London South): Same thing in Brantford, Brant county.

Mr. Apps: We have a beautiful new regional and district office which I had the honour to help open along with the hon. Minister from Frontenac-Addington (Mr. Simonett) and the hon. Minister of Highways last spring.

This is a fine new building. It brings a considerable amount of revenue to the city of Kingston yearly. I think it is in excess of one million dollars, and I think it recognizes the fact that Kingston is the centre of the eastern Ontario region as far as The Department of Highways is concerned.

Five years ago the ferry to Wolfe Island was operated by the township and the residents of Wolfe Island were required to pay a certain percentage of the deficit on this ferry. Over the last five years steady improvement has taken place. The Department of Highways has taken over the ferry, they have added another one and the ferry is free to those people who wish to travel between Kingston and Wolfe Island.

More important, the department has seen fit to provide an icebreaker that will allow these ferries to operate between Kingston and Wolfe Island on a yearly basis. The people on Wolfe Island are now, for the first time in their history, able to go back and forth from Kingston to Wolfe Island on a regular schedule, whether it is summer time or the winter time, and this is provided free by The Department of Highways.

I have been advised that this has resulted in the saving to many families on the island of at least $300 a year. Believe me, when people say you have done nothing for eastern Ontario I say: "Ask the people of Wolfe Island what we have done for them."

The Amherst Island ferry, five years ago, operated from 6:45 a.m. to 6:30 p.m. and if you were not on or off the island by 6:30 you were there for the night. The islanders paid, I think, 30 per cent of the deficit of the ferry and the ferry ran only periodically throughout the day.

At the present time, the department has taken over the cost—the complete cost of the ferry—which I think has saved the taxpayers on the island approximately $10,000 a year and which is a fair amount considering there are approximately 400 people there.

However, we still have a little way to go, I say to the hon. Minister of Highways, in that for six to eight weeks in the winter time the residents of Amherst Island are completely cut off from the mainland unless they want to drive back and forth on the ice.

I have had the pleasure, or maybe I should say, the misfortune of doing that several times this year and it is not a very comfortable feeling. I might point out that when the ferry docked for its last trip it was on the Amherst Island side and it has been indicated to me that The Department of Highways officials are certainly not going to go over on the ice to check and overhaul the ferry over there, because they do not want to travel on that ice. They will not send people over on the ice to fix up the ferry over on the Amherst Island dock.

Mr. Speaker, if The Department of Highways will not send their workers over to fix up the ferry, how do they expect the residents of Amherst Island to like going back and forth on the ice daily in order to get to the mainland?

So, I feel that in the years to come, there must be some arrangements made to improve the facilities of getting from Amherst Island to the mainland during the winter.

The time has come, and I think is probably past due, where residents of this province are isolated for a period of eight weeks in the winter time, because the transportation is not sufficiently well arranged to look after them.

Now this may cost some money, it may result in a more powerful boat and it may have to result in better ice-breaking equipment but I think that eventually this must come.

However, I might add that the people of Amherst Island are very much appreciative of the help The Department of Highways has given them over the last four years, and they are very much better off than they were before. When they say to me, you have done nothing for eastern Ontario, I tell them, go and ask the people on Amherst Island what we have done for them.

The Department of Highways has helped to build the Sir John A. Macdonald Boulevard in the heart of our city. They are now doing construction work, or preparing to do it on the counter street connecting link, and on the bridge over the CNR track on the western part of Princess Street in Kingston.

There is a proposed limited access throughway now in the design stage which is being presented to The Department of Highways for Concession and Stephens Streets which will enable traffic to go through the city much easier now than it did before.

So Mr. Speaker, The Department of Highways has done a great deal for the people I represent, and as I mentioned before, I hope that the present Minister of Highways will do the same job for us as we have had done in the last previous years by the now Provincial Treasurer.

Let us go to The Department of Education. It is my contention that the city of Kingston has the finest all-round educational facilities of any comparable city of its size in the province of Ontario and in the Dominion of Canada, and I will tell you why—

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Next to Welland.

Mr. Apps: Even better than Welland.

An hon. member: Oh no, we cannot buy that.

Mr. Apps: First of all, we have some of the finest elementary and secondary schools in the province. We have Queen's University, of which the province, has, over the last four years, contributed in excess of $20 million in capital grants and a like amount in operational grants.

We have been very fortunate in having located in the city of Kingston the St. Lawrence college of applied arts and technology. I would like to compliment the Minister of Education (Mr. Davis) in our government, along with those members opposite who supported this concept—and I think many of them did—for the idea and the carrying out of what I feel has been a tremendous revolution in the history of education in this province. I will tell you why.

We opened last year in Kingston with an enrolment of 250 students and, I think, about 150 in Cornwall. The projected enrolment for next year is 465; for 1969-70 it is 680; 1970-71, 750; and 1975-76, 1,160. This is in the city of Kingston.

I would like to quote a few words from an address given by Mr. R. C. Short, the president of the St. Lawrence college of applied arts and technology, which I think outlines to some extent what I mean when I say that this has been a tremendous improvement in the overall education in our city and, I think, in Ontario.

> The colleges of applied arts and technology are first and foremost an opportunity. An opportunity for both secondary education to one, two or three-year programmes in the area of technology, applied arts and business. The student interest in employment needs of the Ontario counties along the St. Lawrence were the governing factors in the choice of courses offered

at St. Lawrence in this, our inaugural year. We have good strong classes in each of the following areas:

3-year course in engineering technology with 52 students.

3-year course in business administration with 75 students.

3-year course in home economics with 14 students.

2-year course for electronic technicians with 39 students.

2-year course for industrial chemistry technicians with 17 students.

2-year course for mechanical drafting technicians, 24 students.

2-year course for instrumentation technicians, 43 students.

2-year course in general business, data processing 83 students; accounting 33 students.

2-year course in early childhood education, 29 students.

A total enrolment of 409, made up of 250 in Kingston and 150 or so in Cornwall.

Members will observe that these courses are disciplines, related to a particular need and designed for a special clientele. In relation to staff—this might be interesting to the hon. members:

We have received over 350 applications for the 35 academic positions at the colleges this year and were able to select the highly qualified staff, many of whom have their advanced masters degrees and all of whom have the equivalent knowledge level through experience. In addition to the obvious commission of imparting useful knowledge the academic staff is fully cognizant of the responsibility.

So, Mr. Speaker, contrary to what some people said that we would not be able to find staff, I think this proves conclusively that there has been no problem in finding good, adequate teachers for the positions that were open. Again I quote:

Finally, our philosophy is based on a belief that the campus for St. Lawrence is the community, that community interest and imagination are the college's lifeblood. We invite the community to actively participate in college affairs and, through the advisory committee, help us determine selection of the courses and their contents. We have raised our recently chosen college colours marking the establishment of not just another school, but a vital centre for training and retraining to better equip people for the upward movement of human functions in all occupational roles, which now requires them to generate knowledge and information rather than energy.

Mr. Speaker, I firmly believe that the new colleges of applied arts and technology are going to revolutionize the post-secondary education in this province and particularly in the city of Kingston. I, for one, and I think I speak for all the people of Kingston, am very, very happy to see this college situated where it should be in the city of Kingston.

I would also like to pass on to you a couple of comments of parents who have students in this college. These came from parents who were concerned about their children because they had not been doing well in high school for one of any number of reasons. They have come to me voluntarily and said that they were delighted with the progress that their boys were making at the new college and they were very thankful for the fact that we had that college there in Kingston. I think that this probably proves beyond any shadow of a doubt the great help that this is going to be to all our people in our area.

An hon. member: What about the girls?

Mr. Apps: I am sorry I did not catch the hon. member's question.

An hon. member: I asked about the girls.

Mr. Apps: I think it applies to the girls as well.

In addition to this we are fortunate in having in our city the new MacArthur College of Education. Sometimes I despair whether it is ever going to be built, mind you. But the fact remains that it is there, it is progressing, I would say favourably, and I would hope that in the very near future a start will be made on the actual construction of the facilities of this new college of education.

So let me sum it up. We have good elementary and secondary schools, we have Queen's University, we have a college of applied arts and technology and we have an Ontario College of Education. Whether this has been the result of good government planning or good co-operation by the citizens of Kingston with this government in electing a Conservative member down here, I am not quite sure.

Now may I go on to parks development and tourist development, and outline to the

members here the situation that we find ourselves in in the Kingston area. I am going to start with my hon. friend from Prince Edward county and the sandbanks of Prince Edward county.

There is no finer park in the whole of eastern Ontario than the sandbanks in Prince Edward county. The number of people who go to that park is tremendous.

Now in case I offend my hon. friend from Frontenac-Addington, I might add there is another fine park a fair distance north of Kingston—Bon Echo park in camp Mazinaw which is bulging at its seams and is one of the most popular park areas in our vicinity. We have Adolphustown park at the Glenora ferry; we have the Fairfield park, Fairfield house, along Lake Ontario Highway 33. We are in the process of accumulating a 9,000-acre park just north of Kingston, which I think has almost been completed and which will also add greatly to our parks area in this district.

We have the Little Cataraqui conservation authority, who have developed a green belt with the help of the province and the city between Kingston and Kingston township. Some people tell me that that is because, "You want to put a division between the township and the city so you will not fight so much over things."

But I think the real reason is because they want to provide a green belt for the pleasure of the citizens of Kingston and Kingston townships in between the two particular areas. We have our Centennial park in the city of Kingston, a gift from the provincial government in recognition of Kingston's unique place in our country's history.

This has been developed in front of our city hall, and those of you who have seen it, I think, will realize that this is one of the most improved areas in the whole city of Kingston. We have Old Fort Henry and the Old Fort Henry guard which, I think, everyone will agree is one of the finest tourist attractions in this whole province, if not in the whole of our country.

Many of you have seen the Fort Henry guard. I think it took part in the opening ceremony of our pavilion down at Expo, and I think it is internationally known. It is a tremendous credit to The Department of Tourism and Information for the way in which it has developed Old Fort Henry and the Fort Henry guard. And finally, in case I bore you with this—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Apps: —The Department of Lands and Forests has recently, I understand, turned over to the St. Lawrence parks commission, a 500-acre park on Wolfe Island. It is on the southwest corner of Wolfe Island peninsula, jutting out into Lake Ontario with a beautiful sandy beach in the bay, a view of the lake steamers going back and forth just to the south.

This will be one of the finest camping, picnicking, swimming and tourist areas of any kind in the whole particular area. Fishing too, I should not forget the fishing. So when people tell me, "You have not done anything for eastern Ontario," I just like to enumerate a few of the things that this government has done, with the co-operation of the people of the area, for the riding and the area for which I have the pleasure to represent.

I am quoting here a statement:

> A recent study by the parks integration board shows that Frontenac county now has 13,354 acres of parkland or .16 acres per person based on 1966 population figures. This includes provincial parks, conservation authority recreation areas, and parklands of the St. Lawrence parks commission.

From this it appears that Frontenac county leads all others in the province in the amount of parks acreage available per capita, and parks development in the Kingston area has by no means ceased.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think that we have been very plentifully endowed by this government as far as parks are concerned.

Now, may I just spend a minute on "elderly citizens' housing". I would like to outline to you the situation as it affects the city of Kingston. First of all, we have the House of Providence. This is a very fine home for elderly citizens in our city. I had the privilege of visiting it on several occasions and was impressed with the calibre of the help and accommodation that is provided for elderly citizens at the House of Providence. It is full.

Then we have Rideaucrest which is our city home for elderly citizens. I had the opportunity just a short time ago of helping to open a fine new addition at Rideaucrest. And here again I must congratulate The Department of Social and Family Services.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): He should not break his arm!

Mr. Apps: I am just trying to show members. When members say we have not done anything for eastern Ontario, I am just trying to show that we have.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Apps: Rideaucrest is a wonderful spot. The only problem that it does not solve is the loneliness of our elderly citizens, and that can only be solved by ourselves, by other citizens, who are really interested in making them feel at home.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): It is wonderful. I wish we had them in northern Ontario.

Interjections my hon. members.

Mr. Apps: I might say, as far as Rideaucrest, we still have a few vacancies. So, any of you gentlemen who want to retire prematurely might come down to Kingston.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Apps: We might find accommodation for you. In addition, there is a new county elderly citizens home being built just outside the city of Kingston, to look after the needs of those elderly citizens in the county of Frontenac. In addition to that, we have the St. Marys of the Lake hospital for chronically ill. It also is doing tremendous work for the chronically ill people, not only in our area, but I think far outside the borders of Kingston.

But do not let us forget the elderly citizens home, and here I want to show how important is the co-operation of interested citizens within a community. I would like to pay my tribute and congratulations to the Kinsmen club of Kingston and those people who have done so much for the Kingston elderly citizens home. They have built approximately 70 units for elderly citizens in the city of Kingston. Demand is still great. They are in the process of building 31 more. This, as you know, is a combination of CMHC loans, the $500 per bed grant from the province, and all the dedicated hard work and financial help from the citizens of Kingston.

In addition to this, the Ontario housing corporation has received tenders recently for 30 more units of elderly citizens homes.

I do not know whether many of you have visited these people in these elderly citizens homes, but if you have not you should go in and visit them and ask them how they like it. If you want to find out what they feel about the province of Ontario, and whether we have been of any help, go in and ask them what they think of their accommodation. You will come away with almost tears in your eyes—

Mr. G. Bukator (Niagara Falls): Oh no! They will smile, they will be happy.

Mr. Apps: —to think how appreciative they are to have this type of accommodation at a reasonable rental.

Mr. Bukator: They not only enjoy it, they like it there.

Mr. Apps: They sure do!

I have time for a couple more. We have heard a great deal about the need for help for emotionally disturbed children, and I agree wholeheartedly on this. I would like to point out to the members here the facilities that we have in the Kingston area.

First of all, we have one of the first regional psychiatric centres for this province in the Beechgrove psychiatric centre in connection with the Ontario hospital in Kingston, which is beginning to do tremendous work on behalf of emotionally disturbed children. We have the Kingston general hospital psychiatric centre which also, for many years, has been doing great work for emotionally disturbed children.

And finally, we have Sunnyside children's centre which is a private organization and, I think, is one of the best institutions of its kind in this province.

Here again, let me stress the importance of involving private citizens in this type of work, because the government could never hope to duplicate or pay for the dedicated service that many of our citizens are giving for our emotionally disturbed people. This is particularly true of the Sunnyside children's centre.

What I think is needed is a little bit more co-ordination between the three, and I think that this is being worked out.

In case you feel that I am a little bit biased in my remarks, one of the things that I would like to point out—and I would like to direct these remarks to the Minister of Social and Family Services (Mr. Yaremko)—is that I am somewhat dubious of the effects of The Day Nurseries Act, the new Act that has been passed last session, as to how effective that is in the promotion of day nurseries within this province.

I say that because we have a day nursery that is struggling to get started in the city of

Kingston. It seems to me that one of the things that is lacking in the legislation is that they have taken out of this Act, the provision that day nurseries may be licensed by a municipality.

I think this would be a good addition to put in again because otherwise, if you make it the sole responsibility of the municipality, it is going to cost you more money which we do not want to spend. In addition to that, it is going to take away, from the operation of the day nurseries, volunteers who want to be of service. I do not think this is right, and I think that any legislation that we pass that tends to discourage private people from taking part in these kind of organizations is not good legislation.

I would suggest to the hon. Minister of Social and Family Services that he review that provision of the Act as it applies to day nurseries, and to see if something more cannot be done to help these people who are trying to do a good job on their own.

I would like to ask him: How many new day nurseries have been started in the last year, how many day nurseries have ceased to operate, and whether we are better off now than we were before?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Apps: Although the Minister is not here, perhaps he may take note of that and maybe he can tell me—he does not necessarily have to tell me in the House, but he can tell me outside the House.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Apps: Gentlemen, I have several more departments I would like to discuss, but I see the time is almost running out. I did this and I have not prepared it too well, I realize.

But I did this because I get a little bit tired of people sitting over there telling us what we are not doing for our part of eastern Ontario. Come on down to Kingston and see.

I have tried to show you that we, as a government, have done a great deal for the Kingston area and I am sure any one of my colleagues sitting here can tell you the same about their area in eastern Ontario.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Apps: I am not quite finished, I have three more minutes. Finally, Mr. Speaker, may I congratulate our Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts)—

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Singer: The hon. member should have started with that.

Mr. Apps: —for his vision and his foresight in convening the Confederation of tomorrow conference. The exchange of views that were made at this conference has, without question, been of great benefit to our province as well as the other nine. He is to be commended for his concern about the unity of this country.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Father of Confederation!

Mr. Apps: Just a minute. And he is to be congratulated for the way he has conducted the affairs of this province since he became Prime Minister in 1961.

Now, regardless of what our friends in the Opposition may have to say, the fact remains that Ontario is a pretty good province in which to live—

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Apps: —and it is the most prosperous and the soundest province in this country today. Much of the credit for this, and we do not take all of the credit, we take some of the credit, is due to the sound, stable, progressive government that the Conservative Party has given during the last 25 years.

A word of warning—let us always remember, however, that although we think of ourselves as Canadians, and although we must be concerned of the future unity of our country, let us not forget that our prime responsibility is to the people of Ontario, and that our primary efforts should be directed towards improving the health, happiness and prosperity of the people of this great province.

Mr. Apps moves the adjournment of the debate.

It being 6.00 o'clock, p.m., the House took recess.

No. 18



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

First Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Thursday, March 7, 1968

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1968

5

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Thursday, March 7, 1968

Resumption of the debate on the Speech from the Throne, Mr. De Monte, Mr. Martel, Mr. Winkler 567

Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Winkler, agreed to 594

Motion to adjourn, Mr. MacNaughton, agreed to 595

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, MARCH 7, 1968

The House resumed at 8 o'clock, p.m.

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

Mr. D. M. De Monte (Dovercourt): Mr. Speaker, as I rise this evening to make my first address to this great House, I rise with just a little bit of apprehension. Since the day I was elected, my first speech has been uppermost and constantly in my mind.

One is reminded that it is one of the most important addresses that one will make. But after listening to the hon. gentlemen in this House, I have come to the conclusion that it can be long or short, and the content is pretty well up to the individual.

I thought that, in making this speech, I should say what I feel, and after listening to the hon. member for Lakeshore (Mr. Lawlor), who made a long, philosophical and learned discussion, going right back to the early philosophers, I am struck by the fact that if we look at the philosophers, then we might very easily find out what they were trying to tell us.

They were trying to tell us something very important. For instance, there is one prime factor that stands out in all of the writings of the philosophers, going back to Anaximander, down to Plato, to Aristotle, down through Descartes, Aquinas, Spencer, Webb, Marx, Engels, Nietzsche and all these men.

One thing stands out. They were trying to hammer out four things: They were trying to hammer out man's relationship to God, man's relationship to himself, man's relationship to the society around him, and government's relationship to man and man's relationship to government.

Mr. Speaker, it might be well that we might ponder for a moment and, in pondering, decide that we in this House most certainly must consider all these aspects—for we are the legislators and we legislate man's relationship with man, and government's relationship with man.

And I daresay, Mr. Speaker, that everyone in this House is here because of some contribution that he wants to make, not only to the province and to our country, or to his country, but also to his fellow man.

What does that contribution consist of? In my view, it consists of looking at the laws we legislate, and have legislated, and are about to legislate, to criticize them, amend them, repeal them, but with only one thing in mind, that these are just laws.

Everyone must be equal before the law, and the law must not be arbitrary. We must, like all the philosophers, consider that the common good of man is our paramount consideration, and that the individual is the most important aspect in our society, and that his rights are the most important rights in our society.

The hon. member for Lakeshore gave us a great dissertation of Thomistic philosophy, and, in my view, there is one paramount aspect of Thomism, and that is that the individual must stand above all institutions, and that an individual's rights are sacred.

If I may also say, when St. Thomas Aquinas, in his *Summa Theologica*, was discussing the rights of man, he was not discussing socialism, he was discussing socialization, and the common good of men. And when we legislate, this should be uppermost in our minds, that we are legislating for the common good of man, and that all the people of Ontario are the common people of our province, and that as individuals they are the most important things that we have to legislate about in this august Legislature.

Mr. Speaker, I notice that in the past conference in Ottawa, in connection with provincial and federal rights, the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Wishart) maintained that we do not need an entrenched bill of rights, that our rights in Ontario spring from that great British system that has developed over all the years since time immemorial, and that these rights are inherent in our law, and that is correct. We are fortunate enough to live in a jurisdiction, in a country, where we realize the people's rights are paramount.

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order: I do not like to interrupt a maiden speech, but on a point of order, the hon. member has just said

that the Attorney General maintained that we did not need an entrenched bill of rights. I think that if he would recall my remarks carefully, he will find that this is not the case; that what I said in the conference is that we should consider the whole question of rights, whether entrenched or whether unwritten, in connection with the division of federal and provincial powers. I did not take the position on behalf of the province that such rights should not be entrenched in the constitution.

Mr. De Monte: Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. Attorney General is correct. I used a bad phrase and I—

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Well he might be, but it is a minor difference.

Mr. De Monte: But the point is, if I may go on, that the hon. Attorney General did not think that these rights should necessarily be entrenched, that we must examine whether we should entrench them or not. The whole point is that when we consider the rights of the common good, and of the individual, we also have to consider the Parliament which makes those laws and impinges on those rights, or gives those rights. As Mr. McRuer said in his great thesis on the inquiry into civil rights, Parliament is supreme, and this Parliament is supreme according to our constitution in those areas that were given to it by the fathers of Confederation.

Now when we consider this we should remember that we can abrogate any right, here in this assembly, that we want. We can abrogate them; we can take them away. We can do anything we want to do with an individual's rights.

It has been said that Parliament can make a man a woman if it so desires. When we consider that aspect of our constitution, would it not be a great constitutional path to follow if we would entrench these rights in some way so that these people that could change those rights would be the people of Ontario or of Canada and no Legislature could do it.

I think that this is the beauty of the rights that exist under the constitution of the United States—no one can tamper with those rights.

The right to search is abrogated in the constitution by civil rights legislation and I do not have to worry about some inspector coming on my property to measure how long my grass is or whether my poor wife has finished the morning dishes; or come in and measure the area of my room to make sure that two of my children, one being a boy and one a girl, cannot sleep in that room.

Mr. Speaker, this is the whole point. This Legislature has given the city of Toronto the power to walk onto anybody's property and measure it and if you have not done the dishes, you should take a course in dishwashing.

It seems to me to be just a little ludicrous that we could consider that type of legislation, that the city could consider that type of legislation. Yet some people in the province and in this country, say that we do not need an entrenched bill of rights. They say we have to look at it, we have to study it, we have to do this and that.

In my view, Mr. Speaker, with the greatest of respect, I say that we need an entrenched bill of rights both from the federal and provincial levels.

I should also, Mr. Speaker, like to compliment our Premier (Mr. Robarts) for his statesman-like approach to the most important problem facing our nation today, and that is the problem of welding together the two founding nations into a viable united whole.

As it must be to all Canadians, Mr. Speaker, this problem is one which concerns me very much. Indeed, my concern may be somewhat greater than of those Canadians who have a background different from my own.

I was born in the west end of Toronto. My father came to this great country, and to this great province, as an immigrant from northern Italy at the turn of the century. He was in the forefront of a massive wave of new Canadians which washed over this land and deposited a rich variety of cultures and languages here.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud of the riding of Dovercourt which has been the beneficiary of this rich blend. Within myself, and from the hardworking dedicated people of my riding, I know that a new Canadian is a good Canadian. Clearly, any deliberation intended to weld this land into a single country must consider the hopes and aspirations of these people who make up one third of our nation, and from whom I personally have sprung.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be able to tell you that the wants of the people of my riding of Dovercourt are not excessive. During the last election and since, I have talked to many thousands of them. These people are proud and self-reliant and all they ask of the government is to create an environ-

ment to provide jobs, and job security, homes to live in, to contain the inflationary forces that rob them of the rewards of their labour, and freedom from exploitation of callous employers—and by that, I mean security in their jobs.

Mr. Speaker, it is my strong belief—and a belief which caused me to become a member of my great Liberal Party under the leadership of the member for Brant (Mr. Nixon), to serve in this House—that the government is not truly aware of their desires. I believe that this government is incapable of understanding the needs of the people of my riding, and I believe this government responds to a problem only when it has reached crisis proportions.

Earlier I said, my constituents want an environment which provides them with homes, jobs and job security. Many of my constituents need adequate housing, and, certainly home ownership is their greatest personal and basic need. The response of the government has been to introduce the so called HOME legislation—home ownership made easy. That is a beautiful publicity stunt—a beautiful name. You can remember it, it is short—

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Everything but a house.

Mr. De Monte: I submit, Mr. Speaker, that this legislation was only introduced after shortages of shelter reached a crisis situation and is, in fact, an insignificant answer to the problem.

The average yearly wage of the labour force in Ontario set down by the latest statistics released by The Department of Labour, is $5,200. To qualify for a home ownership made easy plan, the Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Randall) advised this House that the minimum requirement for home ownership made easy is $6,600 a year.

Now that is pretty good for the average man who earns $5,200. He might squeeze his way through, but what about the fellow that earns less than $5,200 a year? What do we do with that fellow? Where do we send him?

Mr. Sargent: He will get a $200 rebate—

Mr. De Monte: That is the point. Let me say this, that this does not make home ownership made easy for the constituents of Dovercourt. It certainly does not. In connection with mortgage interest rates—the government says, "Oh, the interest rates are not our fault. We do not control interest rates."

That may be true, Mr. Speaker, but what are they doing about them? Why do they not subsidize the interest rates? If they are really interested in home ownership made easy, why do they not subsidize the interest rates?

What about the person who has a few dollars but cannot afford the large down payment required to buy a home ownership made easy home or to buy any other home? What could the government do? It could institute, at no cost to the government really, a plan where they could provide low interest rates—second mortgages. If they wanted to do that, they could probably borrow the money at 5.5 or 6 per cent and lend it out at 6.5 per cent. The extra interest charges pay for their administration charges. It would not cost them a cent. But, that takes imagination, something that does not exist over on that side of the House.

There are other ways of making home ownership easy. Some while ago, Mr. Speaker, the government commissioned a study of the division of taxation between the municipalities and the provincial government, and between the provincial government and the federal government, known as the Smith report.

The problem is that they only commissioned reports after the crisis developed. The Baldwin Act which laid down the system of taxation in Ontario was introduced in 1840, when the whole economy of the province of Ontario depended on the rural type of existence, and where the burden of the services provided by the municipalities was on land because that was the only wealth we had.

Now we have developed our wealth. We have stocks, bonds and many ways of collecting our taxes from corporations and other areas and we knew this for 50 years, Mr. Speaker. The development of our province has not taken place in five years. It has taken place over 50 years but the government waits until the crisis develops and then says, "Let us commission a report." Then it takes it five years to bring down the report and when the report comes down, the government says it is going to study it.

I trust that after the study is complete, a viable recommendation will come down to lift the onerous burden that exists on property today. If we could remove that onerous burden, we could make it possible for the municipalities to go ahead with sewer and road development, because it would release more funds for the municipalities.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the government has to distinguish between services to people and services to land, and those services which relate completely to people should be removed from the load of the landowner in Ontario.

The cost of education should be entirely removed. I noticed, talking to some of my confreres in the House here, some of my Liberal confreres from the rural areas, that they say we train a child, we give him his education, we give him a high school education and what happens to him? He goes to Toronto.

The point is this, the municipality is actually subsidizing something the government should be paying for, because when we train young men or young women, they will go anywhere in the province and they will be educated when they go. I think that the province should pay for this cost—the complete cost of education.

My constituents impatiently await the implementations of this overdue Smith report and overdue reform.

On the question of inflation, I sometimes think it is very easy to say what faults, what forces cause inflation. We have the wage-price spiral but what has the province done about inflation? What has the government done about inflation? Nothing. I was disappointed, Mr. Speaker, that this problem, serious as it is today, was not even mentioned in the Speech from the Throne.

Mr. Speaker, in the matter of security for the working man of my riding, I would draw the government's attention to two problems. First, the matter of workmen's compensation. It seems to me from the outcry in my riding and I do mean outcry—I have a file that thick of workmen's compensation cases—

An hon. member: Is the member going to give the names to the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Bales)?

Mr. De Monte: I am going to do that.

An hon. member: He is going to do a lot.

Mr. De Monte: And I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the workmen's compensation board is introducing the adversary system in claims-adjusting in the workmen's compensation board. If I can just mention one thing. A man has a claim in the workmen's compensation board, Mr. Speaker, and if there is some question, perhaps, whether he got hurt or the extent of his back ailment, he can first go to the claims department. That is the first thing he does. Then he goes to the review board, then to the review committee, then to the appeal tribunal, and if that does not work, he appeals directly to the board.

Mr. Speaker, we do not have that many rights of appeal in law; we have three rights of appeal. The other thing is that they are setting it up so that a working man, probably not as articulate as some people should be, appears before a board. The workmen's compensation says to him, "Well, we will give you somebody to help you with your case, but we cannot give you anybody to appear before the board for you." So this poor man goes up before a board, he probably has never appeared before any other type of judicial or semi-judicial or committee board or anything before, but he has to appear before this great board.

So what happens? He is turned down, and he keeps going up and has to hire a lawyer. It is getting to the point where these boards are getting so highly technical, where they keep the file close to their chests so nobody will know what is going on. We had to have a court case so that we could force the workmen's compensation board to release the file to the man who was primarily affected by what was in the file.

Now this does not seem to me to be the function of the workmen's compensation board. If we are going to have rights of appeal and reappeal, let us remove it from the workmen's compensation board, and put it back in the courts.

The other problem is this. In the report that has just been brought down, they said the reason the workmen had to suffer something was the employer is giving up something, therefore the workman gets a little less. This is the McGillivray report.

I do not think that this should be the purpose of the workmen's compensation board. When a man loses a hand, Mr. Speaker, he deserves to be compensated, and not on the archaic principle laid down in 1914, when the workmen's compensation board was introduced. I think that a man who gets hurt on the job has contributed to the development of this province and he should be properly compensated for his inability to earn income because he has lost the tools with which to earn it.

What is it, Mr. Speaker, when a man loses a hand and the board gives him $25 a week? Is that justice? What is it? It is just a complete disregard of the rights of the workmen of this province. We have got to remember that without workmen nobody exists in this province and without the labour force, we may as well all go home.

The board is consciously or unconsciously, Mr. Speaker, introducing very technical appeal procedures. This means that the workman must not only spend time to establish his or her right to recover. In many cases I have been asked, "Where can I get a lawyer to appear for me, because I do not know what is going on." Certainly, he does not know what is going on; he has never been trained to know what is going on.

The other problem is the pensions that are paid to these poor workers, and I do say poor. When a ditch-digger or electrician or a plumber loses a hand, he is losing the very tool by which he earns a living.

Now the philosophy of the workmen's compensation board is "Well, he—the workman—gives up his right to sue—pardon me—the employer gives up his right in law; the employer is getting a benefit so the board will not give the employee that much, we will just give him a little bit—not all he should have—to compensate."

The point is, when a man loses a hand, he should be compensated so that he can live in decency and not a subsistence level existence because he lost a hand. I submit also, that the dependents of deceased workers should be properly compensated. It is $40 a month for each child, and $75 for a wife without the breadwinner. It seems ludicrous to me that these people cannot be properly compensated for their injuries and their deaths. There is no doubt that the workmen's compensation board is the envy of the other provinces and jurisdictions, but we must improve it to the extent that we are giving proper compensation to these people.

There is another aspect that I would like to discuss and that is the construction safety association. Now this is an association that received $1,415,500 from the workmen's compensation board last year. What does the construction safety association do? Does it have any regulatory powers to be able to legislate if a employer is committing some breach of The Construction Safety Act, or The Trenching Act, or all the Acts that The Department of Labour is required to enforce? Does it have the power of enforcement? No. Does it have the power of regulation? No, it does not have any power at all.

I will tell you what power it does have. It has the power to advertise and it costs us $1,514,500. It is with respect that I submit, Mr. Speaker, that this amount could be used either by the workmen's compensation board to give increased benefits, or it could be used by The Department of Labour to increase its staff in order that it could improve inspection procedures within the construction industry.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that the single most pressing problem and worry of the average family in my riding—and of the average family in Ontario—is what happens to someone when the breadwinner gets sick, or when anybody gets sick. Who is going to pay for the high cost of getting sick, and it is a high cost.

In my view, the province needs medicare. The estimates of what medicare will cost, I believe have been well aired from all sides of the House. Some people say it will cost more; some people say it costs less; but there is one overriding factor. Surely, in an issue as important as this, we should find the money to pay for it.

Mr. Speaker, may I take this opportunity to congratulate you on your appointment? I am a new member in this assembly and have been here a few short weeks, but I have noticed that you have kept order in this House in a gentlemanly, sportsmanlike and firm way.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): Mr. Speaker, I would first of all like to congratulate you on your appointment and to express my thanks for the concern you showed during the past several weeks to me.

Mr. Speaker, I come from the land of promise—the land of promise for two reasons: Promise, because of the great potential of the north, should this government do its proper job in the economic development and planning, and promise, because of the great number of promises made by this government and never kept. Here I am moved to suggest another name for the northern regions of this province—the forgotten land.

As with my earlier title—the land of promise—there are two good reasons why "the forgotten land" may well designate the north of this province. First we are forgotten in all ways which really count, and second we are the area to which more promises have been made by this government and then forgotten than any other part of Ontario. I would like to examine a few of these promises.

The one that got the most mileage for the government was, and is, the Timmins highway. From what I can gather, this has been promised for well over 20 years. At last it is being constructed. You might argue that if it is at last being constructed, why register a complaint? A quote from the former member for Nickel Belt on June 9, 1959, will answer this question. He "expected the continuation

of Highway 69 from Capreol to Westree would be started this fall". The government must have forgotten even the route it promised for now the highway is being built in an entirely different area.

It is being built through what one Minister has described as, the more "scenic" part of the area. This is the sole consideration advanced as the reason why a highway to the north is abruptly shunted 30 miles to the west before it gets started in the direction it is ultimately supposed to go.

Far be it from me to belabour these aesthetic considerations, but really, Mr. Speaker, I feel I would not be serving the people who elected me if I did not say now what needs to be said, and has been left unsaid since the days when my friend Bob Carlin stood in these chambers and pleaded the cause of the north in general and Sudbury East in particular.

The extension of Highway 69 is not being built by the shortest, most direct and most reasonable route. It is being shunted west through large timber rights held by Brown Forest Industries. It will provide an excellent access road to this timber and will save Brown Forest Industries a lot of money. It will not go through the area of our forests north of Capreol which are already stripped of a good part of their timber.

The fact that the route is longer, costlier and in a new area is of little consequence, just so long as accessibility to certain cutting rights is obtained, at the expense of the taxpayer.

Forgotten too, is another announcement made on June 9, 1959, by the same member, and again I quote: "A school-hospital for retarded children will be built in the Nickel Belt", Rheal Belisle, MPP announced at a Progressive Conservative meeting in Capreol. Mr. Belisle said that Premier Frost had given him "this wonderful news" when the Premier was campaigning in Sudbury. "It was only proper to make this announcement in Capreol," Mr. Belisle felt, "because mayor Prescott had canvassed and received more than 1,000 names of retarded children in the north, and it was only fair that Capreol get the recognition it deserved.

The Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond) also indicated his support would be given "if the number of mentally retarded children warranted one." Figures in the Sudbury *Star* indicate that by February 18, 1967, the number of known retarded children in northern Ontario was over 1,900.

Mr. D. Jackson (Timiskaming): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, one of the things that has been said over the past few days is that a new member would be entitled to a bit of respect. I just ask the government to give the same amount of silence to this hon. member's speech as they gave to the hon. member for High Park (Mr. Shulman).

Mr. Speaker: The member will resume his seat. He has no point of order and I will ensure that the member receives the same courtesy as other members have received.

Mr. Martel: The Minister of Health at that time suggested that possibly the people in that area could go out and find the number of names, the facilities, the staff to build this hospital. I suggest to you, hon. members, that here are the names of the children—

Mr. Speaker: May I remind the member that he addresses the members of this House through Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Martel: Sorry, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, here are the names of the children, here are the people who are willing to work, the trained nurses, the clerical staff, nurses' assistants, the cooking staff. The only thing that we have not got are the doctors, or of course the hospital. But that was 1959 when the promise was made by the then Premier of Ontario. I am just wondering if these numbers of cases warrant action or not?

I could go on indefinitely outlining in detail promises made, and use quotations from newspapers to back my statements. However, I will just illustrate briefly the variety of promises made, but very quickly forgotten.

1. Conversion of part of North Bay hospital to one for retarded children;

2. Ontario training school for boys 8 to 18;

3. 50,000 trees around Coniston in an effort to re-forest the area. And the latest one in the last election campaign:

4. Planning for factories in the Noelville, French River area to be started six weeks after the 1967 provincial campaign and those people are still waiting for the planning to start.

Forgotten again. These promises range over a number of years and are breathtaking in their imaginative qualities and variety. They have one thing in common. None have been implemented.

It is not, however, my intention to be simply negative. Rather, I want to deal with the problems as they are and the remedies

that I consider would be most effective if northern Ontario is to develop to the full, its economic and social potential.

We have an economic structure based entirely, or almost entirely, on primary industry. We do in fact have a colonial economy—that is, we are drawers of water and hewers of wood. Granted the technology involved is modern, but the distribution is similar to that which existed when the French first arrived in America. We export raw materials to southern Ontario, Norway, the United States and then we import almost all the essentials of life. In short, we do not have any secondary industry.

Because we lack such secondary industries we have a very small base of industrial assessment. Here we are posed one of the essential ironies of northern Ontario economics. Despite the fact that the mines of northern Ontario are among the richest in the world, the towns around those mines are often among the most deprived. I can take you to a town of 3,000 inhabitants within 15 miles of INCO's principal site. This town does not have a single foot of sidewalk, a single foot of sewer, a single foot of water main or a single foot of paved street.

With the vast stores of raw materials that we have in the north, we continue even at this time to supply others and develop nothing. Why is this allowed to continue? The failure on the part of the government to get involved in a meaningful way; their failure to encourage the location of secondary industry in the north; their lack of economic planning; these are the main reasons the northern part of this province can be called the forgotten land.

We cannot go on allowing just what is good in dollars and cents for the corporations. Our criterion must be what is good for all of Ontario and its people. The government is reluctant to get involved and help direct industrial development, but I say it is the responsibility of the government to get involved. Not only must this government get involved but it must stop its hypocritical posturing as the party of so-called "free enterprise." It has been involved in the production and distribution of electricity for 67 years. It has been involved in the operation of rail and bus lines. It has been involved in the operation of insurance plans. It can, and must, become involved in the planning and establishment of secondary industry in northern Ontario.

More assistance for more primary industry will not solve the problems. Planning and a little imagination would. Why don't we, for example, manufacture copper pipe or wiring from the copper mined by INCO or Falconbridge? Why not manufacture nickel goods in the district?

If the government used a little imagination, we might even plan a pipeline from Alberta to northern Ontario. Crude oil from Alberta could be refined in the north and then by pipeline, the cheapest means of transportation, shipped to where it would be used. This would help the north and the south. Transportation used to be one of the major factors hindering location in the north. This was for two reasons—primarily, time and cost. Time can no longer be considered a factor. Crack freight trains can go from Capreol to Toronto in less than eight hours. This leaves transportation costs. I ask you, why should people continue to subsidize the producers of raw materials and the railroads to their own detriment? When I say subsidize these groups, that is precisely what I mean.

The companies have the right to negotiate their own freight for raw material with the railroads. The rate per ton for raw materials coming south is much less than the finished goods going north. Northerners pay for this difference when they purchase these finished goods. What is even worse is that income tax money, paid to the federal government, is used to subsidize the railroads who need the money to operate, but who see fit to give greatly reduced rates on raw materials being shipped from northern companies to southern plants. The railroads operate successfully, the producers of raw material get preferred rates. At whose expense? The people who subsidize railroads, who in turn cut rates, which in turn cut costs for companies southward?

The freight rates should be comparable for raw materials and finished goods, then companies would think twice before shipping tons of waste material mixed in with the usable ores, and so on. The result would be location of secondary industry in the north. The provincial government should work towards equitable freight rates in conjunction with the federal government.

When industry moves north, the government would have to eliminate certain barriers. The foremost barrier to go would be the great land holdings that the mining and pulp and paper companies have tied up. For example, Pine Land Timber, a front for certain key companies, has over 125 townships locked up where no one is allowed to cut a tree. As a result, the village of Gogama lost its one industry, a small independent mill, which was willing to invest $250,000 in

equipment if it could have had but three of these townships to cut in out of the 125. As a result, many of the residents, save for The Department of Lands and Forests people, are on welfare. Throughout the north, the same conditions exist. To entice industry, these holdings should be returned to the Crown if not worked within a specific time, and the way cleared for secondary industry either by the government or by the new company.

We can offer industry a great deal of water, cheap land, a ready supply of raw materials, an energetic people, hydro and gas power, university graduates aplenty, and accessibility to market. We could avoid, in this manner, the destruction of good farm land in the south and the need to import more and more food, thus becoming more reliant on the United States. We cannot grow much on our rocky terrain, but it would be ideal for industry.

This move would also eliminate great highway costs in the south and particularly around the city and through the city of Toronto. This money could be used to help industry establish in the north. It would help to eliminate the acute housing situation, cut down on land speculation and reduce pollution. In short, secondary industry locating in the north would be beneficial to both northern and southern Ontario.

If industry does not want to participate, then the government should consider setting up Crown corporations in order to develop northern Ontario to its fullest and alleviate the problems in the south. One of the major problems would be reduced if secondary industries located in the north—the problem of taxation. It is quite obvious that neither the federal government, by its apparent rejection of the Carter commission findings, nor the provincial government, by its apparent acceptance of the Smith report, has any real desire to tax the mining industry fairly.

The rejection by the 50-odd mining municipalities that form the association of mining municipalities, of the formula for taxing mines is ample proof of my allegation. Secondary industry would account for some of the revenue needed by municipalities in the north if they are to provide the services required in towns, such as sewers, water, streets, and so on, which the mining tax is not doing. I would like to quote from the nickel basin planning study—which was sponsored by The Ontario Department of Municipal Affairs and the central mortgage and housing corporation—to back my allegation that the mining industry is freeloading at the expense of the people. This is taken from pages 84 and 85:

> Municipalities in the study area are unique in that, while servicing a gigantic industry by the provision of urban and suburban service for that industry's employees, there is virtually no substantial industrial assessment in this study area. The grants received by mining municipalities when converted into assessment are not representative of the industry's real property values and leave the municipalities with a tax base heavily oriented to the residential land uses. Thus another major factor hindering well-planned development in the area is the inability of the municipalities, under the existing legislation, to realize enough from the existing non-assessable industry operating here.
>
> While it is true that most of the municipalities do derive income in lieu of industrial assessment by way of grants from the province, both as a share of the mining taxes and from other funds for specific purpose, these do not compensate for loss of assessment and therefore are not sufficient to help finance the same level of services provided in other comparable communities.

We must, in order to provide the services needed, have a source of revenue. This source of revenue could come in part from secondary industry and in part from the implementation of the Carter commission on taxation. Revenues are needed for other essential projects. One of these needs is the long-promised school hospital for retarded children. After the announcement several weeks back that the Dew and Pine Tree lines could be abandoned, I would urge the provincial government to acquire the Falconbridge radar base and convert it into this much-needed and long-awaited school hospital. The facilities are excellent and the location is ideal, situated as it is near an airport, two railway lines and very near the trans-Canada highway.

Continuing on the medical needs of the area, we need a hospital to service the municipalities of Carson, Hanmer, Capreol, Val Caron, Blezard, and so on. This reaches a total of some 25,000 residents, all of whom must travel to hospitals located in Sudbury. Here they are faced with a waiting list which delays treatment from four to six months. To reach two of the hospitals, residents from the area must cross the city. The only hospital where this is not necessary will be shutting its doors and moving, I am told, into

the same area as the two other hospitals which now exist.

Smaller municipalities in this area, such as Hagar, St. Charles, Noelville and Alban are in dire need of some form of small clinic with approximately five to eight beds for emergency treatment. These areas do not even have emergency facilities. These areas might be serviced by a small clinic hospital located in a central place such as Noelville. Drugs might be dispensed at this clinic to a populace without even the luxury of a pharmacy for 40 or 50 miles.

This same situation exists right across the north. Doctors would go to these areas if such clinics were strategically located, then giving much-needed medical and possibly even dental service. I ask the government to consider this matter carefully as the demand is great.

One final point in this field, in the need of the north for hospitals, would be the location of a workmen's compensation hospital in the north. We have a high accident rate, due to the heavy nature of our industry. The distance to Toronto eliminates the possibility of many men getting home for weekends during long periods of convalescence. The cost to wives or children to journey to Toronto to see a husband or a father confined over a long period is prohibitive, creating hardship for all. Considering all these points it is obvious there is a need for this hospital. I would suggest that the government consider this project carefully and do something to eliminate the problems encountered by these families.

The government also must consider the problem in the unorganized areas. Regulations and assistance are necessary. It is not enough to have them pay land tax to The Department of Lands and Forests and then forget about them until next time taxes are due. The roads in many of these areas are deplorable. However, a key problem, is one of a real health hazard. According to The Department of Health, there is an average of 2.5 lb. of garbage per person daily. In unorganized areas there is usually a spot designated as a dumping area. People bring their garbage to this location. It piles higher and higher. No one has the equipment to cover it over with sand. Occasionally a department such as Lands and Forests or The Department of Highways sends in the needed equipment to cover the garbage over.

In the meantime, the rats overrun the dump and invade the villages. The flies infest the dumping area. I ask you to consider the health hazard. I ask you to consider the needs of these areas and to bring in legislation to remedy the problems. Is anyone aware, Mr. Speaker, that The Department of Health or the district health unit can stop dumping? They have a real solution to this problem. An inspector can be sent to watch these dumping areas, and if someone is caught disposing of his garbage he can be fined, usually $10 or more. What are they supposed to do with this garbage—eat it? Would it not be simpler to include in The Department of Highways budget a sum to cover the cost of employing its equipment to cover these dumping areas? Give these people service, do not punish them. The government has a responsibility to these people, not just to the welfare of industry.

Another way that the government could help the people of the north, if it were interested, would be to end the profitable practice allowed to the companies. We in the north do not object to paying the transportation costs incurred by the oil companies to transport gas to the north. This cost, I have been informed by the railroad officials, is less than one cent per gallon. Why then do we pay five or more cents per gallon in the north than we do in the south and in this whole area?

I would like to read a letter, Mr. Speaker, from the general manager of superior auto association:

> The cost of gasoline to retailers and the price the motorists pay at the pump have always been an issue in northern Ontario. The general feeling of the people in the north is that they are paying higher prices due to the lack of effective competition and always the rather isolated position. We have been told from reliable sources that it costs approximately a third of a cent per gallon to ship gasoline by boat from Sarnia to a town 60 miles south of Sudbury. To haul from there to the Sudbury area by tank truck is approximately six-tenths of a cent per gallon. This means that shipping charges are less than one cent per gallon to transport gasoline from Sarnia refineries to the Sudbury area service stations.
>
> Gasoline is shipped to the Toronto area from Sarnia by pipeline. We do not have the cost of this operation but let us assume that it is not more than half a cent per gallon. Our findings indicate that the tank wagon price of gasoline to the Sudbury area retailers should be no more than one half cent per gallon above the tank wagon price to the retailers in the Toronto area.

At this time Sudbury area retailers pay 2.2 cents per gallon more than their counterparts in the Toronto area.

Many major corporations such as tire companies establish a wholesale price to retailers. This price is the same all over Ontario and no one is penalized because he happens to live away from the core of the population. If a major oil company were to raise the tank wagon price of gasoline one quarter of a cent to the retailers in the Golden Horseshoe area of Oshawa to Niagara, the tank wagon price of gasoline could be equalized across Ontario and no citizen would suffer financially for the living in remote areas.

The differential in area tank wagon price is not as serious as the matter of the major oil company's ability to sell gasoline to the commercial and unbranded account at a price of up to eight cents per gallon less than they charge their own lessees and dealers. Commercial trucking firms are buying gas at up to 18 cents per gallon less than the price most motorists pay at the pumps. Oil companies will claim that they have no overhead in the selling to these commercial concerns. Yet these same oil companies must install tanks and pumps and deliver the gasoline to these commercial accounts.

Commercial and unbranded purchasers of gasoline will call for tenders for their gasoline requirements and any oil company wishing to gain the account would find it necessary to bid lower than a competing oil company. Most oil companies are geared to produce more gasoline than their retail outlets sell. This surplus gasoline is sold to the commercial account, who is free to obtain fair prices as a result of strong competition between oil companies for this volume. We believe this competition is good but it should be extended to the retail dealers' level.

Dealers and lessees of major brand gasoline, which is 80 per cent of the retail market in Ontario, are not in a position to purchase on the same competitive market as commercial accounts. These retailers are required by agreement to pay the price the oil companies wish to charge them for the gasoline. If a dealer or lessee will not agree to pay the tank wagon price posted by the oil company, then that dealer or lessee cannot buy gasoline. For a business man to retail the same gasoline as sold to the commercial accounts only under a brand name, he must pay up to eight cents per gallon more. This represents to the motorist an extra cost of approximately 16 cents on the dollar.

Oil companies claim it costs from four to six cents per gallon to finance the building of retail outlets and maintain the stations they own. We question this cost of four to six per cent per gallon charged to the tank wagon price to maintain retail outlets. The oil companies receive rent from their property, rent from their signs, rent from their greasing equipment in many stations and require that the lessee purchase their line of tires, batteries and accessories for which they set the wholesale price and make a profit.

An hon. member: Quite a monopoly.

Mr. Martel: We are coming to the rest of it now. Still quoting:

Most oil companies, in addition to these revenues, are receiving a kickback from tire companies of up to 15 per cent of the dealer's price. From preferred jobbers of automotive supplies some oil companies receive a kickback of up to eight per cent. Shell Oil is one company that has a tie with the tire companies and automotive jobbers. The kickback which they receive from preferred jobbers is in the area of six per cent. Shell Oil will encourage their lessees and dealers to buy from jobbers preferred by them.

Our information indicates that any dealer or lessee who buys from the oil company's preferred jobber as a rule, does not receive as good a price as he would get if he purchased from another jobber not connected with his oil company. Taking into consideration the various kickbacks oil companies receive from their suppliers to retail outlets, the rents from lessees, the profits from their own lines of tires, batteries and accessories, is in our opinion sufficient revenue to pay these companies for their investment in real estate, buildings and equipment.

We find no justification for oil companies adding up to six cents per gallon to the tank wagon price of gasoline and claiming this against the cost of investment in their retail outlets. I am convinced that a thorough investigation by a Royal commission would back our findings. I also feel that the public deserves action by the government to bring these monolithic corporations to the realization that they, as citizens of the country, are obliged to operate in the best interests of all. There is no indication that major oil companies are concerned

with any obligations other than their personal ambitions to reach unlimited wealth.

No one objects to the growing wealth of a company provided this wealth is deserved from operations carried out in a truly competitive free-enterprise system. Control of the Canadian petroleum industry is in the hands of approximately seven major companies. These companies do not appear to recognize the free-enterprise system other than as a system to control and exploit. They know the motorists must purchase their product, and they are at liberty to charge accordingly.

Major oil companies use the cost in service-station property as an excuse for tank wagon price being higher than the price they sell to commercial and unbranded accounts. If this continues to be their policy and the facts prove that this is not true, then it is necessary to call for legislation to remove oil companies from the retail field.

A retail dealer with a margin of ten cents per gallon and an annual volume of 200,000 to 300,000 gallons, along with the associated sales, could pay the upkeep and mortgage on the average retail outlet. Removing the retail service stations from the ownership of the major oil companies and placing these companies in the position of competing for the volume of these stations would create free enterprise and reduce the price to retailers in line with the price now available to commercial and unbranded accounts. This move to create competition between oil companies at the wholesale level would create a retail price across Ontario in the area of 42 to 44 cents per gallon.

These facts were placed before you, along with discussion on oil rental policy, when we met with you in September of last year.

This is a letter, Mr. Speaker, that I received from superior auto association, and it shows, I believe, the type of exploitation that is going on right across Ontario.

Mr. C. T. Rollins (Hastings): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, referring to places and the manner that gasoline is sold in this province. I happen to be an independent operator and I happen to be associated with Shell Oil. Some of the statements that were made here tonight are not in keeping with industry practices.

Mr. Speaker: Is the member's point of order that the member has been giving misleading information to the House?

Mr. Rollins: Mr. Speaker, yes.

Mr. Speaker: So state it then.

Mr. Rollins: With the sale of accessories not being competitive compared to other automotive selling practices—

Mr. Speaker: I would call to the member's attention that if he has a point of order, which I believe is that the member who is making the speech has been misleading the House, then would he please state it, and if it is, I will rule on it.

Mr. Rollins: What has been stated as far as comparisons are mentioned is not accurate.

Mr. Jackson: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Sudbury East is right. I operate two service stations in Ontario, one in the north and one in the south, and everything he says is true.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The member will continue.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): I hope the member for Hastings will prove his point of order before the debate is over.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the members of the member's own party will give him the floor of the House without interruption.

Mr. Martel: Just in summation of this, Mr. Speaker, I have been told that the price is greater because the consumption of gas is less in the north than in the south. I have been informed that the cost is transportation, handling, and a variety of other things. I am just wondering why the cost of beer is the same, and I am sure there is more consumption in Toronto than there is in Sudbury. I am wondering why the price is the same there and the government regulates it?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Martel: Mr. Speaker, I would ask you to consider another dilemma confronting northerners. The drain of our resources is not confined solely to raw materials. It includes our youth. Because of the need to increase their level of education, many young people are moving south. These young people do not want to enter the mining and smelting

industry. To substantiate this statement I will quote from assistant professor J. R. Winters of The Department of Economics and Development in his study *Sudbury—An Economic Survey* published in 1967, page 30. Mr. Winters at this point is discussing education. He states, and I quote: "This industry is evidently not being successful in attracting workers with more formal education." What then, I ask, is the future for these young people? They have a choice, and again I quote Mr. Winters:

> Their first preference will be to accept work here rather than bear the physical and psychic costs of migrating to seek jobs elsewhere: that is they will be prepared to make some sacrifice in order to remain in the area. However, failing this they will migrate elsewhere taking their skills and training to benefit some other region.

What does this mean to northern Ontario? With little secondary industry, it means that many of the skilled people, educated and trained in the north at a tremendous cost to their parents and their community, will be lost to the north. It means a brain drain from the north for if these people are to work at what they are interested in, they must get out. So you see the need for secondary industry is again essential for us, if we are to keep our young, skilled and educated citizens in the north.

Add to this dilemma, a paradox! As just stated, we educate the youth and they must move south. Strangely, in one field where there is a growing need for an educated group, we must send them south to acquire their training, as nowhere in the north are there facilities available. It seems there is no end to our problems. I will endeavour to clarify this point.

The north is a storehouse of raw mineral resources. The mining industries are constantly in need of engineers. In fact, I am told that International Nickel could use 50 graduates alone annually. Laurentian University, located in the heart of the mining industry, has not been granted a department of engineering. That this situation exists is not the fault of the university officials. They realized the value of such a department to the north long ago. Where in Ontario could there be a more ideally situated engineering faculty and department? Why then, I ask, has The Department of University Affairs not given its blessing and its assistance for the immediate implemention of an engineering department at the University of Sudbury or at Laurentian University, any of the four combined?

A great deal has been said during the last three months regarding The Department of Education's intention to reduce the number of school boards and form larger units of administration, thus giving equal opportunity of education to all the children of Ontario. I agree that somewhat larger units are essential, if we are to obtain this desired goal, but I find several contentious points, as they were spelled out in the proposals we received recently. In fact, I find a rather dictatorial approach by The Department of Education in the manner in which the whole plan was formulated. That the two groups primarily involved in education in Ontario—the teachers and the trustees—were not consulted nor involved in this scheme is, I believe, a gross error and an unforgiveable insult to both of these groups. To consult them after the plans were made just compounds that insult.

The contentious points mentioned earlier involve teachers and the proposed composition of the boards of education. Teachers have been left in a complete fog for over three months, following the Premier's (Mr. Robarts') announcement last fall. The Department of Education has done very little to relieve them of their fears. Nor do I find anything in the plans, as presented by the government, to give them any indication as to what will happen to them, except that their contracts will be honoured.

The Department of Education has done a great deal to undermine the confidence of the teachers and caused them to work for months under tremendous anxiety. I know this to be a fact, due to the great amount of correspondence and the great number of calls I have received from teachers throughout the province, and from the very fact that I was, up until December, working as a teacher in Ontario. They are concerned with such things as loss of sabbatical leave; loss of retirement benefits from boards with which they have remained for many years in order to qualify for these benefits; and wage loss or wage freeze that is going to happen. Nothing has been said, really, to alleviate these fears.

These are but a few of the anxieties which the government has so generously given to the teachers of Ontario as a Christmas present.

The second point involves proposed composition of boards. As from the teachers, so too from the boards, I have received numerous letters from various parts of the province. The chief complaint registered by the boards will be the loss of representation for

most communities. For example, in the area I represent, the city of Sudbury will probably end up with 14 of the 18 representatives on the board of education. Six must come from the public school supporters in Sudbury, four from the outlying communities which have at least 50,000 people. The eight members to the board of education from the separate school supporters will be voted for by the Catholic citizens at large.

As a result, those candidates from Sudbury will win eight seats. The outcome will be 14 of 18 members to the board of education coming from the city of Sudbury. A ward system might be considered for the entire area, thus providing a better balance of representation to deal with the two vastly different types of problems encountered in rural and urban school areas. Certainly a new system or formula is necessary to give the type of representation needed.

A second solution favourable to some boards would be to make separate city and rural boards. Cities are now providing the type of education desired. If all the rural boards could form one board in the designated area, they, too, could provide the type of education needed. This would mean two boards for each area now under consideration instead of the one board being proposed.

I would ask the House to consider the proposal presented by the leader of the NDP (Mr. MacDonald) with respect to the Indians of Ontario. We have managed to destroy their self-respect, their confidence, their pride and their initiative with our paternalistic approach. In short, our approach has been a dismal failure. And in this, the beginning of our second century of Confederation, we must usurp the powers the federal government possesses to ensure a brighter future for the first citizens of Canada.

We can no longer tolerate the entire male force on a reserve being unemployed and every family receiving welfare. We are fostering third and fourth generation welfare cases and reducing these once proud people to a position where they appear to be lazy, unreliable and shiftless.

How does a man on $31.50 a month welfare, who must spend $6 of it for a taxi to reach the nearest store and $6 to return home, live with dignity, eat and clothe himself properly? Are we willing to spend the amount of money necessary to provide a better quality of education, and to retrain the men so they are competent in their employment, so that they will be able to leave the reserves if they want?

I do not believe they will integrate unless they can do so on an economic level equivalent to ours, with a degree of confidence they will be able to compete for good jobs and that they have some assurance they will have steady employment. These people do not want handouts. They must have the right to make decisions themselves and implement these decisions. We must ensure we provide the means for these people to help themselves to regain their rightful place in society.

I believe that the government, in this situation as in others I have outlined, is not aware of the problems we face. If it is aware, then it just does not give a darn about doing anything to solve them. It seems to me that we are looked upon as a source from which to draw raw materials for the mother countries, southern Ontario and the United States, and there is no need to put anything back into this sector of the province.

Another problem that we are faced with is that of highways and it seems to me that this is the criterion: There is no need to build good roads in the north. The people there drive in extremely hazardous climatic conditions for the better part of seven months, on roads which are largely substandard. The fact that we, in the Sudbury district, have the largest, highest accident rate, probably in all Canada, is not because the roads are poor; no, it is because we are all bad drivers!

Is this what the government is asking the people of Ontario to believe? How does this government explain the high accident rate and what does it propose to do about this situation and about the condition of the roads?

If the government is as quick in solving this gigantic problem as it is in solving the fog conditions on the Copper Cliff to Sudbury section of Highway 17 west, then this generation will be doomed to drive on poor highways for a long time.

Let me outline briefly the problem that exists on this road, a road that is travelled on daily by 8,000 to 10,000 workers at least. The section under consideration is two to three miles long, if that. The number of accidents that occurred on this section of highway from 1960 to 1967 was 168; the number of deaths in the same period was 11. The problem was fog.

A small stream remains open year round. Ice does not form in this stream even when the temperature sinks to 35 below zero, and let me assure you that it is not the speed at which the water is flowing that prevents it

freezing over. This stream does not freeze because of two factors. In the first place, it emerges from the INCO smelter only a few hundred yards away, and second it contains a high enough level of pollution to reduce its freezing point by several degrees. We have measured it and at 35 below zero it does not freeze.

This is coincidental, Mr. Speaker: The union attempted to get the fatality figures from the department and they were turned down; it was by skulduggery that they were obtained. The heavy toll in loss of lives, 11 in seven years, 168 accidents, demands prompt action. The figures, as I stated, were for seven or eight years. Why is it taking so long to rectify the problem?

Oh yes, I am aware that three departments are doing studies in a very quiet and unpublicized manner. These take time. However, if the government could allocate in the fiscal year ending March 31, 1968, $2 million for maintenance of the GO transit system and provide yet another $1.6 million for capital for GO transit for the same period to provide transportation for people in the Golden Horseshoe, could they have not allocated an adequate amount of money to rectify the situation immediately even if it meant boxing in the whole creek in an effort to safeguard the lives and limbs of these people?

If boxing in the creek is a wild theory for eliminating the problem, a simpler solution might be to remove from the water the pollutant that is preventing it from freezing, or better still, do not allow what is preventing the freezing to be dumped into the water in the first place. Regardless of the measure used, I am sure that with the scientific knowledge we possess today, if the government had been truly concerned about this situation, it could have been remedied years ago.

The same could apply to the pollution problem in our area. The area has been ravaged, yes even raped, by the effects of the estimated 1,000,000 tons of sulphur that is normall emitted from the INCO stacks alone. Had the government passed the sulphur bill presented by my good friend, Mr. Bob Carlin, the former MPP for Sudbury, some 20 to 25 years ago, we would not have been exposed to the 20 million to 25 million tons of sulphur which has been dumped on the area over this period of time nor would we have suffered from the effects of this generous gift by INCO.

When the member for High Park described the damage, as he saw it, everyone screamed, people were indignant. A local paper advised him to look at the problems of pollution in Toronto. Well, I have lived my whole life in this nickel basin. In places the situation is so bad that there are no trees, no shrubs, no grass, no topsoil—and this is no small area—just barren rock and lifeless soil. I am not trying to make my area appear desolate and hurt the image of the Sudbury basin, thus limiting or hindering movement to the area, but rather I am trying to prompt the governmen to take action and, if it is not aware of the existing condition, and I am sure it is not, then to draw its attention to the situation as exists. I have a quote, Mr. Speaker, from a doctor friend of mine last weekend and he said: "The day somebody decides to give an enema to clean up pollution in Canada, the tube will pass through Sudbury."

I was not going to talk about this topic, Mr. Speaker. I did not have it in my speech, but I could not help deal with this now after the series of questions that I have been asking, to which the answers were sometimes curt. Sometimes I was made to appear as though I was not concerned about the men in my area. This is precisely the reason I have been raising this question—the question of mine inspections.

How or what is the value of an inspection if the company is aware that the inspection is going to take place and it keeps maintenance men in to work overtime to clean up, to put the machines in operation? When the inspectors come in, the place is superb. It is spotless. The whole purpose of the inspection is lost. When this issue was raised I was told that I was pointing the finger at The Department of Mines. Well, certainly I was but not, I might say, at the new Minister (Mr. A. F. Lawrence) who is not responsible, or was not responsible for the conditions which existed before.

Then I followed this up, Mr. Speaker, with another question and I asked if the government would consider preventing remedial work taking place and I think this is logical. If, as has been explained, it is necessary to advise people that an inspection is going to take place—and I doubt this, having worked in the plant for a year; possibly underground but not on surface—but, I will go along with the answer I received that they have to have a sufficient amount of time to line up the tour.

I am asking, at least, that remedial steps are prevented so that the conditions that exist from day to day are the same conditions

that the inspectors will see, and nothing else. We have had two mine explosions and after the first one, the report that came in, was glowing. The December 18 report was glowing, yet within a month and a half there was another explosion. If the true facts had been reported, we might not have had that second explosion. We were very fortunate in both of them that there was no loss of life and I am asking the hon. Minister of Mines to rectify this situation by insisting on either one of two things: The company is not notified, or remedial steps cannot be taken once the notification has been given.

Mr. Sopha: You would agree, of course, that INCO is one of the most safety-conscious companies in North America? You would agree with that?

Mr. Martel: No, I am afraid not.

Mr. Sopha: You do not?

Mr. Martel: No.

Mr. Sopha: Well, I am sure you do not know what is going on.

Mr. Martel: I have the letters upstairs.

Mr. Sopha: You can tell your steelworker friends that I said that during your speech.

Mr. Martel: Fine. But I can take you upstairs and present the letters which show the number of compensation cases who are brought back; the member for High Park indicated the number of patients that were brought back and not put on compensation. They listed just about 12, just as a starting point, so that no compensation would be paid and I am sure that the responsible Ministers on the other side of the House have the same letter as I received.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Martel: I am just wondering, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Six years ago he was against taxes for INCO. No company should be left at the whim of the local council, he said. His position down through the years has been flip-flop, flip-flop.

Mr. Sopha: I was in the forefront of demanding they pay taxes, too, and your member now speaking—I never heard him open his mouth about it.

Mr. MacDonald: You were opposed to the taxes six years ago.

Mr. Sopha: I am sorry to interrupt his maiden speech, but what he states is a distortion of the facts.

Mr. MacDonald: It is on the record.

Mr. Martel: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, it is not a distortion. Is it a distortion of facts when a company is tipped off? Is this the safe policy that this member is talking about—that you tip off the company ahead of time? Is that what he is talking about? Is it fair play?

Mr. Gisborn: It has been done.

Mr. MacDonald: Yes, it was a regular practice.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

Mr. Sopha: If they catch you without your helmet on you get four days off.

An hon. member: I was a supervisor in one of those mines.

Mr. Sopha: I am sorry for having to say that but we should get the truth here.

Mr. Speaker: Will the member for Sudbury East please continue?

Mr. Martel: I would also like to touch briefly on an article, Mr. Speaker. I have heard a great deal about the socialists and how we have ruined Britain, and this has gone on and on. Now I want you to listen well, and I will read—

Mr. MacDonald: Listen to one of your own.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Martel: Just listen. You just be quiet, I have the floor. I am talking about the economy. I am going to read you an article that appeared in a newspaper and I have another article to back it. Will you listen to it for long enough or are you scared to?

Mr. G. A. Kerr (Halton West): Is it from the *Globe and Mail*?

Mr. Martel: No it is not. Are you scared to hear it? Well, just listen.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I think that if the member will direct his remarks to the chair and proceed, there will be a little order here.

Mr. Martel: I would like to read this article and I quote:

> The beleaguered Labour government, attacked on all sides because of Britain's

shabby economic situation, has received an unexpected accolade from Lord Thorneycroft, a Conservative, and a government Minister for ten years. Thorneycroft, in a startling maiden speech in the House of Lords Tuesday night, not only praised Labour for its new corrective measures, but blamed Britain's current plight on the former Conservative government. Specifically, he fingered former Prime Minister Harold Macmillan. "He found it exciting to live on the edge of bankruptcy," Thorneycroft said of his own former Cabinet boss. "I found it exciting too, but it was an excitement scarcely consistent with our responsibilities to the national Exchequer, and so we parted company."

Peter Thorneycroft was referring to his own resignation ten years earlier to the day, as Chancellor of the Exchequer. Thorneycroft, who had previously been Trade Minister for five years, returned to the government two years later as Aviation Minister and was later Defence Minister. "If the Macmillan government had stood firm then, the country would not be in the state of humiliation that it is in today," Thorneycroft stated. He said that the Labour government's new measure to cut down public spending showed a great deal of courage and a great deal of determination.

That is for you gentlemen over there. Finally, Mr. Speaker, the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Bales) today talked about the compensation cases, and I have some lulus, if I might use the term. Here is one about a man who has been out of work for some four years and cannot walk across the floor without falling down.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Martel: That is a wisecrack "leave the liquor alone"—for a man who has earned $67.50 per month; that is a wisecrack.

Mr. Speaker, this man earns $67.50 per month pension. He has three children and a wife, and on top of that he has the Atlantic Finance Corporation after him. They are going to sue him because he owes some $1,900, which in an eight-month period has jumped some $800. I took him to the compensation board.

Heavens, we have some smug people over there, Mr. Speaker. They are not suffering though, that is the difference. The fat cats.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): Yes we are, we are listening to you.

Mr. Martel: Well, you might be, you guys. You do not like the truth, because you guys are yelling. I have never seen so many smug people in my life.

Mr. Gisborn: How much did he get a month? $67.50?

Mr. Martel: $67.50. The compensation board will not reopen this claim; they say that it is a psychiatric overlay. So I took him to the psychiatrist and he states that he has a psychiatric overlay now, but that the physical problem which brought it on is what is bothering him and that all the psychiatric help in the world is not going to help him. And yet the compensation board will not handle this case. Four years!

I could go on and name many more, which I have appealed to just about every level now. I am running out. I have another case where five doctors, three of them specialists, say that the man has silicosis, and the compensation board says no, he has not got silicosis. So on October 13, 1967, we finally got him another trip to the compensation board. They gave him a sputum test on October 13. By December 29, I received the report. He had active tuberculosis at that time, and he still had not been notified by the board or by the health board.

For three months they knew that he had active tuberculosis and he was not notified. And he cannot claim compensation. He is not getting it, and his wife is getting $20 per week from the union, and yet I have three specialists and two regular doctors who say that he has silicosis, and the silicosis referee board says no, he has not.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): The compensation board is a scandal in this province.

Mr. Gisborn: We are going to clear it up before we—

Mr. Martel: In summation, Mr. Speaker, I have attempted to draw the attention of the government to some of the problems that we face in the north, and solutions to them must be forthcoming. Things such as secondary industry, equalization of gas costs, a hospital for retarded children, clinics and highways must be considered, and so on.

Mr. Speaker, the wheels to implement the solutions must be got into motion. I suggest that the wheels should not turn too slowly, for if they do, the industrial south is in danger of losing its raw material. The movement towards a separate province is strong.

Such sentiments are shared by a wide spectrum of people. I suggest that the

chamber of commerce is one. I can suggest a variety of people who have suggested an eleventh province, and those members for the north who are saying that the feeling is not there have lost touch with the people. There is also no longer a Mr. Spooner or a Mr. Wardrope, Mr. Speaker.

Such sentiments are shared by a wide spectrum, as I have already said. It is not hard to find. The people in the north are required to live in a more rigorous climate, they must engage in more dangerous and challenging employment, they must travel more miles, they enjoy fewer services, and they endure greater expenses. All we ask in return is good government to ensure that a just and reasonable return on our labour remains in the north, so that we can raise our families in dignity and comfort.

Mr. E. A. Winkler (Grey South): Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in the House in extending felicitations on the occasion of your appointment and also, of course, to the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts), once again being the first citizen in this great province of Ontario. I feel, Mr. Speaker, as humble here in this legislative assembly as I did in my previous elected office and I must say that there are some changes, when a member enters this chamber, as opposed to the one I was in.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: State your point, please.

Mr. Gisborn: My point of order is, would it be considered a maiden speech when one has become disenchanted with the higher level of government—

Mr. Speaker: I do not believe that constitutes a point of order at all. The member will proceed.

Mr. Winkler: Mr. Speaker, I want to thank that hon. member for his kindness and co-operation and courtesy, such as some of the others have said.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): He is not sure you are a maiden.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Winkler: And I will have a further word to say about the hon. member before the night is over, too.

Mr. Speaker, to digress from that type of remark for a while—and I hope I can enter in the vein of lighter things, I would say in the humorous vein—it was a little difficult for me, and to that hon. member, to leave the House of Commons. You will recall that a very few weeks after I left, the Prime Minister resigned and a few weeks after that the whole place almost fell apart. But I am humble enough to suggest it had nothing to do with my leaving.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I must say that the change is a very pleasant one because of course, the group is a smaller group, the chamber is smaller, and there are a fewer number of people. And the differences are very noticeable. One thing I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that there is a great difference in the lack of facilities accorded to a private member. I could detail them and number them down the line but in this regard I want to extend congratulations to the Prime Minister, because I understand there is a move afoot to change the expenditures for the House and for the membership from the administration of the government to a committee under his jurisdiction, where I believe it properly belongs. This is no credit to myself; it is the Prime Minister's own idea.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Winkler: Mr. Speaker, for the sake of the hon. member who rose, it is no secret that the federal riding which I had the honour to represent for a considerable number of elections was eliminated by redistribution and that, of course, under the administration of the present Liberal regime in Ottawa. I believe the redistribution lines that were drawn were not consistent with the interests of the people. I also believe that the riding that I presently have the honour to represent is much more sensible because it contains a larger portion of the county of Grey. These are all good, honest, hard-working people. I might say it has been rather a good way to enter the provincial field because I got into the newly-redistributed riding without having served in its original context.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I might say a word about that great constituency running from Meaford and Thornbury and Craigleith on the north to the southern limits of the county of Grey. It is a very old and historic county, a valuable one in many ways, which has produced many people in the political arena who have deported themselves extremely well—including my predecessor, who, as you know, occupied the seat in this chamber for that constituency for, I believe, 41 years.

The fact that he was able to remain here for that number of years is indeed a tribute

to that gentleman himself. Now that the change has been made I suggest that the people of Grey county want some action. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that—

Mr. MacDonald: Are you suggesting that action is possible only if a member sits on the government side?

Mr. Winkler: I do not say that in a derogatory sense about my predecessor, not for one moment; but I am saying that that is why I am here. I told them that is what I came here for and I intend to fulfill that promise and obligation. In this regard, I am calling upon the government to assist me and do those things which I believe need doing and which I have enumerated in the course of the most recent provincial election campaign. I believe that your approach determines precisely what you receive.

Mr. Speaker, I recall going through the last campaign. There were some areas of embarrassment to me simply because a great effort that I had put forth in my previous position was in regard to the development of Grey and Bruce counties, which I also represented a portion of at that time. We tried vigorously to receive the benefits of the designated area programme from the federal government, which never did come and never will come.

Therefore, I am taking off my hat this evening to the Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Randall) because it did not take very long following the promise to bring that particular benefit to our area. My running mate is in the House, the hon. member for Grey-Bruce. I noticed in the course of the campaign in Bruce—the area that I no longer represented—he stated that he was very influential in bringing the benefit into the town and that it would not be very long. This is the very ad I have in my hand, Mr. Speaker; I have it before me, where he prints in big, black print, that Walkerton, which is in the particular area that I had the honour of representing before, was to be included in the federal designated area programme, and that very soon or very early, I am sorry, that is what the ad said —

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Read the ad.

Mr. Winkler: I will:

> As a result, we now have assurance from the federal authorities that an early review will be made with the aim to have Walkerton and Bruce area share the great boom now being enjoyed by Owen Sound and Collingwood.

Now, first of all, Mr. Speaker—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Winkler: Well, you can beat your desks but you know very well that you will never get it. And the hon. member for Grey-Bruce—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Winkler: Mr. Speaker, I have always been taught when you are hunting for moose you should never be distracted by rabbit tracks.

And the hon. member for Grey-Bruce can well thank the Minister of Economics and Development for bringing this programme in for those people would have had no assistance whatsoever. Any hon. member will know that I took the same position when I was in Ottawa.

Mr. Sargent: On a point of order, he must know something that I do not know. Will he tell us what we have?

Mr. Speaker: Order! The member will state his point of order. He will not ask a question and he will not make a statement except as to his point of order.

An hon. member: He said, "What will you have?"

Mr. Sargent: The hon. member has implied that we have had great benefits through this Minister for Walkerton and Grey-Bruce. Will he please tell us what we have? What has he done for us?

Mr. Speaker: Is the point of order that the member speaking has been misleading the House or—

Mr. Sargent: It is a very ambiguous statement.

Mr. Speaker: The member will proceed.

Mr. Winkler: Mr. Speaker, I did not say that the programme had yet brought any results but what I said is that at least they have a programme which they did not have before. I will tell you there is nothing more deceptive than that ad which he put in for political purposes only, because he knew he could not fulfill that promise because of the last visit we made to meet his friends in Ottawa.

Inasmuch as the hon. member has become exercised I will go into the second half of it, although I did not intend to. He also put a copy of a telegram in the paper in regard to the beginning of the construction of a post office, which he felt was also going to do him some good. I did not enter that campaign against him but I might inform him now that I had a letter from the Minister of Public Works prior to his getting this telegram that told me the same thing. So there is a little honour among those Liberals down there.

Mr. Sargent: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, this is a completely misleading diatribe. I would simply suggest if you are going to give him the floor to say things—

Mr. Speaker: Would the member please take his seat? He has raised his point of order.

Mr. Sargent: I should have a chance to reply to this.

Mr. Speaker: No, you do not have a chance to reply to it.

Mr. Sargent: It is completely wrong.

Mr. Speaker: The member will please proceed. There is no point of order.

Mr. Winkler: Mr. Speaker, I might say that that is another notable difference between this House and the House in Ottawa. There is much less respect for the chair.

An hon. member: In Ottawa.

Mr. Winkler: Here. Right here.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Winkler: Now, Mr. Speaker, I have a few other points that I want to make in regard to that campaign, and I do not have to reach far. Another point I want to make here, Mr. Speaker, is in regard to statements that were made in my area during the campaign. They were made for a specific purpose and I happen to be here now and I can use the material. It was used to defeat me at that time, but it did not click.

Mr. Speaker, it is stated here that at a big rally that took place, the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. MacNaughton), in order to bring about some of the changes that were going to be necessary in the educational programme, was going to have to raise the sales tax by three per cent. We know very well there will be no increase in the sales tax, and there will be no increase in the income tax either. But what did the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Nixon) promise, and what did the hon. member for Grey-Bruce promise? They promised the 80 per cent—

Mr. Sargent: We certainly did.

Mr. Winkler: And little does he know that right tonight over 16 or 18 municipalities in those two counties were receiving way beyond 80 per cent right then.

I want to quote from an article here written by Eric Dowd of the Toronto *Telegram* in regard to the promises that were made by the Liberal Party in a statement that was made by the leader of the Opposition. I believe he was speaking in Windsor the same evening as the hon. Provincial Treasurer. I am quoting from the article. He was speaking in St. Thomas.

> Now, the Provincial Treasurer laid down precisely what the situation would be, and when asked how he would fulfill the promise of his 80 per cent guarantee, he did not know. And if it were fulfilled you can bet your last penny that that sales tax would have gone up many, many points. There is no question about that.

The article concludes by saying: "Mr. Nixon may not thank Mr. MacNaughton for filling in the blanks." I believe that to be quite true. It is like the empty situation they created all over the entire countryside.

Mr. Speaker, because of the large percentage of the agricultural industry in the county of Grey, I think I might have a word to say about that. From the north to the south it has every type of industry. We have the very important apple growers in the north ranging down to the beef producers in the centre of the county and the very valuable milk producers in the south.

I realize, and I know, the days these people are passing through at the present time. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that there will, in the long run, be only one answer to the effective measures that can be brought about to support the agricultural programme, and I believe it will have to be done through national marketing boards. I believe that the experience of the wheat board, as it works to the benefit of producers, can work that way with other commodities, and then the government at the federal level can take the action that is necessary where subsidies are required.

We must remember that these primary producers are selling today in some of the foreign markets that are not affected as much in their economies as we are here in Canada. It is a very difficult thing for these producers

to receive the return in both kinds of markets to give them the standard of living they should have. I think that the support programmes in the capital sense from the provincial government are substantial, and I think they are worthy ones, but I believe that the long range programme, and the assistance the young farmers need will be brought about through the national marketing plans, as I suggested, such as the wheat board, to bring them the return that they so justly deserve for their efforts.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I will turn for a moment now to the northern extremity of the constituency where the apple country exists. I believe and I hope that the legislation presented by the Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. Stewart)—which is the first of its kind I believe in North America—will be of great benefit to the producers of that product. It is in the area of the ski resorts and the Blue Mountains, and because of the climatic conditions with the waters of Georgian Bay on the northern side it makes very fertile ground for the production of this product.

While I am in that particular area, I might mention for the benefit of the Minister of Tourism and Information (Mr. Auld), that his department may well have a look at that northern area for the development that can be created and, for the good promotion of the ski industry, that he might assist with.

I also noted in looking over the history of that northern area we had a very eminent Canadian come from the area around Thornbury, Sir Sandford Fleming, a man who was a great engineer with the Canadian Pacific Railway at the time that they developed their line across Canada. It was Sir Sandford Fleming who designed and applied the present system of standard time as we have it in Canada, and I would suggest that the Minister might take some suitable action there to note this great gentleman's contribution in Canadian life.

While I am in that northern end of my constituency for a moment, I might say that it is gratifying to see the return of the fishing industry in Georgian Bay which because of the—

Mr. Sargent: There is nothing there.

Mr. Winkler: Well, you wait for a while, my friend. If you have not tried and you do not know the results of the Croquinay programme and the other programmes that have been introduced there, you had better find out. And as a matter of fact, I had quite a few people down from your constituency on Sunday to see what I could do for them in this regard. It is one thing to shoot your mouth off, and another to know what is going on, and I would counsel my hon. friend—

Mr. MacDonald: On a point of order. At least six or eight times, Mr. Speaker, I thought you were quite correct in drawing attention to speakers on this side of the House about addressing members directly rather than through the chair. I think that this maiden needs to be corrected too.

Mr. Speaker: If the member will carry on.

Mr. MacDonald: If the hon. member does not know, he pointed his finger and he was talking directly to a member here on this side of the House.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, at least eight times. If I have to go back to the record, I will get it and make you eat the words. Members on this side of the House were corrected for speaking directly to someone there rather than through the chair.

Mr. Speaker: I would point out to the member that he is making his point by directing his remarks directly to members on the other side, instead of to the Speaker.

Mr. MacDonald: Right, Mr. Speaker. I am making it directly, but I suggest that if it is made directly there, we should not have so many corrections in this side. Let us apply the rules evenly across the board.

Mr. Speaker: The point of order is well taken. The member will continue with his speech, and I trust that he will follow the rules of the House.

Mr. Winkler: Mr. Speaker, I apologize if I broke the rules of the House, but I have a little experience, and I do not consider this my maiden speech by any means. I have sat here since February 14 and watched that hon. gentleman point at everybody in the House. Not once, but many times. Now you cannot expect one thing one way, and yourself the other way.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Sit down!

Mr. Speaker: The comment that I made was with respect to the members of the party led by the member for York South, and was occasioned by the verbal interruptions of his own member who was then speaking, by a member of that party, not by the particular course of action to which the member

for York South now refers. Will the member please carry on?

Mr. MacDonald: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker. If you want to deliver a little lecture let me add, I was not referring to that at all. I was referring to at least six or eight occasions. I will go into the record and draw your attention to occasions when members on this side of the House were corrected for not speaking through the chair. Now, let me make this clear. I am not saying that we must always speak through the chair and cut off any kind of direct confrontation—I enjoy it—but I am asking for an equal application of the rules of the House.

Mr. Winkler: Mr. Speaker, I have noted this carefully, too, in the last few days. I do not think that I have breached the rule. If I refer to the hon. members, I do not call them by name. Occasionally I say the hon. member, Mr. Speaker, as I said in this case.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Winkler: I want to deal with them for a few moments. The hon. gentleman might well appreciate the kind of leadership when he is putting up with what he is putting up with these days.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to deal with a statement made by the leader of the NDP the other day, and it bothers me a little bit. It bothers me because of the material that I was gathering at that time. I have it here on page 229 when there was a little repartee going on at that particular moment, but these are his words, and I quote:

> The Liberal Party's differences add up to quibbling over pork barrel tactics, and they do not like your pork barrel. All they want is their pork barrel.

He was making reference to the two other parties in the House. This is a very fascinating thing and he may want to deny this. I do not know.

I have in my possession, a statement that was taken from a speech in the province of Saskatchewan reported in the paper of the city. I am not sure of the name of it, but it was reported nevertheless, and I will read from the quote.

Mr. MacDonald: What is the whole story?

Mr. Winkler: All right, I will give you the whole story and I will use this one first. This is from the Regina *Star,* I think it is called.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The Regina *Leader Post*! How does that grab you?

Mr. Winkler: And datelined Regina:

> The Provincial Treasurer said yesterday in the Legislature that a United States labour union had contributed funds to the NDP in Saskatchewan. In the closing stages of the Throne Speech debate, Steuart said that the renewal of the charge was based on reports from the U.S. Labour Department, and documents signed by Walter Reuther, president of the united auto workers union.

Well, Mr. Speaker, from the position that these people have been taking about American influence in Canada in the last few days, I think that this is a remarkable statement of fact. I would like him to deny that one.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): At least we know where ours come from. Where does yours come from?

Mr. Winkler: Mr. Speaker, I want him to quit pointing at me, I do not like that. The article goes on, Mr. Speaker:

> We now know without a shadow of a doubt that NDP members of this Legislature, especially the farm members, are only labour-controlled puppets. The Minister said that the documents showed that that UAW—

Now here is the one that hurts, and this will hurt him badly, I know.

> The Minister said that the documents showed that UAW gave the NDP $120,400 between 1961 and 1966. He said that he wondered how it was possible to judge the sincerity of NDP members who complained loudly about U.S. dollars.

Well, there is on thing that you can say about the Conservatives, Mr. Speaker, we do not take any dough from the Yankees.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Winkler: He said that he wondered how it was possible to judge the sincerity of NDP members who complained loudly about U.S. domination of Saskatchewan's economy, when they had been bought lock, stock and barrel by American labour bosses. Wow! Steuart said that the NDP, a bitter, jealous people, had done everything in their power to thwart developments of the province's northern industries.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Winkler: Yes, that is right! Meanwhile, back at the ranch the situation was exactly the same.

Mr. Sargent: What about the Tory party?

Mr. Winkler: Now Mr. Speaker, I will quote from a speech—I want a little applause from the other corner this time—made by the hon. W. Ross Thatcher, MLA, the leader of the Opposition in his address of reply to the Throne Speech on Thursday, October 12, 1961.

Mr. T. Reid (Scarborough East): You really dig back.

Mr. Winkler: Well, we heard a little digging today that went a little deeper than the years that I am talking about and I have a little word about that too. I just want to put this statement on record because it is a direct quote from a Mr. Max Greenberg of New York City, international president of the 168,-000-member union. He said: "The international union has already contributed to the new party." Mr. Greenberg said union affiliates have urged the support of the labour party strongly—mind you some of them do not like to be called labour. "We have pledged financial support, we will continue to contribute and we have contributed—"

So it will go on and on. So do not let them deny their American associations, they are there in black and white.

Mr. MacDonald: You open up your books and see where you get yours. How much did you get from Kraft Cheese?

Mr. Winkler: You can look at mine anytime you want to look at them, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The member for York South will please recall his own exortations to Mr. Speaker that members be given equal opportunity—

Mr. Winkler: Mr. Speaker, since we are in the area of that Tory discussion, I want to carry on. First of all, I want a word in all seriousness in reference to the proposed medicare question that has flown back, and about the different positions that were taken.

I want this made very, very clear. I am not quoting it for any other reason than to make a policy position very clear, and nobody has to agree with me, but it happens to be a position that I agreed with.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Winkler: This is out of the pages of *Hansard,* Ottawa, October 25, page 9,094:

> That is not the way to approach, that is a present considered application, of medicare that is not the way to approach a matter which is within provincial jurisdiction. We intend to give the provinces the opportunity to provide medicare and assist them, but without regimentation and with complete freedom of choice.

The very point that I adhere to in the matter.

I had it explained to me today that the situation of Canada will never be the same as situations in other countries, but it is well to bear in mind—and in this particular instance, I call as my witness, Mr. Norman Campbell of the Ottawa *Citizen,* which is not usually a very great friend or supporter of this particular party. I just want to quote a few things out of the article or rather out of his commentary on the CBC not too long ago. He quotes Mr. Frederick Fletcher, a Swedish author and he says he notes that Sweden's medicare started 15 years ago but started modestly enough. There are 8,500 doctors in Sweden. Only 1,200 are in private practice. Over 25 per cent of these are 70 years of age or over; in other words, there are more than 7,300 civil servants created as a result of that.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Winkler: Let me tell you. If you will wait you will hear.

Mr. Speaker, it is great for them, just wonderful when they think they have you on the run, but they do not wait to hear a person out to the end of his argument.

Fletcher writes—

Mr. Gisborn: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Usually if one is going to quote from a document he will give us the courtesy of saying who it is he is quoting from. He has not mentioned yet what he is quoting.

Mr. Speaker: In this case the member has given the page reference in *Hansard* and if he prefers not to state the origin or the name of the speaker I am sure that it is quite open to the member questioning to look at page 9,000 and something in *Hansard.* The member will carry on.

Mr. Winkler: Mr. Speaker, I am always glad to have interventions from the member from Hamilton East. Let me tell you, the other day when I heard him in this House talking about the shameful situation of laundry and dry cleaning workers in Hamilton working for a dollar an hour, I recall a few weeks ago when a member of his federal

party, out of the city of Galt, right on the national television, said, "I cannot pay them more than they were getting when they were on strike". Now, what kind of a labour supporter are you?

It is high time that they start doing a little backdoor cleaning themselves before they start looking at somebody else's front door.

I am glad also that my hon. friend from Scarborough West came in, Mr. Speaker, because now when we are talking about all this area and how these people operate, it could, of course, take an all-evening discussion. I will try and not be that lengthy, Mr. Speaker.

I often wonder when we hear of the domination of that party tonight by the international unions, I wonder who their bosses really are. That is why he came in. He wants me to say this—

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): I heard you.

Mr. Winkler: I know that. I am well aware of that, Mr. Speaker. Last July 12, he and a colleague of his in their offices here, in the centre block of the Parliament buildings, at Queen's Park, entertained ideas and had pictures of Mao Tse-tung and Ho Chi-minh, a good three feet high, two feet wide, ready to post them in their office. I do not know why they changed their minds but it is very—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Winkler: —significant that they were there. Mr. Speaker, I want that member to stand and deny it because I have a witness in the House tonight with me.

Mr. Sopha: You may have better luck than Donald MacDonald.

Interjection by an hon member.

Mr. Lewis: The member for York South does not have a beard, Mr. Speaker. I would not pretend to deny it, but I have heard with equal authority that the member speaking has a life-size statue of Generalissimo Franco under his bed, and that worries us on this side of the House.

Mr. Winkler: Mr. Speaker, that is confirmation of my statement, and I invite the hon. member to look under my bed. I hope he is more successful at find something than I am.

But the important point here is: Who is their leader?

It is very nice to make light of this, Mr. Speaker, it is very wonderful to make light of this—

Mr. MacDonald: Oh you are so self-righteous!

Mr. Winkler: Let us see what the ideology of this party is. Who are their bosses and who are the people who run it? Who do they admire? Who are their idols? Are they Canadians—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Winkler: It is their own leader?

Mr. MacDonald: What a joke!

Mr. Winkler: I do not believe that at all.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Winkler: Well, Mr. Speaker, they do not bother me.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Winkler: I do not care who their leaders are, really, Mr. Speaker. I lived under a dictatorship for a while myself and I happened to come through it and not too badly at that.

Mr. MacDonald: You lived through Diefenbaker and that was a dictatorship in Ottawa.

Mr. Winkler: You would have done a lot better under his leadership than you are doing right now.

Mr. Speaker, I would now like to say a word about the speech that was delivered yesterday and again today by the hon. member for High Park. Never before in my experience as a parliamentarian, and I have been through some pretty ugly messes, have I heard anyone who—

Mr. Gisborn: How about Gerda?

Mr. Winkler: —approached the personal aspect of his argument as I heard this man approach his yesterday and today.

Mr. MacDonald: No, has the member forgotten Diefenbaker?

Mr. Winkler: He degrades the legislative—

Mr. MacDonald: He reduced politics to a personal vendetta.

Mr. Speaker: Order! The member for York South, please give the member speaking the courtesy of an uninterrupted speech.

Mr. MacDonald: The truth hurts.

Mr. Winkler: Mr. Speaker, such personal attacks as these do nothing for the prestige and the posture of any elective assembly—nothing.

Mr. Shulman: Take the halo off and sit down.

Mr. Winkler: I think—

Mr. Speaker: What is the member's point of order?

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, on a point of personal privilege.

Mr. Speaker: State your point.

Mr. Shulman: I wish to state that this hon. member is misleading the House. Every case was presented with detailed facts and was not—

Mr. Speaker: The member has no point.

Mr. Winkler: Frankly, Mr. Speaker, I think the member has a very sadistic political mind. I do not think that that is an over-exaggeration either. As a matter of fact as he opened that dossier of old files today he might well have found one in there that would enlighten us about the losses, the financial losses, of a druggist in Peterborough, but he said nothing about that.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, on a point of personal privilege may I be allowed to defend myself?

Mr. Speaker: As far as I can see there is nothing in what has been said by the member speaking which refers to the member for High Park. It only refers to some case.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Winkler: After what he did, he can hardly call it innuendo because I know that he can tell us more about it than we already know.

Mr. Shulman: Let me try.

Mr. Winkler: You will have another opportunity. You can speak when I am finished. You may have the floor. I did not bother you when you had the floor.

Mr. Gisborn: The hon. member will never bother me!

An hon. member: Who are you?

Mr. Winkler: I wonder if he could produce the right file for this Cabinet and give us the inside information about the put and call business while he is at it.

Mr. Shulman: Right now if you like.

Mr. Winkler: I wonder if there is any area here in which the hon. member was able to swell that sum of money which he is purported to have—his wealth, his total wealth. It is a wonder to me that people who can enter the socialist party of this province can deceive the public that they represent the working classes.

Or maybe I should inquire about a bank manager who came under the machinations of the hon. member for High Park. I hope that he notes that I call him the hon. member for High Park because he did not have this courtesy most of the time through his speech.

Or should I ask him to disclose how he replaced his predecessor, the chief coroner of Metro, and the ugly circumstances surrounding that plot?

This smear business is fine so long as we can appear with a halo and a white gown, but when the back door has to be swept off it is a horse of another colour. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member will take each one of these points and clarify them for this assembly before too many days go by.

Mr. Shulman: I will be very happy to have the privilege to clarify them.

Mr. Winkler: Mr. Speaker, to conclude—

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, may I just clarify—

Mr. Speaker: The member will have a full opportunity to clarify that. Members of this House were mentioned in his speech without interruption. The member will have an opportunity to clarify at a later date.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has asked for clarification, I would like to answer him.

Mr. Speaker: Will the member please take his seat?

Mr. G. Ben (Humber): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Grey South who is speaking now has made an innuendo against the hon. member for High Park. He has not expanded, and although the hon. member for High Park may have an opportunity of reply, since this innuendo has been made I think it behooves you, Mr. Speaker, to request the hon. mem-

ber to inform those members on this side of the House just what is behind the innuendo.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, speaking to this point of order, I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that there is all the difference in the world between presenting a case and documenting it and then inviting a reply, which was done by the hon. member for High Park, and—

Mr. Speaker: May I point out to the member that he is making a statement which is not actually fact, because I may say as a lawyer as well as Speaker here, "documentation" as he refers to it here is proof. I must say that it may have been proof in the minds of some people, but it certainly was not proof in the minds of others. As far as I am concerned—and I would so rule if necessary—as far as I am concerned, I would suggest the point of the member for Humber is well taken.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order—

Mr. Speaker: Just a moment until I deal with the point of order taken by the member for Humber. I think his point is well taken and I would respectfully suggest that the member for Grey South either continue and support the alleged innuendo, or perhaps allow the proceedings to proceed. He might withdraw that part of it and at a later date perhaps the matter can be taken up by him when he is in a position to document it. There is nothing preventing the member for High Park, when his turn comes, to speak again, dealing with those matters as he has been invited to do.

Mr. Lewis: On a further point of order, Mr. Speaker, the member has—

Mr. Speaker: May I request the member take his seat until we deal with the one point of order? I am attempting to deal with it, then I will be glad to give the member the floor.

Mr. Winkler: Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to curtail the discussions of the House in such a way as to deprive the hon. member having the floor if he so chooses. I want to hear about these things too. I can give him some documentation if he wants it. But I would like to hear him talk about them. He is the man who has the responsibility.

Mr. MacDonald: The member made charges; now back them up!

Mr. Winkler: I will act in accordance with the way I spoke. I will conclude now by saying that I am very pleased to be here as a member—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: My point of order, Mr. Speaker. To draw directly to the point, I think, is that the member talked about the ugly circumstances—*Hansard* will bear me out—of the appointment of the member for High Park over his predecessor, and that impugns the integrity of the Prime Minister of this House because he made the appointment.

Mr. MacDonald: Right!

Mr. Lewis: And, therefore, that also requires an explanation.

Mr. MacDonald: The member cannot indulge an innuendo and not back it up.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I quite agree that a member should back up any suggestions, any charges he makes. But to suggest that the hon. member for High Park documented all of his cases yesterday is stretching the truth. It may be, as you, sir, have said, it may be documentation in his eyes, but it was not, in fact, documentation in the eyes of many impartial and perhaps non-impartial observers. For example, let me say—

Mr. MacDonald: The member was nit-picking.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Why do you not let me make my point? I am addressing the Speaker and I am quite in order. For example, the hon. member yesterday made some implication about some parole for somebody, and he said perhaps the hon. Attorney General or the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions can get us some information about this. Now what was that but an innuendo? It is exactly the same thing. I suggest, sir, that it may be documentation in his eyes, but there was much in what he said which in the eyes of any impartial observer was not documentation at all.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, when you rose a few moments ago you stated that in your view what the hon. member for High Park stated was not documentation. With respect, sir, that is the responsibility of government members to prove that it is documentation, and not guesswork. And, Mr. Speaker, my point of order is simply this, that when a member rises in this House and

presents a documented case, if other members do not agree with it, they can challenge it and provide alternative facts. But no member in this House has the right to get up and present three or four cases of innuendo with no documenation.

Mr. Speaker: Order! The member persists in using the words "documented case". I have no evidence before me either in *Hansard* of yesterday or the documents which have been laid before me that it is in the sense that I as a Speaker and as a lawyer would say was a documented case. Now, if the member would say that is a case documented to the satisfaction of either himself or the party or the member presenting it, I would accept that. But I cannot accept the member's statement that it is a documented case.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, Mr. Speaker, not being a lawyer I am not going to engage in the legal quibbling as to whether that was a documented case, but most of the cases that were presented by the hon. member for High Park had factual background.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, if the hooting on the other side of the House has any validity, there was nothing given by the hon. member for Grey South, nothing at all on three or four innuendos. And, Mr. Speaker, I submit that he should either document it, back it up—give it whatever phraseology you want—or withdraw. One or the other.

Mr. Speaker: Well, if the member had listened to what the Speaker said a little while ago, he said exactly what the member is saying and I concur—

Mr. MacDonald: But he was going to sit down.

Mr. Speaker: All right, but the matter has not been completed because the members from the other Opposition party have given no one, not even the Speaker, an opportunity to deal with the matter. Now perhaps if they would be quiet and remain in their seats we will have this matter straightened out.

I said a short while ago and I do not remember my exact words, but I said that I felt that as it was, the member for Grey South who had then been speaking should either produce evidence of the statements or I think—it was quite right, there was an innuendo. We have many of them from all sides of the House and sometimes they are allowed to go by as in the not too distant past they have, or sometimes they are picked up as points of order as the member for Humber did, and he was quite correct in doing so.

So, I would say to the member for Grey South that I think this is an opportunity at this moment for the matter to be dealt with properly. At a later date, if he is in a position to produce the kind of documentation which pleases him, as the member for High Park has done producing the documentation which pleases him, I am sure the House will be glad to hear it and hear these charges and to hear the evidence.

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Provincial Treasurer): Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member is almost through, I suggest that maybe we can proceed. If not, maybe—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: —he would care to adjourn the debate prior to the adjournment of the House.

Interjection by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order! Would the members in the second Opposition party please give the House and the other members the courtesy of having this matter properly taken care of? The Speaker is quite capable of handling it, and will handle it much better if he has a little co-operation and a little quietness from over there.

I have made a suggestion; it does not need any assistance from any other member of the House. I would be glad to have the member for Grey South deal with the matter and then properly close off the debate, if that be his wish.

Mr. Winkler: Mr. Speaker, since the situation has gone this far, I also would go a little deeper into the question, if the members so choose, and suggest that even the leader of the NDP in his contribution here this evening said that the member for High Park documented most of his cases.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, do not quibble over—

Mr. Winkler: And this is quite right. But these matters are serious matters that I would like to have the hon. member for High Park comment on. I do not intend keeping people here all evening to do that. I have the matter, and I am going to take the opportunity of carrying it forward tomorrow, and

if I may, Mr. Speaker, I will adjourn the House—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: I will not accept—

Mr. Winkler: —move the adjournment of the debate, I am sorry.

Mr. Speaker: I will not accept an adjournment of the House motion until this particular point is cleared up one way or the other tonight, because this House must—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Would the members in the second Opposition party please give the Speaker at least the courtesy of being heard without a raucous noise, both vocal and otherwise?

This House is a House where there is a minimum sometimes, of order, decorum and respect paid, not only to Mr. Speaker, but to other members of the House. It has been very evident tonight, and I have done my best to enable debate to be carried on with a little bit of humour as well as a reasonable amount of interruption from each side, because that is the essence of debate in this House.

We have had too much tonight. I would like to call to the members' attention before we finish this matter that in the future I certainly do not propose to let us get to the state where we have been tonight, with respect to interrupting speakers and the debate.

Now, I have outlined to the members the position so far as I am concerned. The matter is quite open to a motion to deal with the Speaker's ruling. I have no objection to that, I will be glad to put it, but I feel that this matter needs to be dealt with. I think that the member for Grey South can, if he has the material tonight, produce documentation which he states as documentation, as the member for High Park did.

Now, whether it is documentation to the satisfaction of certain other members, is immaterial at the moment to me. Or he has the opportunity of withdrawing the remarks to which exception has been taken on the motion of the member.

Mr. L. M. Reilly (Eglinton): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: Order! The member for Humber endeavoured to interrupt the Speaker, which of course is not good practice. I have noticed him and he now has the floor.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Speaker, with all due respect to you, although I agree with your ruling based on my recent point of order, I do think it is incumbent upon the Speaker, the hon. member for Grey South, to move the adjournment of the debate. Then it would be incumbent upon him to meditate overnight what he should do on the morrow—either withdraw the remark, or present documentation.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, if I may comment on the point of order, you have put before the House two alternatives, either a withdrawal or a substantiation of the very serious allegations. We on this side are prepared to listen to the choice that the hon. member is prepared to make now.

Mr. Reilly: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, I believe when a member stands up in this House and moves for adjournment of the debate, under the circumstances I think the Speaker of the House should then put the motion before this House.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Reilly: Mr. Speaker, the member in question has not indicated that he is not willing to continue with this. He has indicated that he has other information that he is prepared to give to this House and at this time he has moved for—

Mr. MacDonald: He cannot produce.

Mr. Speaker: Order! This is a very interesting point, and I noted it at the time and I had hoped that the member was in a position to deal with it, because there is not any question, and even Mr. Speaker cannot argue with the rules of debate. I suppose that originally I should have put the motion to adjourn, because the motion to adjourn always takes precedence. It was put, but I felt that it would be very advisable if this matter could be cleared up tonight.

However, having had my attention called today to the rules of the House by a member on this side, and yesterday by a member on that side, I am prepared to follow the rules of the House today for the member here, as I did yesterday for the member there. The member for Grey South moves the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. Martel: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. You made the ruling prior to his asking for an adjournment.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order! There is no discussion of a motion to adjourn.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Martel: You cannot change your ruling.

Mr. Speaker: The Speaker can change his ruling, and the Speaker has changed his ruling. If you wish to appeal the Speaker's ruling, that is quite in order.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Speaker—

An hon. member: He cannot change his ruling; what is the matter with you?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Just a moment, Mr. Speaker, we are quite—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Will the Minister please take his seat for a minute?

I must say that this is a good way to break in a new Speaker, because while I have been a member of this House for a long time, like many of you I have not studied the rules as well as I should have, although I did some homework prior to the opening of the House. If I may advise you what the Assistant Clerk of the House has advised me —I am going to have to see what he is advising me—

Hon. A. F. Lawrence (Minister of Mines): Mr. Speaker, while you are reading the rules with the Clerk of the House, if I could say a few words?

Some hon. members: The Speaker is standing.

Mr. Speaker: The Speaker remains firm in his original decision that a motion to adjourn is not debatable. There is some question at the moment and I am open to any comment with respect to that, but I think that is a well-known rule of not only this House but any House of this kind. My hearing—and it may be wrong—was that the member had moved that the House adjourn. Mr. Speaker unfortunately did not pay any attention to it. He should have. Therefore, that motion, as far as I am concerned, is before the House and that is a ruling which can be voted against and voted for. I would be glad to have that done.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Speaker, may I draw to your attention, sir, that it was the hon. member's intention to move the adjournment of the debate, not the House?

Mr. Speaker: That is what he did.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well, you just made reference to the House yourself.

Mr. Speaker: Sorry, my understanding was —my hearing—that he moved the adjournment of the debate. I am sorry.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): May I say a word to the point of order? Only once in the history of this House was there an occasion when an hon. member other than the leader of the government ever moved the adjournment of the House, and that prerogative is clearly vested in the leader of the government to adjourn the House. May I suggest what we do?

If he intended to make the motion to adjourn the debate, may I suggest that he withdraw what I think was a slip of the tongue and offer his motion to adjourn the debate?

Mr. Speaker: Well, in my hearing or my understanding, and perhaps I was not paying attention, he moved to adjourn the debate. If that was his motion, perhaps he would make it again.

Mr. Winkler moves the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Speaker, with due respect, you have two motions before you now.

Mr. Speaker: According to the best of my knowledge and my hearing—and obviously from the viewpoint of the members over there, I did not hear right—I thought the member moved the adjournment of the debate. I thought we might settle this matter at the time, and I neglected to give the preference that that motion was entitled to. It has been drawn to my attention now, as a point of order, and I think a point well taken. The motion has been put and I declare the motion as carried.

Call in the members.

As many as are in favour of the motion will please rise.

As many as are opposed will please rise.

Clerk of the House: Mr. Speaker, the "ayes" are 48 and the "nays" 36.

Mr. Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Speaker, before moving the adjournment of the House, may I say that tomorrow we will continue the Throne Speech debate and the private members' hour.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 12.10 o'clock, a.m.

No. 19

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

First Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Friday, March 8, 1968

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1968

5

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Friday, March 8, 1968

Questions to Mr. Davis re children with learning disabilities, Mr. Deacon 599

Question to Mr. Stewart re the Canada and Dominion Sugar plant, Mr. Innes 600

Questions to Mr. Grossman re the Kawartha detention centre, Mr. Pitman 600

Question to Mr. Yaremko re the family counselling service, Mr. Pitman 601

Question to Mr. Davis re the Sutton district high school, Mr. Pitman 602

Questions to Mr. Rowntree re gasoline prices, Mr. Martel 602

Question to Mr. Davis re the regional library system, Mr. Good 602

Resumption of the debate on the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Winkler, Mr. Good, Mr. Kennedy 603

Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Kennedy, agreed to 612

On notices of motion No. 6 and No. 10, Mr. Lawlor, Mr. Singer 612

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Rowntree, agreed to 619

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

FRIDAY, MARCH 8, 1968

The House met at 10:30 o'clock, a.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are always pleased to have visitors to the Legislature, and today we welcome as guests, students from the following schools; in the east gallery, St. William's separate school, Toronto, and in west gallery —Givens Street public school, Toronto, and the citizenship branch new Canadian class for professional people of the international institute in Toronto.

At 11:30 this morning, we will be joined in the west gallery by students from Bayview junior high school, Willowdale, and in the east gallery, at 12:15 by pupils from the George L. Armstrong public school, Hamilton, and again, at 12:30 in the Speaker's gallery, by members of the credit union from the Kenora district.

I am sure that we welcome these young people now, and those who will come later.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day I would like to ask a question of the hon. Minister of Education.

Has The Department of Education investigated reports from the perceptual research centre, Wellesley, Massachusetts, that over the past 15 years, school dropouts have declined 40 per cent in some areas of the United States where programmes of assistance have been introduced for children with learning disabilities?

Second, has the department made plans in its teacher training and staff training programmes for the making available of such assistance for these children in Ontario, which I understand, number about 10 per cent of the child population?

Hon. W. G. Davis (Minister of Education and Minister of University Affairs): Mr. Speaker, in reply to this question, I do not want to be too lengthy but the second part of the question really involves a little bit of detail. I assume the hon. member would appreciate having this.

With respect to the first part of the question. The department has not specifically investigated the report from the perceptual research centre in Massachusetts, although we are aware of their work and we are also aware, without their report, that the dropout rate or the retention factor with respect to children with learning disabilities, certainly is increased very substantially when they have courses designed for their particular needs.

Now, as far as the department itself is concerned, it has been aware of this for some time, and it partially was responsible for the introduction of the occupational courses at the secondary school level in 1963. We think this has very substantially alleviated the dropout problem for some of these youngsters at this grade level.

The hon. member will be interested to know that a memorandum was sent out on November 6, 1967, to our superintendents, directors, consultants and principals of our secondary schools, drawing to their attention the need for modified programmes for perceptually handicapped secondary school students.

The department itself has done much to make specialized training regarding learning disabilities available to teachers.

In 1964, an additional option was introduced into the summer course programme in special education, concerning the education of the neurologically impaired young people. In 1965, a further option was introduced concerning the education of children with emotional disturbances.

Since that time, Mr. Speaker, the number of teachers within these courses has doubled and, of course, so has the programme and this is known to some members in the House. An educational psychology course in the 13 teachers' colleges is presently placing greater emphasis upon individual differences and learning disorders.

We have also made available, through the regional offices, consultants to the boards and to the classroom teachers, with respect to

programmes for exceptional youngsters. We use this term in the broad sense to cover all those areas of disability. Over the past three years, we have assisted in the financing of an intensive one week training programme in August, co-sponsored by the department and the Ontario association for children with learning disabilities.

I should also point out that in September 1967, we appointed—and I am quoting from the press release, "an assistant director of special education attached to the teacher education branch". The function of the assistant director would be, initially, to visit institutions in the United States which provide teacher training programmes in the field of special education and where courses are identified as meeting the needs of teachers working in this field in this province, they will be accredited by the department.

To those of the House who, perhaps, are not as familiar with the situation, one of the difficulties we have had over the past years is the certification of teachers within Ontario who receive their training other than in the province of Ontario. It is interesting to know that to date, the officer concerned with this has informally approved the courses in special education in some 20 universities which are situated outside the province of Ontario.

It was also announced in that press release, Mr. Speaker, and we are making very good progress in this regard, that the department intends to provide a new facility, in co-operation with an Ontario university, to provide the type of training for the number of teachers we will need in the whole field of special education. I think, as a further indication, Mr. Speaker, of the department's awareness, and this government's desire, to come to grips with this problem, is the alteration in grants structure covering the field of special education which has been sent out to the board, and which will be received by all the boards as of this date.

I should further point out, Mr. Speaker, without attempting to prolong this answer, that one of the great difficulties of the whole field of special education is the size of the administrative unit that can deal with these situations. Of course, when the hon. member asks a question of this kind, I am sure he appreciates one of the great advantages in the legislation that will be introduced shortly here, with respect to county school areas, is that this legislation will enable many of the boards that hitherto just could not do it, to introduce courses in special education to deal with these youngsters that live in the less urbanized areas of Ontario.

Mr. G. W. Innes (Oxford): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Agriculture and Food. Has a decision been made with respect to the possibility of the government placing the Canada and Dominion Sugar plant in trusteeship, and if not, when will such a decision be forthcoming?

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): Mr. Speaker, I regret to say that no decision has been reached as yet. The matter is still under consideration.

Mr. W. G. Pitman (Peterborough): Mr. Speaker, might I direct a question to the Minister of Reform Institutions? Would the Minister indicate whether major alterations are intended for the Millbrook reformatory before it becomes the Kawartha detention centre?

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): Mr. Speaker, major alterations to convert a portion of the Millbrook reformatory for use as the Kawartha regional detention centre, are part of an overall plan for integration of the correction system in the province.

These plans, which I announced publicly on December 20, 1967, include the construction of a new reformatory to replace the present Mimico reformatory, and the new training centre on the site west of Toronto. As part of these plans and to alleviate costs, a large portion of the property at the Mimico reformatory is to be sold. Existing buildings of the Mimico reformatory will be converted into a clinical complex for the treatment of alcoholics, drug addicts, and sex deviates.

The enlarged facilities for treatment of these offenders will provide accommodation for drug addicts and some sex deviates that are now sent initially to Millbrook reformatory. A new staff training college will also be built on the site at Mimico.

Major alterations will be made at Millbrook reformatory to permit a portion of the reformatory facilities to serve as a maximum security portion of the Kawartha regional detention centre. The alterations will ensure that the populations of these two units are completely segregated from one another. Since the maximum security facilities are the most expensive areas in a regional detention centre our plans will result in considerable savings in capital expenditures.

In addition we propose to enlarge the minimum security facilities of camp Durham, an open unit, to increase its accommodation

from 14 to 50. This will provide a minimum security setting for inmates sentenced to the regional detention centre. It is most unfortunate that the hon. member and others in his party did not check the facts, which I announced on December 20, 1967, before making such irresponsible statements as appear in the February, 1968 issue of the *New Democrat*. I am rather surprised, to tell you the truth, that it came from the hon. member for Peterborough. Let me quote:

> —according to Walter Pitman, NDP, Peterborough, plans to build a new juvenile assessment and detention centre in Kawartha have been scrapped. The adult prisoners in Millbrook will have to be moved to other institutions. But instead of tearing down the grim fortress, The Department of Reform Institutions is going to incarcerate children there.

This is a barefaced lie.

Mr. Pitman: May I ask a supplementary question as to whether the Minister intends to have facilities for emotionally-disturbed juveniles in that Kawartha detention centre?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, of course the answer is no. If the hon. member had read my statement which I made on December 29, 1967—it was laid out in complete detail and was available to the press and every member of this House. But it remains that the hon. member stated as a fact—unless he says that the *New Democrat* did not quote his statement correctly—that we were going to incarcerate children there, which is an absurd suggestion. It is an irresponsible statement for any member of this House to make.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Pitman: In my context juveniles are children, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I do not think that there is any doubt about it; that includes juveniles. My statement does include juveniles. Of course, juveniles will not go to Millbrook detention centre.

Mr. Pitman: Will there be special facilities for detaining emotionally disturbed juveniles?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Now, now, one thing at a time. You asked that question. There are many other misstatements in this paper, and we will deal with them one at a time later during this session. Some of the members on the other side have been growing wilder and wilder in some of their statements. They will hear from us before this session is over.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): But none of us can match you.

Mr. Pitman: I shall look forward to hearing from the hon. Minister on those statements. A question for the Minister of Social and Family Services. If you have a counselling service being accorded to those receiving assistance from the department, by the family counselling service, and in view of the Minister's purported remarks in Peterborough last weekend that there is a shortage in this department, would the Minister consider amending The Child Welfare Act to enable this organization to become eligible for the provincial subsidy from the Minister's department?

Hon. J. Yaremko (Minister of Social and Family Services): In order to enlighten those members of the Legislature who did not have the opportunity of seeing the remarks as reported in Peterborough—I myself did not see them—I will just extract a part of what I said on that occasion. Having delivered some remarks on my opinions in relation to rehabilitation and prevention in relationship to dependancy on public maintenance programmes, I went on to say this:

> If we are to enter more widely into this type of rehabilitation, if we are to find the best answers to dependency, there are two main prerequisites—more staff and more knowledge. We shall need a greater number of skilled persons to work in this demanding field of human relations, and we shall need more knowledge to make that work effective. The shortage of qualified social workers is rapidly being overcome. Two new university schools of social work have recently opened; undergraduate courses are being started by four or five universities; and the new colleges of applied arts and technology—the "community colleges"—are training social workers in a large way.
>
> I am proud of the fact that my department has played a significant role in attracting and cultivating a rapid and prolific growth of social scientists.

That is the term that I like. The second requisite that I named to carry us forward on the hopeful road was knowledge:

> More knowledge, more light, more skills —these are the things that men have wished for in all their efforts; each is especially desired in the professions that they have

> as their object, the making of life meaningful, and good. Physical science has made strides with seven league boots. Modern medicine dealing with tangible physical structure has had marvellous success, as we all know. Psychiatry, psychology, and the social sciences treating the intangibles must seek no less universal positive results.

I will save the rest of this speech for some other occasion but those were the remarks which I assume were reported in Peterborough.

Now recognizing the needs of recipients of allowances for additional services, we in the department are in the process of establishing a family services branch to provide counselling services. This would not be affected under The Child Welfare Act, which relates only to children's aid societies. Future developments in this area will be announced by me.

Mr. Pitman: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Minister of Education: does he intend to investigate the charge of racial bias at Sutton district high school, as occasioned by the expulsion of an Indian student as reported in the Toronto *Daily Star* on Wednesday March 6, 1968?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, the preliminary information we have with respect to the problem in Sutton would indicate that it did not arise from a question of racial bias.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): Mr. Speaker, may I ask a question of the hon. Attorney General? When will The Attorney General's Department exhume the body buried under the name of Harold E. Ryder? Is the Attorney General aware of what happened to Harold E. Ryder?

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I received the question a moment before I entered the House. I will be glad to take it under consideration and furnish a reply.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs.

If the wholesale price of gas is 25.2 cents per gallon in Sudbury and in Toronto it is 21.6—therefore leaving a difference between Sudbury and Toronto of 3.6 cents per gallon —and if transportation costs from Britt to Sudbury are six-tenths of a cent, why is there an additional three cents per gallon handling charge in Sudbury over Toronto?

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Mr. Speaker, these questions both deal with oil company pricing policy.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the Minister would allow the member to place his second question because presumably the two are being asked in conjunction.

Mr. Martel: Do the unbranded dealers in Ontario get regular gas from the major oil companies at eight cents a gallon less than the dealers and lessees of the major oil companies?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Mr. Speaker, both of these questions deal with oil company pricing policy.

In reply to the hon. member I can only repeat what has been said previously in answer to similar questions—and I quote from my answer on March 4:

> We must ask ourselves, however, whether a province can control prices in the market place. Is it proper for any province in a federal state to move unilaterally into areas having to do with price control, either generally or in the specific example indicated by the hon. member's question? I think not and therefore am of the opinion that questions of this nature are not properly within the jurisdiction of this House.

The information requested, Mr. Speaker, is as readily available to the hon. member as it is to me. There is no legislation in Ontario which requires manufacturers to report their pricing policies to any department of government.

In this vein, Mr. Speaker, I think it might be helpful and worthwhile for me to quote briefly from what has come to be known as the Batten report on prairie living. Judge Mary Batten, at a press conference in Regina, said there did not appear to be any major way that provincial governments could roll back prices. Judge Batten said, and I quote:

> Price increases are mainly due to inflation which is beyond the capacity of a province to control.

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Education.

As the department has indicated through the provincial library services branch that no payments can be made before April 1 to the midwestern regional library system, and since they are not permitted to borrow funds, what

steps does the Minister intend taking to finance the regional library system from January 1 to April 1 of each year?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, this has been the policy for some time as the hon. member well knows, and the vast majority of regional library boards take into account, in their own budgeting and their own financing, the fact the grants are not payable until April 1 of each year.

We have ascertained that it is not a great problem for a number of them and, Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member, perhaps, is well aware of the situation. There is just no way that monies can be paid until the grant regulations and the funds become available on April 1. The regional library boards have budgeted on this basis for some years.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The first order, resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the amendment to the motion for an address in reply to the Speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor at the opening of the session.

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

Mr. Speaker: May I ask the member to resume his seat for a moment before he commences his remarks. Last evening, before the adjournment of the House, there was a matter under discussion. The Speaker submitted to the member a course of action, and I would presume that the member is now prepared to deal with that in his remarks, and I would trust that he will do so at the opening of his concluding remarks in his speech on the reply to the Address from the Throne.

Mr. E. A. Winkler (Grey South): Mr. Speaker, as you suggest, and at the risk of imputing motives and on your advice, I wish now to place before the Legislature the references that were used by myself last evening.

In respect to the involvement of the Posluns case, which involved a good deal of the beginning of my words, I wish to quote from the *Dominion Law Reports*, the record of a judgment handed down by Chief Justice Gale and is a decision of a court of law.

In that report, which is volume 46, 1965 on page 229, the justice writes as follows:

> The testimony of the other two witnesses who have been singled out is not easy to evaluate. Unquestionably, Doctor Shulman is blessed with a brilliant and facile mind. However, his performance as a witness probably suffered because of being so endowed for, at times, he responded so quickly as to invite the notion that he was too glib to be entirely truthful.
>
> On occasions, he certainly contradicted himself, perhaps for that very reason, or, perhaps, he did not stop to consider his answers before making them. And, I came to the conclusion that where his evidence was found to be in conflict with that of a calm but reflecting witness, I should accept that over the latter.

Mr. Speaker, in my view, that is quite sufficient in regard to the remarks that I made in the actions of put and take in the people that were referred to in that particular quotation.

In the second instance, Mr. Speaker, and I refer now to the hon. gentleman's appointment as chief Metro coroner, I would like to quote too—just so that we have the records straight. I might inform the House and all members that the words in the speech I made were provoked by the hon. member himself; he used many instances when he did not document what he said, and I wish that some time in the future he will conclude that speech by documenting the balance.

But I quote here, from the *Globe and Mail*, Friday, March 8, the reply made by the hon. member in the House: "I am not suggesting the Premier (Mr. Robarts) did anything illegal, improper or unethical, Doctor Shulman replied"—that is the hon. member for High Park. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I believe that what I did, and the questions I asked were well founded, and deserved answers.

Mr. Speaker, on the CBC in April of 1967, the hon. member was on a show known as the Don Simms Show with John DaFoe, Kesley Merry and Jack Cahill. He was asked a question and the question is this: "I presume you were appointed as a matter of political patronage initially."

Doctor Shulman said that was true. He later on discussed his political connections with the Conservatives and people therein. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, and to this moment, I cannot get the tape of that particular programme. But when it is available I will be very, very agreeable to placing it on the record in this House.

Then in the Toronto *Telegram*, April 13, 1967, Mr. Speaker, an article with the headline, "Shulman claims he got job through political patronage". Surely the circumstance in the position that that party takes in the

House is ugly enough when I quote that headline and in the subsequent article:

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): That is what you call an ugly situation—Tory patronage!

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Winkler: To continue:

> Fired Metro chief coroner, Doctor Morton Shulman, told the John White society at Osgoode Hall today that he had been hired in 1963 through political patronage. Patronage, he said, was behind all coroners' appointments before 1963. He was made chief coroner for Metro because he was an active Conservative. At one time, he was president of the Young Conservatives.

Mr. Speaker, I hope this will satisfy that which you required of me last evening.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Winkler: Now just a moment. To conclude, Mr. Speaker, I think that probably most people in this chamber are aware, but I would also like the public to be aware, of the deep concern that the hon. member for High Park (Mr. Shulman) had to get into the political arena sometime immediately following that appointment.

Even the leader of Her Majesty's loyal Opposition knows the concern that was caused in his office over the approaches that were made, and I will say one thing further, that the members of his party who I associated with, and who are good hon. members in the other body to which I belonged, assured me that he would never get into their party.

Mr. MacDonald: That is just peddling rumours!

Mr. Winkler: So I suggest that the circumstances are applicable on a much wider basis. Mr. Speaker, I had further—

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. Perhaps the member might clarify his comments. I would not dress them up by saying they are allegations. It is simply that we cannot understand them.

Mr. Winkler: I think all the leader of Her Majestiy's loyal Opposition has to do is say that they are correct.

Mr. Nixon: The hon. member is misinformed!

Mr. Winkler: We will see about that. I am here with a mandate, the same as you are, and do not forget that.

Mr. MacDonald: You are abusing your mandate.

Mr. Winkler: Not as much as the people in his quarter, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I request the hon. member to detail, as he suggested last night, my effect on my bank manager, whom he mentioned, I believe.

Mr. Winkler: I made no reference, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. gentleman's bank manager—none.

However, Mr. Speaker, I am going to conclude my address at this point, and hope that I will have an opportunity to enter at a future date.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The hon. member also made reference—he appears to have doctored *Hansard*, but he made the reference unless he has cut that out also—to a druggist.

Mr. Speaker: The member will please remember that last evening, in the debate, not only he, but the leader of his party, indicated that in most cases he had documented his allegations, or his innuendos, or his statements. I would say that in this case, the member who has just concluded speaking has documented to his satisfaction—at least, those that he has made. I think that the honours are divided and I think that we have dealt with this particular case in the same manner as we have dealt with the previous ones.

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): Mr. Speaker, I would like, at the outset, to extend my congratulations to you on your election as Speaker of this House; to my neighbour and hon. member for Waterloo South (Mr. Reuter) on his appointment as Deputy Speaker; to the hon. Premier (Mr. Robarts) as leader of the government; to the hon. member for York South (Mr. MacDonald) as leader of the NDP; and, lest there be any thought that I am forgetting the leader of my own party, I have congratulated him often in private and I do not think that this assembly is a fitting place for public leadership aggrandizement.

I was pleased to learn, as a new member, that we are given a great amount of scope and lattitude in what we say in our maiden speech, and also that we have, more or less, an audience which will listen with attentive

silence. I hope that all of the hon. members do not go away, because compared to what went on here last night, what I have to say will sound like a Sunday school picnic.

But I do believe this, Mr. Speaker, that if one throws mud, one ends up with one's own hands dirty, and I think this to be true, whether it be a rebuked renegade or a frustrated federalist. I would like to say a little regarding the election campaign, so I would like to say that we, in our riding, had a clear and clean campaign. The candidates were together 14 times during the course of the campaign and we did have four candidates in our riding.

There was one thing which became apparent very early in the campaign, and that was that the NDP policy in our area seemed to bear no resemblance to socialism. It was refreshing to come here and find out that down here they admit to be socialists. Back in the riding, we could not get our candidates to admit anything of that nature. When they were in the apartment areas, their policy was simply one of situation—a situation policy.

Mr. P. J. Yakabuski (Renfrew South): That is typical.

Mr. Good: When they were talking to people from apartments, they were going to control rents and bring down rents. When they were talking to high school and university kids, they were going to lower the liquor age and the voting age. When they were talking to a business man, they would not admit to any form of nationalization, or any form of socialism, and when they were talking to insurance men, the NDP in our area would not admit to nationalizing the car insurance business. That is correct.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Good: Now, we were not blessed with the presence of the hon. Premier in our riding during the campaign, although word went around, and I say it as a quote:

> The policy of the Conservative campaign committee seemed to be, do not send John, send money.

And believe me they did, in wheelbarrows.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the riding which I represent—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Would the members please extend to this new member the courtesy of silence during his speech?

Mr. Good: Nothing more controversial, hon. members. Mr. Speaker, the riding which I repersent is Waterloo North and when I wrote this speech, I thought it sounded something like Tom Jones singing the "Green, green grass of home". But after hearing the speech of the hon. member for Kingston and the Islands (Mr. Apps) yesterday, I think I have neglected my constituents, somewhat, in my speech.

This riding is situated about 60 miles west of here and includes two-thirds of the land mass of Waterloo county. While there are almost a quarter of a million people in the county, the population of my riding is about one quarter of that number.

I think there are many things which I would like to tell you about the riding and the fine people who live there. First of all, Mr. Speaker, our area is one of extreme contrasts. Settled as it was in the early 1800's by people—Mennonites, Pennsylvania Dutch background and later by large groups of German-speaking people.

It is agricultural and rural in its outlying areas, and in the centre of this fine farming community, there is a core of fast growing urban population.

I speak here of the city of Waterloo and included with it, in the riding is the north ward of the city of Kitchener. The city of Waterloo, Mr. Speaker, has become the home of thousands of newcomers since World War II. You may ask how did so many people find their way to the city of Waterloo?

I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, and I hope the hon. Minister of The Department of Highways (Mr. Gomme) is listening, that it was not through well-marked highway signs. Along the entire length of the Macdonald-Cartier freeway, there is only one sign, travelling in either direction, which bears the name Waterloo.

Surely, Mr. Speaker, the department is not in that poor financial condition that it could not put up adequate signs to mark the location of this important city. By my own count, I have counted signs showing the position of small communities, four, five and six times—repeating themselves. Admittedly, these are on the eastern end of Highway 401.

Waterloo would be very proud; in fact, we would be pleased to share a little space on one of the numerous signs which, at frequent intervals, shows the way and gives the mileage to the city of London. Mr. Speaker, about ten years ago, Ontario had 20,000 university students and half of these were in the city of Toronto.

It was from this point that the idea was enlarged and developed that the then small Waterloo college should be developed into a large university. From this beginning ten years ago, two universities have developed with a total present enrolment of 10,000 students.

While forecasts are difficult to make, it is quite certain and fairly accurate that within ten years there will be 18,000 to 20,000 students in the city of Waterloo at the two universities. I was going to say for the benefit of the member for London South (Mr. White) that we, too, had polls in our universities. I will put it on the record; maybe he will see it.

While our university is new, the students are not hampered by any preconceived ideas. We have a freedom of action, perhaps not enjoyed by an older established university and while our students are beholden to no one, they did top the polls for the Liberal candidate at all the university polls.

Any city is proud to be the site of a great university and Waterloo is no exception. Picture, if you can, a campus of 1,200 acres; with buildings of the two universities approaching the $100 million mark in value, with several thousand students living on campus and residences, with their necessary, accompanying commercial establishments.

Now to accommodate and support this large number of student population, the city of Waterloo has provided, and must provide, a great many services. These include, of course, water, sewage, police and fire protection. We are also, in Waterloo, educating the children of people who are living on campus, and all this is done as the hon. member for Kingston and the Islands pointed out yesterday, without the city receiving any municipal taxes from the university.

In view of the fact that no assessment may be made on these buildings, I would think that the provincial government would be well justified in giving a grant to these municipalities, in lieu of taxes for their on-campus commercial establishment. Now let me, for the sake of clarity, say that I cannot follow the argument from the member for Kingston and the Islands where all buildings, on the university campus, should be taxed.

I think that any university city receives other benefits from having this population and this great work force and this intellectual community within its boundaries. But I do believe that the provincial government should make a grant to these university cities for the on-campus commercial enterprises which exist there.

Mr. Speaker, in Waterloo county, we are in the midst of an area study review. No doubt you are familiar with the problems that arise as a fast rising urban community eats its way out into the surrounding farm land. Since the second world war, the townships around our cities have been faced with one annexation appearing after another, in order to accommodate the tremendous growth of the urban areas. With the townships giving up their land, they, of course, are faced with new problems.

With each annexation by the city, the township loses its prime assessment. It loses its best roads, as paved roads are usually those close to the city. It loses its schools and a great many of its people, and finally all that is left is an administration with virtually nothing left to administer, and very little source of revenue with which to do it.

To compound the situation, each jurisdiction, I believe, tries to do what is best for the residents of that particular area and it is only natural that the overall good of the entire region is considered secondary. Such a situation now exists in Waterloo county.

The municipalities have problems with each other and they speak in the best interests of their particular people. These family differences usually end up down in The Department of Municipal Affairs as the hon. Minister will relate.

It is all very fine for his department to lecture to the municipalities on the foolishness of creating such expensive and costly hearings, but surely, The Ontario municipal board and provincial government cannot pretend that all the fault is at the local level. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the lack and the uncertainty of provincial policy on urban growth and development has been the real cause of most of our problems. Not until very recently has there been any sign that the province is willing to give any leadership in this important matter. To solve our problem of urban growth, there must be overall planning as it relates to land use in the whole of the province, and especially in southern Ontario.

This cannot be done, little by little, by individual municipalities, but a start must be made on a general plan for all of Ontario. Divide the province if you wish, Mr. Speaker, into economic regions, drainage basins or counties to form regional government. This is not too important, although co-terminous

boundaries are advocated for economical and regional divisions and political regions.

What is important is that when regional government does come, there must be with it some degree of regional responsibility, and that means cutting of red tape from the province in some areas, and a strengthening of provincial responsibility in others. Let us just consider the frustrating present situation. Let us assume that an owner of a small parcel of land wants his zone changed; he had approval from his local planning board; the city engineer says that it is fine; the council approves it; the area planning board approves it; and now I ask you, Mr. Speaker, why there should be a delay of up to six months, when this plan comes to Toronto, while some man who has probably never been to the riding of Waterloo North in his life, looks at a map and decides, "Well, I do not think that is a good idea"?

Another example, Mr. Speaker—what interest should it be to The Department of Highways if the town of Elmira decides to put up a stop sign at a certain corner within their town boundaries? Surely, as we may move to larger areas of administration, whether it be on a one-tier or two-tier basis, we can expect a reduction in provincial red tape in some of these areas.

When we talk of regional government, and with it, the need for regional planning, and incidentally, I am not too sure our present area planning board is able to operate as effectively as it would like to under existing conditions, then we must include in any discussion the matter of assessment. This Mr. Speaker, is one area where the province does have a responsibility to fill. In my opinion, that the use of the two hand-books produced by The Department of Municipal Affairs should be made mandatory across the province.

I speak of "the appraisal of notes for the assessors", and "the assessors' handbooks of cost factors". I assert the evidence that an assessment carried on for all municipalities within the county or region, would be much superior to the method that we now have. As an example, let me show you what can happen in the twin cities in my area.

Two commercial establishments, one on one side of the city boundary, and one on the other side of the city boundary, built exactly the same would end up with two vastly different assessments and two vastly different tax structures because of our present lack of uniformly equalized assessment.

I would suggest that a regional office, under The Department of Municipal Affairs assessment branch, which would give equalized assessment over an even larger area and would be most desirable. This system would justify the use of data processing equipment and all notices and assessment rolls would be the same throughout a large region.

This would tend, along with creating equalized assessment, to reduce the possibility of political pressure that could exist on assessors in some municipalities. In this area, Mr. Speaker, I say the province has a real responsibility.

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Would I be permitted a question, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker: I would suggest that since this is the member's maiden speech, that he should be uninterrupted.

Mr. Good: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say just a word about grants or, as the Smith report refers to them, the "chaotic grant system in Ontario". The present grant structure, perhaps as much as anything else, is hindering the voluntary union of municipalities into regional units.

We are all aware of the systems where amounts of grants vary from one municipality to another for reasons which may have been valid 25 years ago but which are no longer sound. Or, on the other hand, where a town may be reluctant to become a city because it has a bridge to build, and they know that their grant for bridges is different from being a town than if they should be a city.

Specifically though, Mr. Speaker, I would like to refer to the library grant as it affects the city of Waterloo for the year 1968. Mr. Speaker, the city of Waterloo stands to have its provincial grants cut from 18 per cent of approved costs to 12 per cent for approved costs. This is a reduction of 33⅓ per cent or $6,000.

I had explained to me the complexities of the provincial equalization factor, and that this factor has dropped from 34 to 29 because houses are selling at a high value in Waterloo, and when this factor is applied to another complex, an old formula, it comes out that Waterloo is to receive only 12 per cent of its approved cost instead of 18.

I will admit the figuring is correct but let us look at it this way—how can you justify a system that will reduce by one third the grant to the library of the city that

is the fastest growing in Canada, that has just built a new library; that has doubled its book stock in the last six years; that has doubled its circulation in the last six years; that is a site of two universities with a community college close at hand and a new junior technical school nearing completion; and a city which is fast becoming the centre of learning for the central part of Ontario?

Mr. Speaker, it just does not make sense. This situation exists in other areas, as well, where new libraries have just been completed, and I submit that no contemplated, patched-up system will do, but a complete review of the grant system, as it applies to libraries, should be undertaken in the whole province.

There are many other things about which I would like to speak, but time does not permit. I would like to mention them though, and later during the course of this Legislature, I would like to speak on them. There is the problem of air pollution; there is an immediate need for regional air pollution offices in the twin-city areas, and the government states that this is still a year and a half away.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to tell you that we had better air pollution control 20 years ago when our sanitary inspector would pull his watch out on a smoking chimney, than we have now under provincial control. There is the water pollution problem in our area, as it is everywhere.

In Elmira, where, through the OWRC, there is the newly built sewage treatment plant which cannot look after the phenol content of the industrial waste, fish cannot live in the streams below the town, and even two or three miles away, there is a smell of phenol along the rocks by the creek.

There is the age old complaint in our area, and this has been brought about by lack of regional planning, where the townships say the city is stealing their water, they are giving us their garbage back in return, and all it is doing is polluting and disfiguring the rural country side.

I would like to say just a word regarding a matter which pertains to the numerous small boards and commissions of government, from both of which I started to gather some information. From my preliminary observation, I think that many operate with a feeling of frustration, not feeling they have any proper communication with this Legislature, in spite of the fact that their very existence is by Act of provincial legislation, while many boards and commissions are responsible directly to the Minister involved. Unless they are involved in the estimates at Budget time, there are seldom any opportunities for discussion of their operations or problems.

Many boards operate from funds from the people they govern, so they are pretty well on their own, as they neither ask for, nor contribute, to the fiscal policy of the province. I would suggest that these boards are finding it difficult to fulfill their proper roles, due to lack of communication with the department or Minister of this Legislature.

Lastly, Mr. Speaker, I want to deal with the matter of schools – the organization of school boards on a one county basis. What I have to say on this subject will be no mish-mash or second hand opinion, but it will reflect the thinking of men and women who have devoted years in the field of education and are members of school boards, teachers, or professionally educated administrators.

From the numerous letters and copies of briefs that I have received, it is apparent that, without exception, these people resent the manner in which this programme was announced. Just let me quote from some of the letters I received. These are not my words, but the words of people who are associated with education. For example:

> An attitude foreign to the concept of democratic responsible government; a mockery of those who sit in the legislative assembly; the loss of rights, and freedom of the little people, from the rural people; we view with alarm the effects of local interests in schools, extra costs.

So the letters read. From the announcement from the Premier, last November, until just a few weeks ago, thousands of teachers, school trustees, and administrators were left completely in the dark as to their future. Now with the exception of the few people on rural consultative committees, I have not been able to find anyone, school trustee, administrator, teacher, inspector, or anyone who has been consulted on this move recently.

I was pleased that the hon. Minister said, in the House a few weeks ago, that delegations would be welcome to appear before the education committee when the legislation reaches that stage. Judging by the enlarged number of interested citizens whom we accompanied here on January 19, I would think that if the Minister is sincere in his offer to listen to delegations, we can expect to have our committee rooms packed.

Mr. Speaker, I am not, nor are most of those connected with education, opposed to larger areas of jurisdiction for school boards. It would be folly to say that no benefit could result from larger units, but what I do oppose is the idea of stamping every county with the same stamp. With the exception of five designated areas with boards of education, they say all others must conform.

We were told, when we appeared here in January, that the department realizes there are shortcomings in the proposal to adopt a one board per county system, but the Ministry spokesman said, "Until someone can show us a better system, we are going to stick with the one-board-for-one-county plan.

Mr. Speaker, for Waterloo county, there is a better system, and I want to show it to you right now. I am sorry the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Davis) is not here. Now let us take a look at how unreasonable this is.

Dufferin county, for example, has an enrolment of 5,000 students; Haldimand county, 8,000 students; and Haliburton, 2,000. These figures are from *School Administration* magazine which, I am sure you all know, makes them authentic. Prince Edward county, 5,000 students, and what is left over in Middlesex county after the city of London is taken out, 9,500 students.

Mr. Speaker, Waterloo county, we believe to be unique. If it is forced into a one-county board, it will be the largest county board in the province. There are 58,000 students in Waterloo county, 44,000 in the public system.

Now compare this with counties of 2,000, 5,000, 8,000 and 10,000 students. Based on the farm and residential assessment recommended in the guide, of the 20 school trustees in Waterloo county, four would be from the rural areas, four would be separate school trustees, and 12 would be from the cities.

In my opinion, and in the opinion of qualified persons of our county, the above distribution of elected trustees would not, and could not, provide a board of education that could be responsible to satisfy the needs of its ratepayers.

First, because of the size of the population and the distribution, and second, because of the major differences of the rural and urban needs of our county. Because of these factors, there is a deep concern that standards would have to be compromised to the disadvantage of the students and this defeats the whole purpose of the proposal.

Mr. Speaker, the population projection of Waterloo county predicts a doubling of population in ten years, while some counties have declined. On this point alone, there should be a division of school boards in the county of Waterloo. It has been concluded, after study of the number of students in each area, and the assessment base of each, that suitable operating groups would remain well above the standards laid out by the board. There would remain large enough areas that there could be a rural-urban division, or a north-south division, or better still, each of these divisions resulting in three boards—three jurisdictions—each treated as being within the guide to reorganization. Mr. Speaker, to pour into the same mould all counties—some with 2,000 students and some with 44,000 students, some are all rural, some rural and urban—is not in the best interest of good school administration.

A modified programme for Waterloo county must be considered. It has the qualities for a natural division into three areas, each of which is large enough to provide the advantages hoped for in the new proposal. I have stated our case and I have offered what we believe to be a reasonable alternative. I trust that the hon. Minister of Education, though he is not here, will give it his careful consideration.

Mr. R. D. Kennedy (Peel South): Mr. Speaker, as I rise to speak today for the first time, it is with the knowledge that some 2,800 members, since 1867, have preceded me in this assembly.

Under their guidance, within The British North America Act, Ontario has reached its present stage of development and prosperity.

I pay tribute to them.

Mr. Speaker, I must first congratulate you on your appointment to the office of Speaker of this assembly. I must say that in the brief time I have been here I have been most favourably impressed with the way the business of the House has been conducted. I might say that there is not always an atmosphere of complete tranquility. Those of us with little or no experience of such matters cannot help but observe the impartial and fair way in which you render judgments. These, of course, can only expedite the affairs of this Parliament. In this way, your service is a service to the people of Ontario.

I recall my first visit to the Legislature was with my public school class, a practice which I am pleased to see still takes place. There must be many more students visiting now because there are more children in Ontario and greatly improved transportation

facilities. A programme to encourage patriotism and civic awareness is to be commended.

In later life, I have had occasion to visit several departments and to meet and, in fact, share duties with some of the Queen's Park staff, and I would like to refer to this relationship a little later. Because of these experiences and associations, I have a certain familiarity with several of the departments.

I might say, too, that we often read or hear of a person achieving a lifelong wish. Although I have always had an interest in civic affairs and some involvement, I cannot say that becoming a member of this assembly has been my objective in life, nor did I think that I was destined to become one. I must say that I am pleased that this event has occurred. I do have a deep conviction that public service can be the highest form of duty to which one can aspire and I do not limit the reference to mean only the field of politics.

While I am making a few remarks of a personal nature, Mr. Speaker, I feel I would be most remiss if I did not acknowledge the kind references that have been made to me with respect to my late uncle, Colonel Thomas L. Kennedy. These tributes have come from hon. members, government staff, the citizens of Peel county and adjacent areas, also persons whom I have met from time to time in many parts of Ontario. Except for three years—1934 to 1937—he served from 1919 to 1959 as a member for the county of Peel, and he had a deep affection for this Legislature.

I am very aware that I have inherited much of this goodwill. As beneficiary, it is my hope to demonstrate that this transfer of confidence has not been misplaced.

I also wish to acknowledge the service to the constituency of my predecessor, the hon. William Davis. Prior to redistribution, Peel South was part of the whole riding of Peel county and it was represented by Mr. Davis, who now represents Peel North. I wish to acknowledge his service. Through his leadership and energy, education has been upgraded to a remarkable degree. In fact, his contribution to Peel and to Ontario is so commendable and so well known that it does not require further comments from me. But, I might say, it makes me even more conscious of the high calibre of service of the able representatives who have preceded me.

I pay tribute to the hon. John P. Robarts, Prime Minister of Ontario. I used both titles as I do not wish to excite the Opposition at this time. I first had the pleasure of meeting him when, as Minister of Education, he opened the new Dixie public school in Peel county. As Prime Minister, he has guided the affairs of Ontario through an era of growth and development unequalled in any similar period. The response of the people of Ontario in the 1960's each time he has sought a new mandate is eloquent testimony to his abilities.

Now I understand it is customary for a new member in an initial speech to make reference to his riding, and perhaps to the residents or citizens within its boundaries. I agree with this. Members must serve not only their own riding, but also on an Ontario-wide basis. Thus it is very desirable, and will be helpful, if we know something about other constituencies. I have found it most interesting to listen to previous remarks and to learn of some of the problems facing other areas. Many are common, perhaps varying only in degree.

Peel South is located just west of Metropolitan Toronto. As the name implies, it is the southern portion of Peel county. It is also the south part of the new town of Mississauga, and all of the town of Port Credit.

Indirectly, it has received an unusual amount of publicity because of the renaming of the township of Toronto to the town of Mississauga and, through this action, it became not only a town but the largest town in Canada. Some say the United States as well. This history-making event received wide coverage in the various news media.

The general area, and the name Mississauga, have an interesting history. The Peel county centenary book reveals that in 1805, at a meeting in what is now Port Credit, the Crown purchased from the Indians the southerly part of the Mississauga tract along the lakefront. This was five to six miles in width and extended from the Etobicoke Creek on the east, westward for 26 miles to the outlet of Burlington Bay. All Tory territory.

In consisted of 70,784 acres, and the price was 1,000 pounds (sterling). Those lands purchased which lay in Peel county were named the township of Toronto in the same year—1805. Excepted from the purchase was a tract which ran the depth of the land and a mile wide on each side of the Credit river.

In 1820, due to serious illness and general restlessness, the Indians decided to sell, and so again with a small exception, all those

previously retained lands, were sold and so the purchase was completed.

Then the author of this article, Mrs. Mary Fix, a former reeve, relates that in 1834 there occurred a seemingly inexplicable outrage. In that year York was incorporated as a city and it appropriated the name "Toronto". This act was apparently perpetrated with no voice raised in protest. So, for 162 years we have had a township of Toronto and, since 1834—133 years—a few miles to the east, a city of Toronto.

So, in centennial year of 1967, came town status approval for the township of Toronto. At the municipal election, in order to identify the new corporation, the voters chose the name Mississauga. On New Year's, 1968, at Confederation Square, Cooksville, the chief and several other descendants of the Mississauga Indians, now living in Haldimand county, joined with our citizens at an historic ceremony to mark the advent of the town of Mississauga.

And so, Mr. Speaker, through this name, we will maintain a link with history and I might say we are learning to spell it!

I mentioned earlier that Peel South riding is part of Mississauga and all of Port Credit. The east boundary is Etobicoke; the west, Halton county; the south, the lake. The north boundary is the Dundas Highway from Halton to Cooksville, then a jog north on Highway 10 and then east to Etobicoke.

I do not propose to take up the time of the House with further description regarding the layout of the riding, but may I invite the members to locate Peel South on the directory maps which are prominently displayed in several locations in this building.

I would like for a moment, Mr. Speaker, to comment, but not burden the House with statistics, regarding the increase in the area, both in population and assessment.

Toronto township, now Mississauga, in 1946 had 13,300 people and in 1966 almost 94,000. On these dates Port Credit had 2,300 and 8,000. Though these figures are impressive, last year was one of phenomenal expansion. Mississauga's population increased by 13,000 people or 15 per cent in the year alone, the increase being about the same as the total population in 1946. In 1952, its taxable assessment was $25,000,000 and in 1967 it had risen to about $180 million. The residential-industrial ratio has remained generally stable at about 60-40.

It is estimated that there will be an increase in assessment of about $20,000,000 and an annual capital budget of from $27 million to $30 million annually for the next few years.

Mr. Speaker, southern Peel county is a region which is experiencing a rate of growth far in excess of most areas in Ontario, in Canada and the United States. We still have much open land, but in company with others, we have problems with services. We have the ever-pressing need to provide schools, expand water, sewer, road, electrical and other facilities, if growth is to continue in an orderly fashion.

If the pressures for expansion are to be satisfied, all indications are that some measure of consolidation and joint action among municipalities must take place. It no longer seems practicable, nor in the taxpayers' interest, to have separate administrative units for all purposes, when the needs of adjoining municipalities, or groups of municipalities without reference to political boundaries, are the same.

When the population was sparse, the need and desire for services and education were modest and when communication was difficult, the handling of public affairs on a confined local basis was logical. But in this modern age it is clear that mutual action, wider in scope, has much to commend it. We are moving toward this consolidation now in some areas—one might call it a municipal ecumenical movement. I heartily endorse the programme.

There are several features and landmarks in the riding to which I wish to refer. First, and quite noticeable with its four 490-foot chimneys—a topical subject—is the Lakeview hydro generating station. This tremendous plant now has five units completed which develop 1.5 million kilowatts. When the last three scheduled for completion this year are in operation, capacity will be about 2,400,000 kilowatts. It will be one of the largest coal-firing stations in the world, with production greater than the peak demand in 1947 for the entire province. This is indicative of hydro's expansion, and of its contribution toward making this province great. In spite of the tremendous demand there has not been a significant power shortage since 1948 or 1949. Hydro is striving to keep the record intact, despite unprecedented demand.

Mr. Speaker, I notice it is now 12.00 o'clock. Is it your wish that we adjourn the debate for private members' hour, or should I proceed?

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the member would adjourn the debate until next week and carry on then.

Mr. Kennedy moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Mr. Speaker, I rise to move resolution No. 10.

Mr. Speaker: Order. Will the member wait until the resolution is introduced and then he may move it. Then we will have the member for Downsview move his resolution and then I will put them into the paper and begin the debate.

NOTICES OF MOTION

Clerk of the House: Notice of motion No. 6 by Mr. Singer.

RESOLUTION:

That this government should enact a tentnts' bill of rights to protect tenants from harsh and excessive terms in rental contracts including: 1. Provision for a standard form of lease. 2. The right of a tenant to limit his advance payments of rent to two months' rent as a maximum. 3. Deposit monies paid by the tenant as security against damage to a premises to be outlawed completely. 4. Forbidding terms in a rental agreement whereby the tenant surrenders the protection of any legislation passed for his protection. 5. Enacting and enforcing regulations that will guarantee the tenant basic safety and health standards. 6. Outlawing exclusive service agreements between landlords and suppliers that deny the tenant's right to free access to goods and services. 7. Forbidding landlords to levy any extra charges on the tenant not specifically contracted for, such as the assignment of leases by tenants. 8. Establishing a tenants' appeal board.

The 10th resolution, Mr. Lawlor.

RESOLUTION:

That this government should introduce legislation for the protection of tenants of self-contained units in multiple dwelling accommodation and single family dwellings, to include: 1. Abolishing security deposits. 2. Establishing a rental and tenancy review board. 3. Enacting a standard form of lease to be used by all landlords. 4. Prohibiting landlords from charging tenants a fee for subletting an apartment. 5. Outlawing all clauses in leases restricting tenants' rights to purchase milk, bread, other foodstufs and personal service from the merchant of their choice. 6. Prohibiting landlords from charging for extra occupants. 7. Requiring landlords to provide adequate standards of maintenance, safety and health for their tenants. 8. Requiring all landlords to carry liability insurance. 9. Abolishing the landlords' right of distress. 10. Authorizing the courts to delete any clause of a lease which, in the court's opinion, is unreasonable.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Speaker, I move Resolution No. 6 standing in my name.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Mr. Speaker, I move Resolution No. 10 standing in my name. Mr. Speaker, I know this may be disappointing to some members, but I have absolutely nothing nasty to say about anyone today.

As a matter of fact, before launching into this present matter, as far as I am concerned, in this House, there is no room for direct personal invective or for innuendo. There is plenty of room for needling; statements made in the public interest, yes, but for vilifications, no.

Mr. Speaker, the other day I gave an outline to this House of what I trust would be not merely a personal point of view as to what government and civic powers are all about; but in any event, for me, in the time I spend in this House, it is a rather superficial outline of the kind of core vision out of which I intend to speak on a more concrete issue.

Today, on questions of landlord and tenant, I will begin a particular application of those general principles. With respect to the relationship between landlord and tenant, as all the good members probably know, we have a Landlord and Tenant Act in this province which is substantially the same as the British legislation of 700-800 years ago. Substantially the same.

Mr. McRuer has handed us down three great volumes on civil rights. Nowhere in those volumes do I see anything whatsoever to do with this very pressing need and this great area of property rights affecting, and I suggest, afflicting the position of tenants in this province today.

I do not mean that in any vein of criticism. I bring it to the attention of the House and to you, Mr. Speaker, with a view that perhaps in the future volumes cognizance will be taken of the present situation in this regard.

Under this heading, I note, too, in that report that no mention whatsoever is made of an institution in this province which has rather nasty undertones, called the bailiff. The bailiff is a borrowing from British institutions. These people are certified through a county court judge on very little recommendation, and having attained that position have authorizations and powers of entry and of lock-up and of breach, which far exceeds the capacities and responsibilities of the individuals who seek to exercise them. Again, a very vital area of human rights, in civil rights, which as I say, has not yet been broached. Again, I trust that some attention will be paid to this particular area.

As far as anti-social legislation is concerned, or as far as people's minds in this society being directed against the public weal, I have in my hand and before me a number of rather standard form leases that the various apartment house owners are requiring their new tenants to sign, on pain of course, of not becoming tenants.

I have a Village Green Development lease here. I will not mention the name of the lessee, it does not matter. It is dated May 22, 1965. This document is a four-page affair, with two more pages of rules and regulations thrown in on the side, in case the landlord had not completely fenced the tenant in. I suggest to this House that there are very few, or no rights accorded to the tenant in the terms of these leases, that the whole weight and the benefits and the privileges, soley and entirely devolve on the head of the landlord. He is a little dictator in our midst. He recognizes no authority, other than himself.

So far does this go in that direction that he says in clause (a) paragraph 7:

> It is expressly understood and agreed between the lessor and the lessee as follows: that the lessee waives and renounces the benefit of any present or future Act of the Legislature of Ontario taking away or limiting the landlord's rights of distress, and agrees with the lessor that notwithstanding any such Act the lessor may seize upon and sell all the lessee's goods and chattels for payment of rent and costs as he might have done if such Acts had not been passed.

This kind of clause is used in several instances throughout, in the subletting or assigning clauses. Again, the landlord here, the apartment owner—and this is common in our modern leases—says that he has no responsibility at all to the people as a whole, and certainly he is not going to pay a bit of attention to whatever this Legislature says; and he is going to be a law unto himself and disregard whatever may come to pass.

Severe consideration must be given to limiting this type of effrontery. Some of our legislation down through the past has been forced—in The Insurance Act, if I recall, and in the mechanics lien procedures. Contractors in the past, we have discovered by grievous fault, would not pay. They would engage sub-contractors and others. The owners of buildings or those who were doing the main contractural work would contract themselves out of The Mechanics Lien Act so that a clause had to be placed in the Act saying that no contract may be executed between the parties which would so contract them out.

It has been found necessary all along the line, in the kind of environment that we live in and the sort of air we breathe, that the Legislature steps in and puts its foot down in order to preserve the rights of those people who are the most exposed, and the least able to fend for themselves.

This is a general rule. It will be necessary very shortly, whatever the government may say at this moment, to bring such a thing to pass with respect to landlords and tenants.

There are a number of clauses in these leases if one read them through, there is point after point that you cannot help but take exception to.

The security deposit, Mr. Speaker, is not an advance payment of rent, say the last month of the tenancy—that would appear to be quite legitimate. But the security deposit is something over and above that, which is retained at the inception of the lease in case there might be damage done to the premises. And what happens to the security deposits? There are literally millions—I understand $12 million in those forms of deposits in the banks of the province today that is in the hands of the landlords. They do not pay any interest on those security deposits. They garner the benefits to themselves, or use that money as they see fit.

We figure it ought to be under a trust concept, that they ought to be responsible as many other people—insurance agents and lawyers—to account for these funds, and like real estate agents to account for these funds to the people who have put these monies into their hands.

At the end of a lease, for whatever reason, a great many of these landlords refuse to return those deposits. There is no justifiable

reason. The fact of the matter is that to sue in the courts—the time, inconvenience, effort and money required to try to get one's deposit back again through the division courts, or county courts of this province—is such an overwhelming burden to the tenants, though they would no doubt be successful at the end of the day. Nevertheless the landlord, knowing what the condition in suits are, avails himself of all the rigamarole, and machinery, and thwarts the needs and requirements. He does not return these deposits. He literally thumbs his nose, and says that he will do what he likes. Again, we have to get a standard form of lease set up in this province which embodies the recommendations to the extent that I outline them today. They are multiple, and they are overwhelming, and the injustice of the present situation must be apparent to any mind.

We have the problems of charging tenants a fee for subletting, and for taking in extra occupants. I had a case of a very prominent citizen on a broadcasting station the other night. We were on the air and he was saying that he had rented an apartment on the understanding that he would be able to get another. He had rented it as a bachelor apartment, with the clear understanding that he would be given another apartment at the same rental. He was paying the higher rental for the bachelor.

When his wife returned from somewhere, the landlord did not have the alternative apartment, and the tenant did not feel that he could afford to move out, but when his wife came into the apartment they charged him an extra $10 per month because of extra occupancy and due to the type of clause that they had in the lease.

This sort of thing is very commonplace. I wonder if people really know how antiquated and really vile are the present laws of tenant and landlord; that feudal outdated thing!

Then take the repair clause. In any building you move into as a tenant, it is not the landlord's responsibility to make any repairs whatsoever. If the roof falls in, it is the tenant's responsibility, unless he contracts himself out. How many tenants know that it is their responsibility to repair the plumbing, the ceiling, and the electrical system? The landlord may say, "Well, if you do not like it, too bad." He is under no obligation to give a habitable building, only in the cases of apartments is this so. In the case of homes, there is no warranty as to its usage. That ought to be altered.

I would suggest in that direction that what happens is that all major repairs should be the responsibility of the landlord and minor repairs the responsibility of the tenant—but with certain limits as to what is meant by that, say up to $50 or $30.

These leases have clauses in them with respect to rules and regulations as I have pointed out—the most ridiculous rules and the most onerous and arbitrary regulations. A man cannot have a budgie bird, he cannot speak to his wife, he certainly cannot yell at her, because there are 15 noise clauses in these leases. Pianos, radios, organs and so on, cannot be played after 11 o'clock at night; any one of these things can be used at any time as a pretext by the landlord to throw the tenant out. And what time does the tenant get under these clauses to get out? Very often, in these leases, 48 hours.

Now of course, any lawyer will say, "Tell him to go blow his nose; you are not getting out, you are going to stay." It is never enforceable in the courts, there would be relief from forfeiture; but do the people know it? Is the general public aware of this? No, they are terrified, they live under a cloud of respect to these tenancies. The best that I have seen in any one of them is five days' notice. Very often people bow their heads before this type of usurpation and get out. It is one of things that I beg of this Legislature, and the government, particularly the Attorney General's office, to give some thought to.

With respect to these clauses, the rules in this Village Green development thing say:

> The rules and regulations to this apartment building attached hereto as schedule A, with such variations. modifications, and additions as shall from time to time be made by the lessor—

out of the air he makes the rules

> —and any other and further reasonable rules and regulations made, that may be made by the lessor, and intimated to—

In other words, as you are coming up the stairs early some morning, the landlord will just sort of wink at you a little bit, and then the next day, if you have not done what he is winking about—which you, of course, do not know—he has intimated to you that he wants you to put in new sinks, or whatever it is that he is intimating about. These secret gestures are to be conveyed to the tenant and he must have some sixth sense to appreciate them. The landlord goes about intimating to people that they must do thus and thus; if they do not, then they are subject to the vileness of these leases.

I have one final point to make, and that is with regard to evictions. There are eviction

proceedings under The Landlord and Tenant Act, which incidentally, bad as it is, is infinitely better than the leases that are drawn and that refer to the Act, because the leases contract themselves out of the Act. It has some safeguards, 15 days' notice, and whatnot to tenants under section 17 of The Landlord and Tenant Act, but there is nothing like that in these leases at all. As a drop of mercy, you would think that it would be well to return to the provisions of the Act itself for these limited purposes.

Therefore, to sum up, Mr. Speaker, with respect to the repairs, and heating—which is the tenant's responsibility except as set out in the lease—with respect to the business of terminations of leases, with respect to distress that is the landlord's right to seize the tenant's goods—now that is very complicated business, and a lot of nonsense. There are certain goods which can be seized, and certain goods which cannot. You have to go to The Execution Act to find out which are which. There is a list of things, like tools, some bedding, and certain personal articles of attire, all that sort of thing is excluded from seizure by the bailiffs; and in any event by a sheriff's officer, should the landlord go to the trouble of taking actual court action which he ought to be obliged to do, like any other creditor in this province.

Mr. Speaker, we are speaking on a matter of extreme urgency. As far as I am concerned many people in this province are being afflicted. I stand here and look across the floor of the House; I see the place virtually empty. I think there is one Minister in the whole House at the present time. Mr. Speaker, I am going to move the adjournment of this debate.

Mr. Lawlor moves the adjournment of the debate.

Some hon. members: No.

Mr. Speaker: Call in the members. As many are in favour of the motion, please rise.

As many as are opposed, please rise.

Clerk of the House: Mr. Speaker, the "ayes" are 38, and the "nays" 52.

Mr. Speaker: I declare the motion lost and would ask the hon. member to continue the debate.

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Speaker, how delightful it is to speak to such a masterful gathering.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that the exodus has commenced again. It is rather a pity that when one of the most serious issues that faces the people of Ontario or certainly people who live in urban centres in Ontario, is here before the House, and is here for a limited time only in debate, that we had at the commencement of this hour, at the time the hon. member for Lakeshore moved his motion, only one urban Cabinet Minister sitting here. He was sitting here because he is the House leader. It is a pity, Mr. Speaker, that we did not have the hon. Attorney General.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Singer: —in his place. The hon. Attorney General is the man who should be, being the chief law officer of the Crown—

An hon. member: Point of order!

Mr. Singer: —concerning law reform.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Singer: I thought, Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the private members' hour at this time was to discuss resolutions 6 and 10. At the time, we are not talking about attendance in the House, but if this is what the member wants to talk about I would like to talk about it too.

Mr. Speaker: The member will continue with his address and he will address himself to the two resolutions being debated.

Mr. Singer: Indeed, Mr. Speaker, that is exactly what I am doing. It was—

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): I was going to ask the hon. member to permit me a word. I would like to say the only reason the Attorney General was not in his place is that he was working on the basic shelter exemption for legislation to see how that might be passed on for the benefit of tenants.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Singer: That will take more than an hour I can assure you.

Hon. J. Yaremko (Minister of Social and Family Services): As we all were—

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. G. Ben (Humber): We were doing something about it.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Sandwich): You had six months.

Mr. Singer: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As I was saying, I do not attribute any base motives to my friend over there. After all, I am sure that when he is not here he is carrying on his job elsewhere.

Mr. Speaker: Would the member please address himself to the two resolutions which are being debated?

Mr. Singer: With respect, I am addressing myself to the two motions that are before us, and to the motion for adjournment that came in the middle. I think I have every right to do so sir.

Mr. Speaker: I would ask the member to address himself to the two resolutions that are presently being debated, and if he will do so, then he is quite in order. If not, he is out of order.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, it is my belief that I am addressing myself to the two motions that are before us. I am starting off my remarks, and I propose to continue and to relate to this House the reasons why I think this is of such major importance, and the reasons why, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, the Ministers of the Crown who are concerned with this particular field should be here and should listen to the topics for debate.

I mentioned the hon. Attorney General because being the chief law officer of the Crown, he is the man who will be responsible if the government sees fit to bring in amending legislation. It would seem to me that the chief law officer, on a matter as important as this one, should be here. And along with him, the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. McKeough), because he is beginning to show, or pretends to be beginning to show an increasing interest in the future management of our Metropolitan centres.

Again, all of us having recently come from the hustings, those urban members who sit in the House must be so aware of the problems that exist, insofar as apartment tenancies are concerned, that I would have thought that the Minister of Municipal Affairs would have been paying particular attention to what goes on in this debate.

The third Minister of the Crown that I want to mention is the Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Randall) under whose aegis and control is the whole housing programme in Ontario. He is the man who is charged by his government with the responsibility for producing housing accommodation, and it is unfortunate in my opinion, that this Minister was not here in order that he could—

Mr. Speaker: I interrupt the member to say that he should note for the record that the Attorney General and the Minister of Economics and Development are in their seats and listening very carefully to what I would hope as Speaker, the member would say towards this bill.

It is my view, and I will continue to maintain it, that if the members on either side of the House endeavour to disparage a member on the other side, and I have done the same thing on this side, then it is up to the Speaker, and if not the Speaker, then it is up to the member making such statements to correct it so that a full and true record of the proceedings here may be available for those who wish to study it.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Singer: I will have to abide by your suggestion and note, for the record, that presently in the House are the Minister of Economics and Development and the Attorney General.

Hon. S. J. Randall (Minister of Economics and Development): A point of order, Mr. Speaker. I think that it is expected of the Ministers that they carry on the work of the department, whether the House is in or out of session, and the comments made towards me, I think, are very unfair.

I was sitting up at this end of the room with three of my staff from the Ontario housing corporation, discussing matters that I think are just as important as the matter that this member is discussing. I do not think that we have to apologize for our absence while we are working in the interest of the province and the people of the province.

Mr. Singer: I must admit that I differ very strongly with this Minister. I would not think, and no one can expect, that a member is going to sit in here through all the sitting hours. But I would think that the Ministers of the Crown, as well as everybody else, should be aware of what is going on on the order paper, and that, when they see that a matter as important as this one is scheduled to come before the House for debate—and hopefully, when it might be anticipated that there will be some intelligent solutions offered —that the Ministers of the Crown would be the first people to be here, hopefully to get some suggestions about how they can help the people of Ontario.

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, this government needs all the help it can get from whatever source it comes.

Mr. L. M. Reilly (Eglinton): Once again, Mr. Speaker, I must remind the hon. member that the resolution before us is number 6 and number 10 combined. There are six speakers listed to speak on the resolution, and I am one of them. If we are going to take up time talking about attendance, I would like to know about it now; otherwise, are we going to discuss the resolution before us?

Mr. Speaker: In accordance with what I understand, there is an arrangement with respect to the division of speaking time between the parties. Certainly, there can be no objection to the lead-off speaker for the official Opposition using the time allotted to him in this ancillary, as you call it, way or, as he has mentioned, important way. I would ask that he continue until the end of the time which normally is allotted to the speaker from the loyal Opposition.

Mr. Singer: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. S. Apps: (Kingston and the Islands): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I ask how long the hon. member is allotted and if that time has not already been taken.

Mr. Speaker: The time has not already been taken by the member now speaking. It has, unfortunately, been taken by other things, but he is entitled to carry on.

Mr. Singer: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Having hopefully established the importance of this debate and having, I think, now, an appropriate number of the proper Ministers here, who hopefully will adopt some of these suggestions and go back and perhaps enact some of these suggestions into legislation, let us get this in other forms of legislation that were brought into the issue that is before us.

The issue involves tenants in apartment houses, but it is broad issue. The long term issue, of course, is the shortage of housing accommodation in our urban areas, and in particular, where it is particularly bad is in the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto.

I do not think that the government has properly brought forward a housing programme that is going to produce any results within the foreseeable future. So this makes it all the more important, Mr. Speaker, that there be available as quickly as possible, a remedy, a reasonable course of jurisprudence, which will protect tenants who, through no fault of their own, are being victimized and badly victimized in so many cases by arbitrary landlords. Because of the government's inaction it has become a seller's market. There is such a shortage of rental accommodation, and this is the fault of the government. I attribute and lay this right at the door of the Minister of Economics and Development.

Landlords are able, by and large, to do almost anything they want, to arbitrarily raise rentals without any reference to anything other than the ability of the tenants to pay. They are able to enact rules such as the hon. member for Lakeshore referred to, which in some way keep within the hands of the landlords the ability to control the comings, the goings, the use of the apartment. They are able to be unfair, arbitrarily acting illegally and so on.

In view of the situation, Mr. Speaker, it is my submission that the government has to step in and enact some form of legislation which is going to protect tenants who have rights, as well as landlords.

As the hon. member for Lakeshore stated, the landlord and tenant law was brought over from the United Kingdom in a form in which it existed several hundred years ago. That law was drafted in England to protect the landed gentry against the peasants, and our law continues to reflect that kind of philosophy.

The English had the good sense to change that law, but the gentlemen on the front benches opposite, Mr. Speaker, apparently feel that this matter is not of sufficient concern to have indicated either in the Throne Speech, or in the remarks of any one of them during the campaign, or since this House has started, that there is any move afoot at all to study this and to bring in remedial legislation.

Certainly, sir, in view of this most difficult, most unfair situation, the government must insert itself as a third party to protect people who are unable to protect themselves, and the most obvious way to do that is to introduce to this House a new Landlord and Tenant Act.

Before this session is over I propose to bring a draft of a bill before the House, because obviously we are not going to get any draft legislation, or even any study of it from the government side. We are going to try and force their hands later on, and that bill will appear on the order paper in my name in due course.

But today I want to talk about the principles involved, and it would seem to me, sir, that you could start off by providing for a standard form of lease. It is rather interesting. I have talked about this a number of times, and I had a letter just the other day

from a landlord. I am sorry I did not bring it with me, but he said a standard form of lease is a bunch of nonsense. Every lease differs, and besides which, landlords need protection.

Well now, it is true landlords need protection. But they do not need as much protection as they are presently being given. They are being given an arbitrary right to persecute the tenants, and so many of them are taking every advantage of it.

I would think it would be a simple thing to enact in our statutes that we have a standard form of lease—that the clauses be such and such and so and so, and there are many statutory precedents for that. If there are unusual circumstances, surely those can be set out on a separate sheet of paper. They can be printed in large type so that they are not a part of a finely written and cleverly designed contract, the meaning of the words of which do not become significant until somebody tries to rely on them.

If there is a departure from the standard form of lease, then I think it would only be good commonsense, and the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs nibbled at this in other forms of legislation that were brought in.

It would be good commonsense that the departures be on separate pieces of paper and in large print, and that the tenant acknowledge that he received them, and that there be no effect to any variation from it unless there has been a delivery of a copy of the lease.

I have brought a great big file, Mr. Speaker, of these cases and it is just shocking, the instances of persecution by landlords. So many of them where the tenants did not even have a copy of the lease. They go in and sign and although their rent is paid, when difficulties arise and you would ask the tenant where the lease is—"Oh, I never got one."

It would seem to me the simplest and most obvious protection that the government should insist upon it, that when there is a leasing arrangement that there be severe penalties if a copy of the document is not made available to the tenant.

We have done that in the mortgage legislation. I think it was the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs who brought in that legislation. But this is the most basic thing.

The question that my friend from Lakeshore touched upon of the general powers of the landlord to add to the lease in these conditions and rules, what utter nonsense. We have a continuing one-sided contract which one party can continue to amend at his will.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that when you were engaged in the practice of law, if you came across this statute and tried to protect in the courts tenants' rights under our present legislation, you know that we have a body of law that has grown up over many hundreds of years whereby the technicalities are far more important than the essence of justice and equity in this field. There are many cases along this line. If you have left a word out of a notice in your form of approach to the courts, you are out.

There is no sort of general saving clause in the statute, as there is in The Division Courts Act, for instance, that division court judges should give judgments in equity and good conscience. No sir. Not in landlord and tenant. In landlord and tenant every 't' must be crossed, every 'i' dotted, or else anyone seeking relief before that forum is just out of luck.

And how do you seek relief? It is almost impossible for anyone not schooled in the niceties of the law, and it is very difficult for most lawyers who are not daily concerned with this particular statute to properly address themselves to a court in connection with a tenant's complaint.

Surely there should be swift remedy, and reasonable remedy, and logical remedy available to tenants who are the little people in this, the pigmies trying to fight the giants, to get before the courts and to assert their rights.

And surely again, sir, there must be a public interest involved. There must be a government agency, or a form of government intervention, whereby when government officials ascertain that something has gone wrong, that the government will go into court and prosecute landlords who are breaking the laws of the province of Ontario.

One case that came to my attention during the course of the election campaign, involved a landlord who had sent in a bailiff, the landlord had in his pocket her security deposit. She had given him notice that she was leaving. The apartment was spotless, but the landlord said: "Nevertheless I am going to apply your security deposit on account of your last month's rent. You give me the last month's rent, and in due course, I will give you back your security deposit."

He was thinking about it during the 16 days that elapsed, and when she came back from work one night, the bailiff had been there and the door was locked.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, the landlord had exercised the right to distrain, because all

her possessions were in there, and the right to evict at the same time. That is illegal, highly illegal.

But what was the tenant supposed to do? She had nothing, and she was locked out of her apartment. She did not have any clothes, she did not have access to anything as she had no warning. She came to me and she was advised: "Go and pay your rent, we will go after him later." She had been paying her rent for several years by cheque, a very responsible lady.

Mr. Reilly: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order!

Mr. Singer: What point are you on? Do you just get up in the middle of a speech and say 'Mr. Speaker' and there you are?

An hon. member: It is 1 o'clock.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, surely it is a rule of this House that even the Whip on the other side just cannot interrupt unless he has got a point.

Mr. Speaker: It is also a rule of the House that those members speaking I hope follow the agreement which I made among the parties with respect to many things, including this private members' hour.

Mr. Reilly: That was the point of order I was going to bring to your attention, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Singer: Well Mr. Speaker, it is 1 o'clock, and the standing order is that this House adjourn on Friday at 1 o'clock.

In view of the unusual circumstances that are surrounding this debate, I would like to move the adjournment of this debate.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Mr. Speaker, before moving the adjournment of the House, may I remind the hon. members that on Monday they should be prepared for second readings and Throne debate. On Monday, at five o'clock, there will be another private members' hour.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree moves the adjournment of the House.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, just before the motion is put: Am I correct in understanding that you accepted the motion of the adjournment of this debate, with the understanding that the resolution could be continued at the next private members' hour?

Mr. Speaker: I did not accept the motion because in accordance with the rules and agreements of this House, the resolutions that are under debate die with the private members' hour. That is my understanding of the rules. If I am wrong, I can be corrected. consequently, on the next private members' hour there will be another resolution or resolutions for debate, in accordance with my understanding.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): Mr. Speaker, on the request of the member for Downsview, I think there has been precedent in not using the hour set aside for private members' hour when we wanted to deal with business of importance. We have picked it up either in part or in whole in another hour. I think that the circumstances did bring about the loss of time for certain speakers, and we could pick it up, and we could make agreement if you would so make that allowance.

Mr. Speaker: I would suggest that the party which apparently is suffering most from the unusual occurrence today in the private members' hour is the government party. True, the member had not finished his address—but I think he had used up the time which normally would be allotted to the first speaker for that party. I would suggest that perhaps the representatives of the three parties who arrange private members' hours might deal with this matter. If it is agreeably arranged and can be dealt with in accordance with the rules of the House, I would have no objection at the first of the week to the matter being raised again. But at the moment, so far as I am concerned, that order is discharged and has left the order paper.

Mr. Reilly: On that point, Mr. Speaker, I may say that I am in perfect agreement to sit down with the other members, the other Whips and possibly at some later date reintroduce this resolution.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 1.05 o'clock, p.m.

No. 20

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

First Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Monday, March 11, 1968

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1968

5

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Monday, March 11, 1968

Marketing of cattle for the production of beef, bill respecting, Mr. Stewart, first reading 623
Conservation Authorities Act, 1968, bill intituled, Mr. Simonett, first reading 624
Questions to Mr. Bales re unemployment, Mr. B. Newman 624
Question to Mr. Wishart re the Metro juvenile detention home, Mr. MacDonald 624
Question to Mr. Rowntree re credit unions, Mr. Stokes 625
Questions to Mr. Wishart re Miss Leslie Turner, Mr. Singer, Mr. Shulman 625
Question to Mr. Wishart re imported listening devices, Mr. Burr 626
Question to Mr. Brunelle re hydro line in Quetico park, Mr. T. P. Reid 626
Question to Mr. Davis re Laurentian University of Sudbury, Mr. Martel 626
Questions to Mr. Grossman re parole, Mr. Shulman 627
Ontario Development Corporation Act, 1966, bill to amend, Mr. Randall, second reading 627
Ontario Housing Corporation Act 1964, bill to amend, Mr. Randall, second reading 627
Sheridan Park Corporation Act, 1964, bill to amend, Mr. Randall, second reading 628
Elderly Persons' Housing Aid Act, bill to amend, Mr. Randall, second reading 628
Transportation of Fowl Act, bill to repeal, Mr. Stewart, second reading 628
Threshing Machines Act, bill to repeal, Mr. Stewart, second reading 628
Steam Threshing Engines Act, bill to repeal, Mr. Stewart, second reading 628
Provincial Auctioneers' Act, bill to amend, Mr. Stewart, second reading 628
Injured Animals Act, bill to repeal, Mr. Stewart, second reading 631
Farm Products Marketing Act, bill to amend, Mr. Stewart, second reading 631
Hunter Damage Compensation Act, 1962-1963, bill to amend, Mr. Stewart, second reading 631
Consolidated Cheese Factories Act, bill to repeal, Mr. Stewart, second reading 632
Seed Grain Subsidy Act, bill to repeal, Mr. Stewart, second reading 632
Fruit Packing Act, bill to repeal, Mr. Stewart, second reading 632
Town of Smith's Falls, bill respecting, Mr. W. E. Johnston, second reading 632
Village of Chalk River, bill respecting, Mr. Henderson, second reading 632
Board of trustees of the combined Roman Catholic separate schools of Renfrew, bill respecting, Mr. Henderson, second reading 633
County of Ontario, bill respecting, Mr. W. Newman, second reading 633
City of Barrie, bill respecting, Mr. Evans, second reading 633
Town of Bowmanville, bill respecting, Mr. Carruthers, second reading 633
Wool and Gift Shops (Toronto) Limited, bill respecting, Mr. Deacon, second reading 633
Township of Nepean, bill respecting, Mr. W. E. Johnston, second reading 633
Trustees of the Toronto general burying grounds, bill respecting, Mr. Henderson second reading 633
Township of Rayside, bill respecting, Mr. Olde, second reading 633
Lutheran Church-Missouri synod, bill respecting, Mr. De Monte, second reading 633
City of Eastview, bill respecting, Mr. Henderson, second reading 633
Canadian order of foresters, bill respecting, Mr. Makarchuk, second reading 633
Imperial Sewing Machine Limited and Imperial Sewing Machine Company (Kitchener) Limited, bill respecting, Mr. Singer, second reading 633
Carleton University, bill respecting, Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence, second reading 633
Lake of the Woods district hospital, bill respecting, Mr. R. G. Hodgson, second reading 634
Resumption of the debate on the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Kennedy, Mr. Ferrier, Mr. R. M. Johnston, Mr. Ruston 634
Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Ruston, agreed to 646
Highway Traffic Act, bill to amend, on second reading, Mr. W. Newman, Mr. Young, Mr. De Monte, Mr. Deans, Mr. B. Newman 646
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to 656

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

The House met at 2.30 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are always pleased to have visitors to the Legislature and today we welcome as guests, students from the following schools: In the east gallery, Northwestern secondary school, Stratford, Runnymede public school, Toronto; and in the west gallery, St. Martin's separate school, Toronto, and Appleby college, Oakville. At 3:15 p.m. we will be joined in the east gallery by students from Innerkip central school, Innerkip, and in the west gallery pupils from the Catholic separate school in London.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Motions.

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Provincial Treasurer) moves that this House will tomorrow resolve itself into the committee of supply.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton moves that this House will tomorrow resolve itself into the committee of ways and means.

Motion agreed to.

Introduction of bills.

MARKETING OF CATTLE FOR PRODUCTION OF BEEF

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the marketing of cattle for production of beef.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, this legislation, The Beef Cattle Marketing Act, has been drafted at the request of the Ontario beef improvement association and in cooperation with the board of directors of that organization.

This association, which came into being in May, 1963, has given a good deal of leadership to the industry with a minimum of cost. As a matter of fact, the organization's principal source of revenue in recent years has been a $20,000 annual grant from The Department of Agriculture and Food, $10,000 of which went to the provincial association to facilitate its operation and the other $10,000 to the county beef improvement associations in the form of grants for approved projects having to do with the improvement of beef cattle production.

It has always been the primary objective of the Ontario beef improvement association to become self-sufficient, to be able to finance its own organization without the need for government assistance. Under this proposed legislation it will accomplish this end.

Under the regulations to be established by this Act, licence fees will be deducted at the market place on all cattle and calves sold through normal sales channels. It is proposed that the extent of these licence fees will be not more than 15 cents for each animal that weighs more than 500 lb. live weight and not more than five cents for each calf weighing less than 500 lb. live weight. We have been advised that although these rates are the maximum allowable under the Act, the association intends to deduct not more than ten cents per mature animal. The funds accumulated through these licence fees will be used solely for the purposes of financing the activities of the Ontario beef improvement association and improving the marketing of these cattle in this province.

While the legislation does provide for the compulsory deduction of these licence fees from all cattle sales, there is a clause in the Act which provides that the producers not wishing to participate in the programme, upon written application may have the full amount of the deduction refunded.

At the present time, there is no standard set of rules or regulations governing many aspects of the marketing of dressed beef animals in Ontario or, for that matter, in all of Canada. Because of this lack of standards or ground rules, there has been demonstrated

a great deal of interest in this Act by Departments of Agriculture in other provinces.

It is quite clear that with the increasing trend toward dressed weight selling and rail grading of beef animals, there is a need for standardized procedures in the market place. The board of directors of the Ontario beef improvement association under this legislation will give priority to this need. In co-operation with the meat packers council, the meat processing companies and the purchasers of beef, they will turn their attention to the creation of a standard basis for rail grade settlement, a uniformed definition of a dressed carcass and the establishment of a system of market price reporting.

It is not the intention of this legislation to regulate or control the sale of beef animals in Ontario. It is the express desire of the membership of the Ontario beef improvement association to retain the elements of free market choice while at the same time securing the benefits of an orderly marketing system.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, if I might ask on first reading, would the hon. Minister explain why this requires a separate bill? Would not the breadth of the farm products marketing legislation in general have covered this requirement?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, no it would not. This is a separate type of legislation. This is a voluntary plan. Anything under The Farm Products Marketing Act is compulsory.

THE CONSERVATION AUTHORITIES ACT, 1968

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management) moves first reading of bill intituled, The Conservation Authorities Act, 1968.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Speaker, this Act is revised and brought up to date and includes major changes mainly as a result of the report of the select committee on conservation authorities.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I have two questions of the hon. Minister of Labour.

The first is, according to the press report, the Ford Motor Company of Canada will be placing on indefinite layoff 131 hourly rate employees in its Windsor manufacturing operations as of March 18. What plans has The Department of Labour to assist these people?

Hon. D. A. Bales (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I have no information in reference to this matter except what has come to me through the hon. member. But using that as a basis, I would simply say I have every sympathy with the people involved.

Generally, I would say, in such cases unemployed persons turn to the unemployment insurance commission for the benefits due to them. Second, they can also ask the Canada manpower services to help them find another job or for counsel and guidance. If retraining is involved, that is provided through my department, on the basis of on-the-job training applications and the projects arise from specific situations in co-operation with an employer and the Canada manpower services. If a specific request for help in training these people comes to my department, it will receive every consideration.

Mr. B. Newman: I have a second question of the Minister.

It was announced in the Hamilton *Spectator* on Saturday, March 9, that Jackson's Bakery is discontinuing all bakery operations as of March 20, 1968. This closing will leave 192 people unemployed in Hamilton, and another 160 in other bakery branches. What plans has the government prepared to undertake to assist these people, who will be permanently unemployed as of March 20?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Speaker, this is the same type of question as the previous one, and I would have to give the same answer.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Attorney General.

What steps has the Attorney General taken to ensure the immediate installation of air conditioning in the Metro Toronto juvenile detention home?

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I am advised by The Department of Public Works, who are looking after the matter, that the installation equipment is on order and they expect the installation to commence on April 1, or thereabouts. It will take some 10 to 12 weeks, apparently, to make the complete installation. I am hopeful that it will be in and working satisfactorily

before the extremely hot weather arrives this summer.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs.

Is it the government's intention to introduce legislation permitting credit unions to increase from $500 to $2,500 the amount that can be paid to a beneficiary of an executor of an estate under sections 40 and 41 of The Credit Unions Act?

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Mr. Speaker, this matter is currently under consideration by the credit unions branch of my department.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Attorney General.

Could the Attorney General explain the necessity of retaining Leslie Turner in custody for one week even though she was accused of no offence? Second, what does the Attorney General intend to do to avoid future detention of persons in circumstances similar to those of Leslie Turner?

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): Mr. Speaker, as I have a question, may I enter it now? It is for the Attorney General. In light of the newspaper story appearing in last Saturday's Toronto *Telegram* that a witness in a holdup case was held in jail for nine days, will the Attorney General take steps to ensure that in future no person against whom no charges are pending is held in jail?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, the law under which this girl was held as a material witness is provided by the criminal code, and the discretion which is exercised was a judicial discretion of the magistrate. I think in the light of the two questions, the publicity that has been given to the matter, and the questioning that has been done generally about it, I should make it clear that there is provision for this sort of detention, and the authority for the warrant of arrest is found in section 603 of the code, which reads:

> Where a person is likely to give material evidence in a proceeding in which this Act applies, a subpoena may be issued in accordance with this part requiring that person to give evidence. Where it is made to appear that a person likely to give material evidence (a) will not attend in response to the subpoena, (b) is evading service to this subpoena, a court or justice or magistrate, having the power to issue a subpoena to require the attendance of that person to give evidence, may issue a warrant on form 12 to cause that person to be arrested, and to be brought to give evidence.

Then you go to section 611, which refers to this section 603 that I read, and section 611 of the criminal code reads as follows:

> Where a person is brought before a court, judge, justice, or magistrate under a warrant issued pursuant to subsection 2 of section 603, the court judge, justice, or magistrate may order that the person be detained, or released on recognizance with or without sureties, to appear and give evidence when required.

In this case, a warrant was issued, the person came to court before a justice and was kept in custody.

My notes indicate that this was a key witness. She did not have firm roots in this country, I believe, being a native of South Africa, and there was fear when she was first arrested that she would leave the jurisdiction before trial.

I might point out that the first magistrate who had to deal with her exercised his discretion, and he detained her in custody the morning after her arrest. The second magistrate decided that she could be released pending trial. This was a magistrate's discretion, having regard for the evidence that was before them in each case.

The detention of this witness, as a material witness, arose out of a robbery at the Westbury hotel on October 10 last year, and the witness was a clerk in the office at the time that the offence occurred. One of the accused, as the House should know, has been sentenced to a term of nine years, and there are three other accused who have not yet come to trial.

It was to make certain that the witness would appear, that the first magistrate detained her pursuant to a provision in the criminal code for this very purpose. The second magistrate released her, and each of them exercised his judicial discretion.

To deal with the second part of the question from the hon. member for High Park—"Will the Attorney General take steps to ensure no person against whom no charges are pending is held in jail?"—

Having read the authority, I think that I would have to say that since the code provides the authority to do this, and since the question of whether it is done or not is a

matter of judicial discretion, it will be understood that I could not interfere in such a matter.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, would the Attorney General accept a supplementary question?

Is the Attorney General aware of any circumstances, other than that the lady came from South Africa, which would have warranted the belief that she was not likely to appear as a witness at trial?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I do not like to be put in the position of answering as a fact things which have been reported in the newspapers, but I did read in the newspaper that when the police approached her she said she would return to South Africa rather than be involved in the case or give evidence, and that when they came to get her, according to one of the reports, she was hiding from them in her room.

I do not say those things were factual, but this is reported. In any case, the first magistrate, as I say, felt that with this type of case —in which she was a material witness to a serious type of criminal offence—he should remand her as he did. The second magistrate, having got further information, exercised his discretion and said, "Let the police watch her if they think that is necessary in order that she may appear as a witness."

But I certainly must point out that I certainly have no jurisdiction to change the law, which I think is a necessary provision in some cases, and certainly I have never, nor would I ever, think of interfering with judicial discretion.

Mr. Singer: The Minister should make the McRuer report compulsory reading for all magistrates.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. F. A. Burr (Sandwich-Riverside): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Attorney General.

Is the use of listening devices, such as were advertised in the *Globe and Mail* on March 6—and I quote, "The world's best listening device. Mini-spy wireless microphone"—with a Switzerland address, legal in Ontario? If not, what steps will be taken to prevent its importation?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, I was able to get a copy of the newspaper report to which the hon. member refers in his question —the newspaper of March 6 with the advertising in it.

The information in the advertisement is not sufficient as to just exactly what type of device this is. I would say that the laws which respect broadcasting transmission, if it be a device of that nature, come under the federal government as do the laws respecting the importation of that type of product. So if the device complies with the laws which are administered by the federal government and does not violate one area where the province has authority, that is respecting telephone communication, then it would be quite legal and proper to permit the importation of the product, which the province could not interfere with in any way.

If the device is such, and I cannot determine that from the advertisement at this time, that it is intended to be used on telephone equipment, then we might take some action. I have not had time to determine the nature of the device as yet. But if the importation of it complies with federal laws there is nothing we can do about stopping it coming into the country.

Hon. R. Brunelle (Minister of Lands and Forests): Mr. Speaker, last week the hon. member for Rainy River (Mr. T. P. Reid) asked the following question:

> Can the Minister advise whether Ontario Hydro has been given permission to erect a high voltage line through the beautiful and wild Quetico park at the east end of Pickerel Lake?

I am pleased to inform the hon. member that although a district cutting permit was recently issued to Ontario Hydro for the locating of a line in Quetico park, recent negotiations between Hydro and The Department of Lands and Forests have resulted in the relocation of the projected Fort William-Atikokan transmission line to a site outside and north of the park. The natural beauty of Quetico park will be preserved.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of University Affairs.

What has caused the delay in Laurentian University being granted a department of engineering? And secondly, can the Minister advise the House when Laurentian University will be granted an engineering department?

Hon. W. G. Davis (Minister of University Affairs): Mr. Speaker, as perhaps the hon. member is well aware, The Department of University Affairs does not grant permission to create a faculty at a university. This must be done by the board of governors of the

institution. The Department of University Affairs, through the advisory committee, provides financial resources for the development of new faculties, but the decision must initially lie with the university.

In recent months, Laurentian University has indicated they wish to extend their engineering programme. They already have an engineering course, as I am sure the hon. member knows, for first and second years, in conjunction with the chemistry department and they wish to extend this now to the third and fourth year. They have met with the committee on university affairs on three or four occasions, I believe, and their last meeting was some time in October, 1967, at which time it was suggested that Laurentian University come back with a specific submission related to cost, number of students and so on, with the idea in mind of considering the development of a full faculty for engineering at that university.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that when the university brings this material and the submission to the committee, it will be given very careful consideration. But nothing further can be done until they make their complete submission to the committee.

Mr. Martel: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Highways.

When will work be started to rectify the fog conditions which have been responsible for 168 accidents and 11 deaths in the last seven years on Highway 17 west between Sudbury and Copper Cliff?

Hon. G. E. Gomme (Minister of Highways): Mr. Speaker, I will have to take this as notice.

Mr. Speaker: Might I inquire if the Minister intends to take it as notice for the notice paper or to be answered orally?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: I will answer it orally, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Reform Institutions.

Is it the usual policy of the parole board to refuse parole to prisoners against whom other charges are pending?

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): Mr. Speaker, I am advised by the parole board that each case is judged on its individual merits. As with other factors which are considered by the parole board, there are many different aspects which have to be considered with respect to charges pending—such as the likelihood of these charges being proceeded with in the near future, when these charges were presented, and the degree of public safety involved in the paroling of a person against whom charges are pending. The parole board makes its decision in the light of the facts of each individual case.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, may I ask a supplementary question?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Now the member is going to get the meat of the question.

Mr. Shulman: Will the Minister inform me, and I am sure he will not be able to today, how many paroles were granted in this past year where there were other charges pending?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, at the moment I am not too sure that this is a proper thing for me to ask of the parole board. At the moment I cannot see why not, but I will discuss it in the light of the policy which I announced the other day of not interfering in respect of individual cases. I think, however, this is some information I can get. I am sure the parole board has it and I will be very glad to get it for the hon. member if it is available.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

THE ONTARIO DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION ACT, 1966

Hon. S. J. Randall (Minister of Economics and Development) moves second reading of Bill 12, An Act to amend The Ontario Development Corporation Act, 1966.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE ONTARIO HOUSING CORPORATION ACT, 1964

Hon. Mr. Randall moves second reading of Bill 13, An Act to amend The Ontario Housing Corporation Act, 1964.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Mr. Speaker, would the hon. Minister please explain the intent of the bill in a little more detail before we vote on it?

Mr. Speaker: I would think that that might be a reasonable request, but I would point out that under those circumstances, the Minister will once again have the opportunity at the end of any debate, of rebutting

remarks made by members of the House during the debate on the second reading.

Would the Minister please explain?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Speaker, on Bill 13—I apologize for my voice today; I think the hon. member for Riverdale has been around, I hope he is recovered—

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Don Mills air pollution!

Hon. Mr. Randall: This is an amendment to The Housing Act in order to permit the Ontario housing corporation to purchase properties—either land or buildings on a mortgage back arrangement—which it does not now possess. The reason for it is, as you will probably recall, that last year the federal government had great difficulty making up its mind whether it would permit the Ontario housing corporation to buy serviced lots and the answer was no. So, we went ahead and bought serviced lots on our own so we could have instant housing, and then came the second problem we ran into.

They are not in accord with us buying unserviced land—what we call cow pasture—and turning it into lots and leasing it for more than 15 years. This meant that the Ontario housing corporation buying land would develop it into serviced lots, and in 15 years time the portion loaned by the federal authorities would have to be paid back and the housing corporation would carry for the remainder of the mortgage on the house. So we believe in being able to purchase these large acres of land, which we will have to do if we want to carry on our housing programme.

It cannot all be done on a cash basis, because there is a limit as to how much money the federal authorities are prepared to advance us. On this basis here we believe we can acquire huge acreages of land over a time basis by giving back a mortgage and it saves us going to the market to borrow at high interest rates. It gives us an opportunity to go into many areas where perhaps we have never been before, to accumulate the land required for this extended housing programme.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE SHERIDAN PARK CORPORATION ACT, 1964

Hon. Mr. Randall moves second reading of Bill 14, An Act to amend The Sheridan Park Corporation Act, 1964.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE ELDERLY PERSONS' HOUSING AID ACT

Hon. Mr. Randall moves second reading of Bill 15, An Act to amend The Elderly Persons' Housing Aid Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE TRANSPORTATION OF FOWL ACT

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food) moves second reading of Bill 16, An Act to repeal The Transportation of Fowl Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE THRESHING MACHINES ACT

Hon. Mr. Stewart moves second reading of Bill 17, An Act to repeal The Threshing Machines Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE STEAM THRESHING ENGINES ACT

Hon. Mr. Stewart moves second reading of Bill 18, An Act to repeal The Steam Threshing Engines Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, that all of these bills on which I have just moved second reading, I would like to have go to the committee on agriculture and food.

THE PROVINCIAL AUCTIONEERS' ACT

Hon. Mr. Stewart moves second reading of Bill 19, An Act to amend The Provincial Auctioneers' Act.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): Mr. Speaker, I was wondering what is the purpose of this particular bill in connection with private livestock sales.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: This really is not a matter of livestock sales, it is a matter of licences for livestock auctioneers. The present terminology of the Act requires that the Minister has to issue and sign the licence whereby purebred livestock auctioneers operate on a province-wide basis. What we are doing here is transferring back to the livestock commissioner the right to issue these licences; rather than having it cross my desk and having me sign it, he signs it. But it provides the right of appeal to a purebred livestock auctioneer who has been refused a provincial licence, to appeal to the Minister for a licence. It is just an administrative matter.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Speaker, I was just wondering as I looked at this bill, and after reading Mr. McRuer's report, whether the Minister had had the opportunity of reading the first part of the first volume of the report, and whether in light of that he might want to reconsider some of the provisions of this bill. Mr. McRuer holds this up as a particularly unusual example of legislation that endows in the—well, it is not going to endow in the Minister—in the livestock commissioner, powers that are very unusual, quite arbitrary, and give no clue at all as to how the statute should be administered.

Just thumbing through this first volume here I made some notes in regard to it. Mr. McRuer seemed quite disturbed by the unusual powers that are given, particularly in this Act, and they are using this one as an example of how things perhaps should not be done. What the Minister is doing here—and the Minister has revived this, and this makes it open to debate even though he is only making a technical change—means that his section is going to say that the livestock commissioner may grant to any person, who in his opinion possesses special qualifications, a licence to sell purebred cattle, and then he says that the livestock commissioner may revoke the licence for any cause appearing to him to be sufficient.

It was bad enough to have that power lodged in the Minister. There are no guidelines at all set down in this legislation by which the licences should either be granted or taken away. And I suppose that as long as the discretion was vested in the Minister, an argument could have been made, as weak as that argument might have been, that the Minister was here in the House and was answerable for the exercise of the discretion, and possibly could be called upon to explain the basis on which he did exercise that discretion.

But here we have got it one step further removed and now a gentleman called the livestock commissioner is given complete and absolute and unbridled discretion as to whether or not he is going to grant a licence, and whether he is going to revoke it. There are no guidelines at all set down in the statute as to how the statute should be exercised.

I was particularly interested in the remarks of the Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts), when he introduced this report, saying this could well be a model for future legislation. Well, the ink in the report is scarcely dry, and the model does not seem to be lending itself to any ready pattern. There is not only this Act here, but there is another Act that came from the Minister of Agriculture and Food. It was just given first reading this afternoon and again as I was reading McRuer, I would think that there were many criticisms that could be levelled against that statute along the line of Mr. McRuer's thinking.

But there comes another day for that, and it seems to me that we have enough trouble in this province already with the ability of Ministers to exercise discretion completely and absolutely. The principle of this bill is to take that discretion away from the Minister and to give the livestock commissioner the right to act on any whim that he may choose to exercise. And there is no possibility of any review at all by anyone of the right of any individual either to have a licence as an auctioneer or not to have a licence as an auctioneer—the right to issue them and to cancel them.

Now it seems to me that this flies in the face of all we believe in this Legislature to be right and proper. This is one of the things that I am sure concerned the Premier when he asked Mr. McRuer to embark on his study. Here we have the study, and here we have the bill. It would seem to me that this bill should be removed temporarily and examined in light of what Mr. McRuer has to say and in light of what makes good common sense.

Surely we do not want any more people in the province, particularly among people who are not Ministers, who are going to be given complete, unbridled and unfettered discretion to license or not to license or to take away licences as they see fit.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, as I said earlier, these bills will all be referred to the

committee on agriculture and food. The point, as my hon. friend has raised, certainly bears consideration; no question of this at all. There is really no change in what has been going on through the administration of this particular piece of legislation since it was introduced, other than to transfer from the Minister's desk to the livestock commissioner the right to grant these licences.

As I understand it, and I have been assured by the administration of our department in connection with this particular piece of legislation, the right of appeal from a decision of the livestock commissioner lies with the Minister, as to whether the man is granted a licence or he is asked to forfeit his licence. However, these two matters can be dealt with in committee stage, and we will take cognizance of what the hon. member said.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I do not want to prolong the debate particularly, but the point as made by the hon. member for Downsview is a very good one. It seems strange that the nature of the powers expressed in the previous bill that was brought forward, I guess, nearly two years ago, and having to do with the powers of auctioneers, are directly referred to on page 97, chapter 7, of the first volume of Mr. McRuer's work that was put before us just last week. So I am very glad the Minister has indicated that the agriculture committee might very well reconsider the powers of the bill before us, in the nature of the specific recommendations made by Mr. McRuer.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Before this vote I would like to speak to the point made by the hon. member for Downsview, because I think it is very important. We are going to have to examine certain statutes almost in groups of statutes, if I may put it that way. In this particular statute I do not think that there is any difficulty; there is a principle involved, of course, and that is the principle of being able to guide on, and where the appeal goes from the commissioner.

The Minister says that the appeal comes to his desk, but there are a whole group of bills and laws on the statute book which have been there for a great many years. I would refer you, for instance, to the question of what we are going to do in this Legislature with statutes which incorporate within them reference to The Public Investigations Act. I believe that Mr. McRuer refers to this specifically in his text. We will have to examine Mr. McRuer's recommendations and see how they affect the actual administration of individual statutes.

Then we will have to see whether it will be necessary, for instance, to go through all the statutes in the books and pick out individual statutes for amendment, or whether it will be possible to develop means of an appeal statute, the provisions of which would have reference to a whole series of statutes, if we are to carry out the recommendations of Mr. McRuer's report.

Mr. Singer: The interesting thing is that he discovered this himself, and suggested that this type of legislation was particularly objectionable.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I would say this to you, there is no doubt he examined a great many statutes, and it may be coincidence that he picked this particular one. I believe that the Minister would be in a position to reassure the House if there had been no question in this particular field of activity. But the point I am making, and I am speaking to the broader principle involved here, is that to accomplish the recommendations contained in the McRuer report is going to require a great deal of detailed study of the recommendations themselves and of the methods by which we can most expeditiously rectify some of the matters the McRuer report finds offensive in the statutes of the province.

I would say that many of these statutes have been developed over a great many years and I would think it would be impossible to prove or to say that these are in any way misused. Nonetheless, the mere fact that they are there in that form is offensive to a great many of us in the House and to the public at large. This is the approach we are going to have to take.

Just how it is to be worked out so that we get down to the fine detail—that is perhaps an example of how great the problem is. We are going to have to look at every statute. What this really requires is some broader range of appeal and broader method of appeal than at present exists. You will recall we had a lot of discussion about this in some legislation dealing with used cars that was introduced a few years ago.

Mr. Singer: Yes, and we got the administration, did we not?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: We have the appeal sections there and it may be that the final answer to this will be to get some kind of an omnibus appeal Act. I do not know whether this will be the final answer or not, but it does appeal to me as being one that

might be feasible, and that would be to have an Act which would apply to a broad range of statutes. These are the matters to which we must address ourselves and it took Mr. McRuer quite a few years to write that report. I suggest it might take us a few months to implement it.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister would permit a question? He made reference to an appeal procedure to the Minister which does not seem to fit into the text of this, because in this Act all he is doing is replacing the word "Minister" with the words "livestock commissioner" and surely the statute as it read before did not say you could appeal from the Minister to the Minister.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: That is quite a logical conclusion to draw, Mr. Speaker. And I say that as far as the Act is concerned, when it was presented to me for approval to be introduced I asked specifically if there would be an appeal from the decision of the livestock commissioner to the Minister. And I would say this, to my knowledge in the six years that I have been Minister of Agriculture in this province, there has never been an auctioneer refused a licence who asked for it on a provincial basis, and there has never been an appeal made to me of any kind, and one has never been turned down to my knowledge.

Mr. Singer: But there is no appeal procedure.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I do not know whether there is or not, because I do not have the Act before me. But I was assured by the administrators of our department, by the legal counsel that this provision would be made. I do not think it is a good thing to leave in the hands of any civil servant—with great respect, no matter how carefully he may handle his responsibilities—the right to make a decision without an appeal to someone else.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE INJURED ANIMALS ACT

Hon. Mr. Stewart moves second reading of Bill 20, An Act to repeal The Injured Animals Act.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister would inform the House if the provisions of this Act are covered in another Act?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes, Mr. Speaker, they are.

Mr. Deans: Would the Minister inform the House which Act?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: The provisions of this legislation are covered in the Ontario societies Act for the prevention of cruelty to animals. It was drafted in 1955. This Act we are repealing was drafted in 1911 and has been superseded by the legislative provisions of the Act of 1955.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE FARM PRODUCTS MARKETING ACT

Hon. Mr. Stewart moves second reading of Bill 25, An Act to amend The Farm Products Marketing Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE HUNTER DAMAGE COMPENSATION ACT, 1962-1963

Hon. Mr. Stewart moves second reading of Bill 26, An Act to amend The Hunter Damage Compensation Act, 1962-1963.

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Speaker, in this matter of a cattle price limit of $500, certainly a lot of purebred stock—I know of one purebred animal that was killed one time—have a value much in excess of $500, and I was wondering why this limitation of $500?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I would say, Mr. Speaker, that that is a proper question to be asked in the committee on agriculture and food, if I may suggest it.

Mr. Speaker: This is going to the committee, Mr. Minister?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Oh yes.

Mr. Speaker: I might remind the member that it is a matter of principle here and this would apparently not be a matter of principle.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE CONSOLIDATED CHEESE FACTORIES ACT

Hon. Mr. Stewart moves second reading of Bill 27, An Act to repeal The Consolidated Cheese Factories Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE SEED GRAIN SUBSIDY ACT

Hon. Mr. Stewart moves second reading of Bill 28, An Act to repeal The Seed Grain Subsidy Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE FRUIT PACKING ACT

Hon. Mr. Stewart moves second reading of Bill 29, An Act to repeal The Fruit Packing Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

COUNTY OF RENFREW

Mr. L. C. Henderson (Lambton) moves second reading of Bill Pr6, An Act respecting the county of Renfrew.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, this bill presents a certain substantial difficulty to me. When it came before the private bills committee and when the history of it was recited by counsel for the county of Renfrew—

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Mr. Speaker, in view of the absence of the member who introduced the bill, I wonder if it might be more desirable if we deferred this bill until he is present?

Mr. Singer: I have no objection to that, except that I would perhaps like your guidance, Mr. Speaker, and the House leader's guidance.

The problem was one of notice and the corporation of the township of Ross was most concerned about this. I attempted to get the private bills committee to delay its dealing with it until inquiries could be made from the various officials of the township of Ross in regard to this bill.

The committee determined at that point not to, and I, having no further information did not press the point any further. However, over this weekend, I was communicated with by a gentleman named Alden May, who is the reeve of the township of Ross, and this morning by a Mr. Lashley, who is the solicitor for the township of Ross, both of whom claim that they did not have notice at all of this bill and would like an opportunity of making representations to the private bills committee.

I do not know whether there is merit in their representations or not, but there was my concern because they were not there at the private bills committee and since they heard of my remarks, they have expressed concern. I wonder whether it would be in order, probably with the consent of the House, that this be referred back to the private bills committee and these gentlemen be given an opportunity to address it, together with whoever else might be interested?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Mr. Speaker, what I suggest is that we just hold this bill until we can check with the secretary concerned with the private bills committee and ascertain what the facts are. Then I will call it and we can deal with it with all of the information before us.

Mr. Singer: That was not quite my point. My point was to give a forum to these people so that they could express their views. As I say, I hold no brief for their views because I am not quite sure what their case is.

Mr. Speaker: I would think that the suggestion of the House leader is a reasonable one and I would ask that he get in touch with the appropriate parties and then with the member for Downsview, because if there are circumstances which require these people to make representations, I am sure this House would want to hear them, either in the private bills committee, or some other forum, and that would appear to be the appropriate one.

TOWN OF SMITH'S FALLS

Mr. W. E. Johnston (Carleton) moves second reading of Bill Pr10, An Act respecting the town of Smith's Falls.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

VILLAGE OF CHALK RIVER

Mr. Henderson moves second reading of Bill Pr14, An Act respecting the village of Chalk River.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE SEPARATE SCHOOLS OF RENFREW

Mr. Henderson moves second reading of Bill Pr15, An Act respecting the board of trustees of the combined Roman Catholic separate schools of Renfrew.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

COUNTY OF ONTARIO

Mr. W. Newman (Ontario South) moves second reading of Bill Pr16, An Act respecting the county of Ontario.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

CITY OF BARRIE

Mr. D. A. Evans (Simcoe Centre) moves second reading of Bill Pr17, An Act respecting the city of Barrie.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

TOWN OF BOWMANVILLE

Mr. A. Carruthers (Durham) moves second reading of Bill Pr19, An Act respecting the town of Bowmanville.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

WOOL AND GIFT SHOPS (TORONTO) LIMITED

Mr. Deacon moves second reading of Bill Pr25, An Act respecting Wool and Gift Shops (Toronto) Limited.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

TOWNSHIP OF NEPEAN

Mr. W. E. Johnston moves second reading of Bill Pr26, An Act respecting the township of Nepean.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

TRUSTEES OF THE TORONTO GENERAL BURYING GROUNDS

Mr. Henderson moves second reading of Bill Pr18, An Act respecting the trustees of the Toronto general burying grounds.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

TOWNSHIP OF RAYSIDE

Mr. N. L. Olde (Middlesex South) moves second reading of Bill Pr31, An Act respecting the township of Rayside.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

LUTHERAN CHURCH-MISSOURI SYNOD

Mr. D. M. De Monte (Dovercourt) moves second reading of Bill Pr39, An Act respecting the Lutheran Church-Missouri synod.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

CITY OF EASTVIEW

Mr. Henderson moves second reading of Bill Pr40, An Act respecting the city of Eastview.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

CANADIAN ORDER OF FORESTERS

Mr. M. Makarchuk (Brantford) moves second reading of Bill Pr41, An Act respecting the Canadian order of foresters.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

IMPERAL SEWING MACHINE LIMITED

Mr. Singer moves second reading of Bill Pr43, An Act respecting Imperial Sewing Machine Limited and Imperial Sewing Machine Company (Kitchener) Limited.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

CARLETON UNIVERSITY

Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence (Carleton East) moves second reading of Bill Pr49, An Act respecting Carleton University.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

LAKE OF THE WOODS DISTRICT HOSPITAL

Mr. R. G. Hodgson (Victoria-Haliburton) moves second reading of Bill Pr50, An Act respecting Lake of the Woods district hospital.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Clerk of the House: The first order; resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the amendment to the motion for an address in reply to the Speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor at the opening of the session.

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

Mr. R. D. Kennedy (Peel South): Mr. Speaker, this is the final instalment of my inaugural remarks. Last week I was describing some features of Peel South and would like to continue in this vein. In May, 1967, the GO transit system began to operate. This rail line, which runs from Pickering on the east to Oakville on the west, with some service to Hamilton, has therefore been in operation less than a year. It has already made a considerable impact on commuter travel. Passenger volume is increasing steadily. It is accelerating development not only in close proximity to the tracks but also in adjacent areas. This imaginative and successful programme sponsored by the Ontario government will play a significant role in future planning, within its sphere of influence. I believe unused rail capacity in other areas has similar potential.

Another facility I would like to mention is the South Peel hospital. This was started by a group of enthusiastic community-minded individuals and it was widely supported. The first stage of 115 beds was opened in 1958, and it has had several additions. The most recent one is for psychiatric and extended-care treatment. The hospital now has 495 beds.

On the same grounds, the Credit Valley school of nursing is under construction, scheduled for completion this year. It is unique in that it was incorporated separately. The clinical facilities will be provided by five area hospitals in Halton and Peel, which joined in this project. It is supported by generous government grants including 100 per cent of approved capital costs – another example attesting to the interest of the government in the people of Ontario.

I would like to mention briefly some other points of interest. Sheridan Park research centre at Clarkson has grown from rumour to reality. Scientists from all over Canada carry out research and share knowledge here. One of the occupants is the Ontario research foundation. We have some excellent recreational facilities, including Huron park centre, a large complex which provides a rink, swimming pool, theatre, meeting rooms, dining hall, and health club, all under one roof. It is believed to be the only one of its type in North America.

Also in 1967, Mississauga established the Allan A. Martin community school. This new concept, I am told, is a first for Canada, borrowed from the highly successful programme in Flint, Michigan. Here the "lighted schoolhouse" has become a household word, with the school plant open at night and on weekends, to serve the community as a recreational and social centre.

The community has also been a leader in other respects. Though a few years have gone by since inception, among other things, our board of education was one of the first to introduce summer courses in secondary schools. Credits in subjects taken at these courses, were subsequently officially recognized by The Department of Education. The programme has also been adopted in other areas.

Red Oaks school for retarded children is operated by a local citizens' association. Not only did this association start the school, but it played a major role in obtaining provincial recognition and grants. It now operates with the aid of government grants and local taxes.

I note now that consideration is being given to having the proposed new county boards assume the operation of these schools. This change would assist these dedicated and persistent people who have promoted this worthy cause, carried the responsibility, and seen it through to fulfillment. Another interesting item is that there are 2,400 electrically heated dwelling units in Mississauga—more than in any other municipality in Canada.

There is a recent event I now wish to mention. On Saturday last the five south municipalities in Peel county—Port Credit, Mississauga, Streetsville, Brampton and Chinguacousy township—reached agreement with the Ontario water resources commission, subject to OMB approval, with respect to sewer and water proposals on a regional basis. Formal agreements are to follow. Councils, public utilities members, staff officials and legal advisors spent a great deal of time in working out fair and mutually acceptable terms. In so doing, they took into account

not only their own needs but also those of the entire area. They have served the area with distinction.

Major projects will include large trunk sewers—one on the east from the Bramalea area, and on the west through Streetsville, and down the Credit river watershed. As soon as possible, lake water will be provided to Streetsville. These and other installations will involve millions of dollars, and will be important factors in ensuring orderly development in the years ahead.

These endeavours show the progressive nature of the citizens of Peel South. They also demonstrate the co-operation of the Ontario government in not only recognizing the benefits of such programmes, but in providing material support for them. They symbolize the great strides forward that Ontario has made, and they are indicative of some of the reasons why the people have had confidence in this Progressive Conservative government for 25 years.

I would like to discuss education further for a few minutes. We have, in common with other areas, excellent educational facilities. Each year the role of education in our society becomes more important. From time to time I hear, as do other people, comments on the cost of education. It is indeed true that we spend a substantial part of both the provincial and municipal budgets on this programme. I associate myself with those who consider education an investment rather than a cost.

In this regard, may I refer to the writing of John Kenneth Galbraith, that expatriate from Elgin county, who wrote *The Affluent Society*. He also wrote a book called *The Liberal Hour*, which, regrettably, has a large "L", though the word has not the same reference as in this chamber. Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, for further compensation and comfort, I propose to use the word "conservative" later in these remarks. In this book he speaks of investment in personal development; in other words, education. He states: "A test of investment is what will pay for itself." To find new ways of investing at a profit is to prove one's enterprise.

Through the expansion of our educational facilities, this is being done in Ontario. It is being done in order to keep abreast of the times and so maintain or improve our position in this ever-more-competitive world. Galbraith goes on to say that we do not conduct our affairs as the Soviets do by having all our resources, including human resources, under public control. In this way Russia has no problem in transferring those resources to be devoted to personal development from private to public use. I interject here that we do not direct or regiment students in this country. We encourage them. We must see spending for education not as a cost but as an opportunity. But we must invest wisely, responsibly and without extravagance in promoting personal development. We must ensure that the investment pays dividends.

Galbraith states that western visitors are impressed with the fact that Russia, a relatively poor country, treats its schools, research and training institutes, worker and adult education with a considerable generosity. So do we, but we also permit students to choose their own way in life. We will guard this right.

He also speaks in favour of the federal government playing a major role in the financing of education. It has access to fiscal resources that are far greater than those of states or localities—what in our case may be comparable to provinces and municipalities. Now that education has become an investment rather than a social service, these resources are indispensable. It is also the unit of government with responsibility for national development and growth. Thus far, financial support from the federal government has been limited. Ottawa has not provided continuous substantial allocations for our school age population. There was assistance for vocational and technical school construction, but here the federal government is now a dropout. The reasons offered include restrictions under The British North America Act.

It must be stated, though, that for certain programmes there are some Ottawa benefits—for example, the new federal-provincial fiscal arrangement for occupational and industrial training, which is in the area of adult education.

It is interesting that in 1961 The Agricultural Rehabilitation and Development Act (ARDA), authorities conducted a study, based on the census figures of that year, with respect to low education level. This revealed, for example, that in York county, including Metro Toronto, there were 69,000 people who had not progressed beyond grade 4. In the county of Peel there were some 2,000, and across the province the percentage ran as high as 15 per cent. Some other parts of Canada were even higher. Presumably, a great number of these were immigrants. With expanding adult education programmes, self

improvement, and in-job training, I assume many of these people have upgraded themselves, if not academically, at least in practical skills, and that they are making their way. It will be interesting to see the 1971 census figures.

It seems redundant to say that personal development means development of our greatest asset, our people. This, of course, is in the interest of Canada as a whole. Therefore, I endorse a programme of persistent effort to try and find ways and means to bring about more financial support for all levels of education by the central government.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak for a few minutes about The Family Benefits Act. It is perhaps a matter that is small in the total context of government, but important to those affected. This Act of 1966 supersedes several other Acts and programmes. It is new and modern legislation, and is more advanced than any of this type in Canada. It provides more generous benefits, which are established under fair and equitable formulas.

I would like to speak in particular about the mothers' allowances section of this Act, on behalf of widows who are in receipt of benefits. As well as the stipulated allowances, an eligible widow is able to supplement income from outside sources until a certain level is reached and then deductions on a prescribed scale commence. This is an excellent clause because it permits beneficiaries to help themselves. However, despite these realistic terms, many find it difficult to have a full life.

When one is raising children and maintaining a home, there are always unexpected costs which upset the budget, and, of course, the cost of living is rising.

This Act could be an even better one if the regulations were extended to permit further outside income. The beneficiaries are not looking for more government aid—though, no doubt, this would be acceptable. They do wish the opportunity to exercise incentive, and so to further help themselves. This is commendable, and should be encouraged. It would not mean an added burden on the public budget. Possibly it could be extended to other branches of social service. Perhaps The Department of Social and Family Services would review the regulations with this suggestion in mind.

Now I wish to express appreciation on another noteworthy topic. I mentioned earlier in my remarks—so much earlier, Mr. Speaker, it was last week—that I know some of the elected and staff officials in the provincial government. I would like to record the co-operation which I have received from the Cabinet Ministers and the civil service—those extremely well qualified public servants—who have given utmost assistance. Their help has enabled another newcomer to this assembly to deal with constituents' problems, and so I state this appreciation on behalf of the people of Peel South.

And so, Mr. Speaker, today I have made reference to some personalities, to local history and geography, and to progress of the community and of Ontario under this Conservative government. Also, I have spoken in favour of regional government, federal aid to education, and for an extension of The Family Benefits Act.

At a later date, I hope to express my views on two other timely and important subjects. One is medicare. I am unable to reconcile the federal attitude toward austerity on one hand, and introduction of this programme on the other. The other issue is housing.

Mr. Speaker, I have enjoyed, and found most interesting, the session to date. It is my hope that I will be able to merit the confidence which Peel South has placed in me. I look forward to service on its behalf, and on behalf of the people of Ontario.

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): Mr. Speaker, as I look across the House today I am reminded of the average evening congregation in most of our Protestant churches; there are a lot of empty seats. I would like to begin by extending my congratulations to you, Mr. Speaker, on your election to the high office that you hold and wish you all the best in performing this office in the House.

It is a distinct honour and pleasure to rise to engage in the debate of this Legislature for the first time as the member for Cochrane South. For a number of years this riding was represented with distinction by William Grummett of the CCF. However, in 1955, the man who had been secretary of the Liberal Party for ten years or more made a deal with the Conservatives, whereby he would run on the Conservative ticket and the Liberals would not run a candidate. As a result of this gang-up of the two old line parties against Mr. Grummett, Wilf Spooner scraped through to win the seat. With the Liberals still obliging, the former Minister of Municipal Affairs was able to hold on for two more elections.

Of course there was another side to the deal. In federal elections, the Conservatives would only run a token candidate to enable the Liberals to hold the seat at Ottawa. The only catch was that Murdo Martin came along and won the seat for our party and has held it ever since.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): According to the papers he can also eat more pancakes than Joe Greene.

Mr. Ferrier: Even I can do that. Since the Liberals were the big losers in this arrangement, they were no longer as ready to be part of this alliance, with the result that this election saw a fair fight for a change in Cochrane South, and the Conservative incumbent was found wanting in this kind of battle. During the election William Grummett died, so he was not spared to share in the victory that has returned Cochrane South to the fold of the New Democratic Party.

Mr. Speaker, you are no doubt aware that I am a minister of the church. In this capacity, you will perhaps permit me an observation. Now, there are various schools of theological thinking current today, but what has really surprised me is that the powers that be in this Legislature seem to be adherents of the "God is dead" school. I say this because of the stereotyped, archaic, formalistic prayers that are said to begin each day's sitting of this Legislature. The content is largely obsolete and repetitious, while the language is out of date. The prayers suggest that God must have died a century or two ago, and if He did not, He should have. The tipping of our hat to God in such a perfunctory and formalistic manner as we do here, in my opinion does not create the strong spiritual atmosphere that we hope to create thereby.

If we are going to open our sittings with prayer, then I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that you could very well commission two or three clergymen to regularly submit prayers that are relevant and current to our situation in the language of the day and dynamic in nature.

Such prayers as read by yourself will give a sense of reality and relevance to our opening, which I submit does not exist at present. A more relevant opening might help us to achieve a greater respect for one another than seems to be present right now.

As far as the Speech from the Throne is concerned, Mr. Speaker, it is a very disappointing document as far as we northerners are concerned. The Tory mayor of North Bay, Merle Dickerson by name, announced previous to the election campaign that he would be seeking the Tory nomination in Timiskaming. He stated that as far as he was concerned all we in northern Ontario are getting is the crumbs from Queen's Park. Well, Mr. Speaker, at least the Robarts administration is consistent. They are still giving us the crumbs from Queen's Park. Unless we northerners can bring enough pressure to bear in this Legislature and elsewhere, we shall never get a slice of bread, but just the crumbs as long as the Tories sit in the Treasury benches.

From the Speech from the Throne, the phrase that the government bandies about, "the province of opportunity", has a hollow sound as far as northern Ontario is concerned. I had hoped, Mr. Speaker, that the Speech from the Throne might have contained a bold and dynamic blue print for northern development. Yet I confess that I was really not that naive as to have expected such from this government.

Members of the Timmins town council have informed me that during a recent visit to our town the hon. Minister of Energy and Resources Management (Mr. Simonett) told them in effect that the majority of government members come from the south and that a majority of the population live in the south, so that it stands to reason that the government will look after the south first. Even though the Prime Minister mouthed the words that the government treats everybody alike, I believe his hon. Minister has stated the situation more exactly than he, the Prime Minister, has.

All we want in the north, Mr. Speaker, is to be treated like those elsewhere in the province. We would like to see the end of the pork barrel approach to politics, where the amount brought out from each riding is commensurate with present and prospective Tory support. Rather, we want policies formulated and put into practice because they are right and in the interests of the people as a whole, not just the political party in power.

If this course of action should be followed by this government then northern development would not be just our earnest plea, but would begin to take shape among us. Government action on a policy of development is of crucial importance to us in Cochrane South. In the last few years, we have sat by and watched our mines close one by one. There was the Johns-Manville asbestos mine in Matheson, and in the Porcupine these gold mines: the Delnite, the Kenilworth, the

Broulon Reef, and the Paymaster. These are no longer in operation.

At the end of March, what was once the largest gold mine in Canada, the Hollinger, is scheduled to close. Before the end of 1968, the Preston East Dome will be finished. These mine closings have caused the Porcupine mining camp to make regular adjustments, but I believe that the closing of the Hollinger will call for an even greater adjustment than we have ever been called upon to make before.

Some miners will find work with other mines. Many will move away, sir, and others will seek aid from the manpower centre, or will need retraining. Days of adjustment will put a heavy strain among us, and will require real leadership of local politicians, plus government assistance. We have had the virtues of free enterprise extolled *ad nauseam* by the hon. members of both the old line parties in the Legislature. Just so the record is straight, let me tell you something about one of the leading members of Canada's free enterprise establishments. After more than 57 years of operation, the Hollinger gold mine in Timmins has produced bullion worth $600 million. Goaded on solely by the profit motive, this mining company, as a result of its Timmins profits, has proceeded to build a multi-million-dollar mining empire, with iron mines in Labrador, and other mines elsewhere, and huge investments in other sectors of the economy.

But what is wrong with this kind of business? I call it exploitation of the worst kind. They have taken all that they can get out of Timmins and the environs, but have put precious little back into the community in the area. This company, in the beginning, did acquire land and build homes in the early days, as unsightly as many have been for their employees. As it became clear that the mine was closing, rather than transfer these homes to the employees who had faithfully worked for them, and paid rent for these homes for years, the Hollingers sold the homes and property to a land developer, and they are thinking to develop the land for big profit. The miners must now scramble around to find new homes if they wish to stay in Timmins.

Then there is the water works pumping station, which has been owned and operated by Hollinger for its own mining operations. It also supplied water to the town for a reasonable fee, and again, rather than turn over the pumping station for a nominal fee, the Hollingers required at least $200,000 from the town of Timmins for this system—even though it would not be of any service to them after the mine closed.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): They want blood all right, eh?

Mr. Ferrier: That is for sure. Pay the money, or do without, the Hollingers said. So we paid the money. The company has made a fortune out of Timmins, but it did not want to help us out with a rather small gift that really would have benefitted us immensely. We have incurred a rather large debentured debt in order to provide services for the Hollinger and the miners that worked there, but now this is our worry when they have finished with us.

In the years of operation of the Hollinger, the area of Gillies Lake was made much smaller than it was in its natural state. However, flooding was not a problem, since the mine mill used a lot of water in its mill operations, and pumped the used water into Pearl Lake. But when the mine ceases operation, there will soon be flooding in Gillies Lake, so that the homes will be standing in water, unless water is pumped into Pearl Lake on a regular basis. But who will have to pay for this? As far as the mining company is concerned the town of Timmins will have to pick up the tab. The Hollinger has made its fortune, now it does not acknowledge any responsibility for us any more, even though its operation caused the situation.

But what about the miner? Well, he is kicked out of a job without a pension, except a very small equity that he has built up through the Canada pension plan through the last couple of years. The great many of the others come out of the mine broken in health, with severe chest ailments, back injuries, loss of limbs, crippled, or just plain worn out. "You have served our purpose, now go and look after yourself. We are through with you," the company says. It is unbelievable that such callousness is still present in the modern civilized world. But what else can you expect from uncontrolled free enterprise?

Over the years, the Hollinger, like other mines, has enjoyed a privileged tax position, and has not really paid its share of provincial taxes, upon which the mining municipality depends for grants in lieu of collecting direct tax. As the mine closed, it was given the opportunity to redraft some of these long-standing wrongs, but there was no deathbed repentance. They are consistent to the end —take all they can and give as little as possible. When you see this kind of operation in action, it is pretty hard to see any of

the merits of this so-called economic god known to some of you as free-enterprise capitalism. What Hollinger has done to the north is typical of all the mines—that is, take everything possible out of the north, and build up a fortune for themselves and put as little as possible back into the north.

We in the north are sick and tired of this kind of exploitation and rape of our natural resources for others' benefit. Governments of this province have allowed it to go on unchecked for decades. We call upon the government to stop it. We believe that the ore, if at all possible, must be processed in the locale where it is mined. If this were to become government policy, not only would there be more jobs for our people and more assessment, but a secondary industry as well could very well spring up around the processing centre.

This is why we in Cochrane South in particular are so concerned that the smelter or refinery to process Texas Gulf concentrates must be in our area. One industry, namely gold mining—as the Hollinger shutdown programme will so dramatically illustrate—is petering out. There must be something substantial to take its place. We must develop to the full the potential that exists with the Texas Gulf operations, and have them build in the Porcupine a smelter or refinery to process the ore which is estimated to be worth at least $2 million. The ore body is so rich, that even the company is not aware of its value.

It is my contention that the Ontario government must take strong steps and give the leadership to persuade Texas Gulf to build its smelter in our area. The company delayed the decision, using as an argument that it must do further research to find a way to best break down the complex ore so that the most economical method of processing can be found.

When this is done, then it can weigh all the factors so as to locate its smelter in the most economic place for the company. Understandably so, its dominant motive is the biggest profit possible for itself. This is what uncontrolled free enterprise is all about.

My position is that the government must take a stand with Texas Gulf—that the smelter must be located in the Porcupine area unless the company can show that, beyond a shadow of a doubt, such a location would prove economically disastrous for it.

This, I submit, it will not be able to do. If the location in the Porcupine were even a little more expensive than elsewhere, that should not be a determining factor. I would remind the hon. members of this House, Mr. Speaker, that one of the senior management personnel of Texas Gulf has boasted in Timmins that the present operation is a $1 million or $2 million-a-week operation. With this kind of production, such a company could sustain a slightly higher operating cost if such were proven to exist.

We need that smelter in the worst way and all our citizens in Cochrane South will continue to fight for it. We call upon the government to act on the people's behalf just as much as it does on behalf of big business. The present uncertainty among our residents, the dropping population and the general lag in business must not be permitted to go on indefinitely. The government must act in this crisis on our behalf, for the future of our section of northeastern Ontario is dependent on the leadership that the government is prepared or not prepared to take on this issue and the decisions that it finally reaches.

Another aspect of our problem in the north, Mr. Speaker, concerns the grants to mining municipalities in lieu of direct tax and rights. For years we have been pleading for more provincial grants. Finally, in election year, such were given, with the ex-Minister of Municipal Affairs giving the impression that more was to come. But when the Smith committee report came out, the formula so worked out there shows that only seven municipalities are to get more while 52 get less and considerably less.

This is another example of southern misunderstanding of the northern situation. We need more and the south comes up with formulas to give us less. Thank goodness a representative of The Department of Municipal Affairs informed the association of mining municipalities meeting in Falconbridge in January that last year's grants will be filled in 1968.

Mr. Speaker, the government cannot accept the recommendations of the Smith committee report regarding the formula to be used in determining the grants to mining municipalities. I support the association of mining municipalities in northern Ontario when it calls upon the government to come up with a new formula that will provide more rather than less to the mining municipalities, which provide the necessary services to the mining industry and the miners who reside therein.

I also recommend to the government, the necessity of levying an adequate enough mine service tax against operating mines, to truly

compensate the mining municipalities for the loss of revenue that would be theirs if they could levy direct taxes on the mining property and buildings.

The mining companies must not be permitted to free-load any longer. They must pay their fair share of taxes. It is their moral responsibility. The residents of mining municipalities must be helped to incorporate a sounder revenue basis as far as their municipal operations are concerned.

Further to this, Mr. Speaker, I believe that mining companies that come into production around developed communities have a special obligation to that community. If the mine had been found and developed in the wilderness, that particular company would have to spend great sums of money to provide living accommodation and services for its work force. Surely then, when they are fortunate enough to find a mine around a settled community and proceed to take full advantage of its services, it stands to reason that they have a special responsibility to help offset the portion of the debenture debt that others have incurred to provide such services in that community.

I ask the government to take under advisement and devise a method to make such a plan operational. Specifically, I should like to see the government find a way to ensure that Texas Gulf and Canadian Johns-Manville assume some of the cost of carrying the debenture debt of the municipalities in the Porcupine camp.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentlemen that sit opposite to me are the vocal exponents of the free enterprise system. If it is such a good system as they contend, then I call upon them at least to take governmental action to see that it is responsible.

We have been raped and exploited enough by this system as far as our natural resources are concerned. Others have benefitted at our expense. It is time that big business operations were forced to be responsible and carry their just load of the burden that rightfully belongs to them. Unchecked and uncontrolled, big business is like a ravaging wild beast that mangles and devours its prey without satisfying its hunger or suffering a twinge of conscience in the process. It is time that the government should act for the people for a change rather than forever capitulating to its big business supporters.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the development of the north for the benefit of the north is a policy long overdue for the government to adopt. In fact, the provincial government at present, by the equalization-of-opportunity policy of the Ontario development corporation, has a policy that nullifies the federal government plan of designation. As far as certain northern Ontario districts are concerned, the federal government's planning officers are making a genuine effort, sir, to encourage industry to the north, but the provincial government's policy encourages industry to locate in areas just beyond the fringe of the southern industrial complex. It is time the policy makers in regional development of both governments got together and came up with a co-ordinated effective policy and course of action for the north. Such enlightened action, however, is not likely to be adopted until we have an NDP government here and in Ottawa.

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Never.

Mr. Ferrier: It is coming. It is coming.

Again the provincial government could give leadership in promoting projects that will bring development of the north. Its refusal to take an official stand and give strong leadership in 1967—as the Frost government did in 1956—to ensure the second gas pipeline would be built in northern Ontario rather than through the United States, set back northern development a number of years. If it will only realize its mistake and will now give leadership to see that natural gas is supplied to those areas of northwestern Ontario that are still denied it, there is still some hope for its redemption.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): The member's leader wanted it to go through the United States.

Mr. Ferrier: That was away back when.

Mr. Singer: That is what he said.

Mr. Ferrier: But he has also reversed his position.

Again, if Crown corporations, when undertaking building projects, would agree to purchase locally where feasible, a great deal of good might come for northern industry. For instance, Ontario Hydro is building some kind of substation in Gold Centre in my riding. Such a building will require something like 20,000 cement blocks. Rather than buy from either of the two cement block manufacturers in Timmins, or from one in Earlton or the other areas of northern Ontario, the Hydro has made its purchases from a firm in Hamilton. It will cost considerably more

money to buy them in Hamilton and ship them to Timmins than if bought locally, but that does not seem to matter. Hydro's specifications for these blocks called for ten per cent less moisture than the national building code, so for this reason it rejected the local supplier. But when he said he would dry his blocks to meet its specifications, and still save it something like $2,400, well that would be job peddling.

What really aggravates me is that in a designated area, where local industry is attempting to survive, a provincial Crown corporation will not buy locally and support our industries, but goes and buys from an area that is rich in industry and business. It just does not add up.

We need much better roads in the north if our tourist industry is going to develop as it should. Moreover, Mr. Speaker, the condition of our roads hampers further industry. An official of the Canadian Johns-Manville Company said to my federal colleague, Murdo Martin, that it had such difficulty manoeuvring its heavy equipment around the curves on Highway 101 from Timmins to Foleyet, that if it had known that the road was in that bad a shape, it would never have gone ahead to develop its mine in Reeves township. Now that the Reeves mine is past the development stage and coming into production, the miners and officials have to drive over that broken-up, curvy road night and day. Not only are they wrecking their cars, but they are endangering their lives. I just hope and pray that there are no more accidents with loss of life before that road from Timmins to Foleyet is straightened out and properly surfaced.

The Minister of Highways (Mr. Gomme) mentions that all his department is aware of the road conditions, yet they have only so much money at their disposal from a belt-tightening budget this year. So it is not likely that they will get around to do any work on it this year. I hope they will reconsider this previous decision, as the need is indeed great.

But I suppose, Mr. Speaker, that we should not be surprised at the poor road conditions in northern Ontario. From an investigation now underway in the Timmins division of The Department of Highways, it seems as though the heavy equipment is too busy at public expense paving driveways and parking lots for prominent Tory supporters to do much work on public roads. But maybe now after the investigation there will be a change for the better.

What are some of the features that make life in the north attractive and suitable for industry? For one thing, there is lots of land in the north. Houses may be built on much cheaper lots so that it is still possible for the citizens of the north to own their own homes.

We have an abundant source of available cheap energy in northeastern Ontario, with cheap hydro and natural gas. We have an over-abundance of unpolluted fresh water. At this point I must commend the government, and especially the hon. member for Wellington-Dufferin (Mr. Root), when they suggest that rather than divert water from the north to supply the ever increasing needs of industry in the south and in the United States, industry should be encouraged to go north where the water is readily available. At this point I am willing to congratulate the government on its Conservative policy of moving slowly.

We have a rich supply of raw materials and natural resources ever at hand in the north. We have availability of outdoor recreational opportunities, in hunting, fishing, and camping, and I hope that our fishing rights will not have a $3 licence fee placed against all fishermen. I do hope The Department of Lands and Forests will not make that move.

These are some of the advantages of the north. The major drawbacks of the north have been the distance from markets and cost of transportation. If the Ontario Northland Railway were to be subsidized as a development road, as it is advertised to be, more preferential rates might be given to secondary industry locating in the north. If, as some are now suggesting, the ONR was to take over the Canadian National Railway line from North Bay to Toronto, this problem of distance and transportation cost could be greatly bridged.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the government has the responsibility to come up with a bold and daring blueprint of development for northern Ontario. I deplore its absence from the Throne Speech.

Before getting on to the one remaining subject that I wish to deal with, I wish to assure the Prime Minister that I welcome his general approach to the recognition of the French fact in Ontario and his willingness to accommodate the province to serve their needs. On behalf of my riding, I wish to thank the Prime Minister that finally he is going to supply public funds to help with the cost of French secondary education. This is a most welcome announcement and I look

forward to the implementation of this in the province this September, if at all possible.

The other subject in the Throne Speech that concerns me is that amendment to The Workmen's Compensation Act to be introduced for our consideration. This is a step in the right direction, because from my experience this board is in need of a major overhaul. While I have little criticism of the personnel of the board, some of their practices and policies are unjust and must be revised.

Claims are often delayed because forms are not submitted by the doctor or employer. For this reason, some of my constituents have had to wait for six or more weeks to get their claim established. A number of these people have to seek assistance from municipal welfare until their compensation is established. Surely the board has more responsibility that it can assume to bring sufficient pressure to bear on delinquent doctors and employers who are late with their reports. The injured workman has enough to contend with in his physical injury, without adding on the anguish that comes from no money in the house.

Pensions certainly need updating, not only for widows and dependent children, but also for those who are receiving compensation on the basis of some ridiculously low wage of 10, 15, or 20 or more years ago. I believe that such pensions must be raised so that the amount received is commensurate with today's wages and the value of the dollar. I hope that this House will accept the recommendation of Mr. Justice McGillivray to reduce the waiting period in order to receive compensation, from three days to one day.

One further aspect of the Act deserves comment and it is the method of detecting the industrial disease known as silicosis and found particularly among hard rock miners. Despite what board people tell me, I am convinced that the rate of chest disabling conditions among miners is a great deal higher than among the other parts of the population. I have seen far too many disabled miners with chest conditions to think otherwise.

Underground miners, let us not forget, Mr. Speaker, are a picked lot. They cannot get a miners' certificate to allow them to go underground, unless their lungs are in good condition. After a number of years' work in the mine, many of them develop severe lung conditions, even though they get their regular X-rays and examinations at the provincial mine chest station. When lung conditions develop they are invariably told that no silicosis is present; it is always some other non-compensable condition that is giving them the trouble—a condition, after all, that everybody gets.

From my contact with miners who have lung conditions, I have come to see that there are positive symptoms that indicate a serious lung and chest disability which is most likely silicosis, but which are never enough to convince the silicosis referee board or the workmen's compensation board that silicosis is what they really have. That august body of medical experts invariably decides that on the basis of the X-rays and the examinations that it makes, the man does not have silicosis. But I am told that the X-rays can be highly ambiguous and do not always give conclusive evidence from which to base a medical decision. Yet the silicosis referee board invariably comes up with its one word "no", there is no silicosis present.

I read the medical report of a Toronto heart specialist as sent to the miners' chest station doctor, who gave it to the workman in this instance to peruse. The report states that the man was suffering from right heart disease and liver malfunctions, both signs of silicosis. In addition, this doctor had done a chest puncture and had the tissue examined by a pathologist. The report states a great deal of dirt was present in the lungs, as was considerable silicotic tissue. You might think that the man would get his compensation right then, but I assure you that it was six years later, that it was given to him, and it was only given then, because of some arm-twisting.

Another constituent has reports from the chest specialist of the Niagara sanatorium and a Toronto general hospital specialist, that in their opinion, the number one reason for his disabling condition is silicosis, with latent tuberculosis and lymphatic leukemia. The appeal tribunal went in the face of such expert medical opinion and has rejected this man's appeal, which now must go to the board. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that in the case of silicosis diagnosis we do not have objective medical decisions being rendered, that there is an unmistakable bias against the workman, so that the benefit of the doubt is never his. My experience in this field, in the last year has convinced me of the same. I suggest that whole method of diagnosing and establishing silicosis needs to be looked at and revived in this province. I also suggest that the Act should be made much broader in scope to include a variety of chest ailments when they are found in long-term miners. Justice demands it.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for this opportunity to engage in the present Throne debate.

Mr. R. M. Johnston (St. Catharines): Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a real privilege to have this opportunity to speak to you, sir, and indeed the members of this Conservative government, the leader of the Opposition and the members of that Liberal Party, and the members of New Democratic Party of this House.

I come from the city of St. Catharines—a city I am sure known to all of you; a city that is the county seat of the county of Lincoln where my colleague the hon. Provincial Secretary (Mr. Welch) ably represents that area. Speaking of that great city of St. Catharines—the focal point of the booming Niagara peninsula—we enjoy a diversified economy, a diversified industrial complex, largely automotive, with large paper industries and shipbuilding industries. In essence, we build everything from ships to zippers, and blessed by nature, we are located in the heart of a rich garden land known for its rich farm land —I heard the word across the floor, the grape growing area of Canada—large acreages of peaches, all kinds of fruits. We in St. Catharines enjoy that type of economy.

It has been my privilege for some years to be the mayor of that great city, and last October, those people who make up that great community saw fit to elect me to this Legislature. Having some background in municipal affairs for possibly 29 years, I come to this Legislature with the hope that we may create even better relationships between our provincial government and the municipalities across this province.

One major move, made by this government in the last few weeks, is taking over the cost of the administration of justice. And may I suggest to the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Wishart) who is in the House here listening attentively, I am sure, to my address, that we too, like London South, have an old court house, and we hope to be top priority for construction of a new facility, whereby we may be able to administer justice in good order in the county of Lincoln and in the city of St. Catharines. We will try that on for size.

While we speak of being in the heart of a great fruit land, may I invite everyone here to participate in our annual wine and grape festival, in St. Catharines, the third week of September. And in that regard, I recall a few weeks ago, since the inception of this Legislature session, the hon. member for Humber expressed an interest in Canadian wines, and I enlist his support, and—

Mr. G. Ben (Humber): The promotion of Canadian wines—

Mr. R. M. Johnston: That is fine. I enlist his support, I enlist the support of this government, so that we may be able to dispense that product in the fashion that I will call a brand new departure in liquor and wine dispensing—sidewalk cafes. While we are speaking of liquor, this takes probably some courage to mention this, but I have made up my mind that I will make this point here and ask the support of every member in this House to bring about an extension of cocktail and dining lounge hours on Saturday evening from 11:30 p.m. to 1:00 a.m.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): What about doing away with local option?

Mr. R. M. Johnston: That is fine with me too. The Sunday barrier has been broken so I ask you for that support.

Now as I travel to this Legislature just about every day—fortunately being located about an hour and 15 minutes from the capital of our province—I have encountered just to the east of the great city of St. Catharines, and the riding of my good friend, the member for Niagara Falls (Mr. Burkator), an interchange. And I hope that he will not take issue with me when I recommend that the traffic interchange, as we proceed to Stoney Creek, be renewed 1968 style. I see the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Gomme) is in attendance and I suggest that top priority be given forthwith to bringing that area up to 1967 travel standards.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): How about 1930 standards?

Mr. R. M. Johnston: You will get it if you stay here long enough.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

Mr. R. M. Johnston: Mr. Speaker, I would like to make some observations as to what has been taking place in this House for the past three to four weeks.

I do not agree with my friend, the hon. member for Peel South (Mr. Kennedy), who spoke so ably to this Legislature just a few minutes ago, that I am too happy with the proceedings that take place. I am used to being in a council and a part of a lawmaking organization that does things, but I have not seen too much done—

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): The hon. member will not be happy here.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. R. M. Johnston: —in this Legislature for the past four weeks.

Mr. Singer: You are in the wrong party.

Mr. R. M. Johnston: Especially in what I witnessed here this past week. All I have heard from that side of the House is hon. member after hon. member spreading doom and gloom.

Mr. H. Worton (Wellington South): Shame, shame.

Mr. R. M. Johnston: There is nothing right in their community; there is nothing right in Ontario. In other words, I believe they do not think there is anything right on this earth. I do not even know why some of them are here.

I have seen this take place and as a rookie —a brand new member—it has been a sad commentary as to government for the people and by the people.

And may I be so bold, Mr. Speaker, to suggest in the interest of good government, that the members in Opposition enjoy the daily question period for one reason only—to get their name allocated in the press some place. I cannot see any useful purpose in that question period—

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): That statement is a gross exaggeration.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. R. M. Johnston: I suggest that these people, these hon. members, should get their questions answered the same way I do mine—I call or write the Minister, and they have that same privilege.

Mr. Shulman: They do not answer the letters.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): The member has a lot to learn.

Mr. R. M. Johnston: Then you will receive your answer and may I suggest that if that answer does not satisfy you, then I say, on a point of order, ask and make a point of it here.

If you wish to do business for the people of this province, and I am sure that is what you were sent here to do, it is not going to serve any useful purpose for the good of this province if you people stand there, asking ridiculous questions back and forth—they are just ridiculous, pathetic questions—of the different Ministers.

Mr. Shulman: The answers are ridiculous not the questions.

Mr. R. M. Johnston: May I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that if it goes on, then I am sure the people of this province will have the idea that what is going on here is nothing better than a Punch and Judy show.

An hon. member: Speak for yourself.

Mr. R. M. Johnston: That is just what is taking place in my opinion. As I related to you a moment ago, I am a brand new member and a rookie, but what takes place here certainly has not impressed me, I will tell you that. I came here to try to do good for people and I would hope that everyone came here with that same thought in mind, but I have not found that. May I also make another suggestion as to the night sessions, that they be convened not at 8:00 o'clock, but at 7:00 o'clock, and that there be closure at 10:00 o'clock.

Mr. Ben: That is adjournment.

Mr. R. M. Johnston: Adjournment or whatever you wish—the same as we do at 6:00 o'clock any other night.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. R. M. Johnston: Then the private members' hours—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order! Order!

Mr. R. M. Johnston: —once or twice a week; I cannot see any useful purpose in these. It would be some use if we were allowed to vote—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. R. M. Johnston: You did not like me before; now you are in love with me, right? Well, I believe that the two hours of every week that we stand here and listen to somebody's oratory—again to make the news—without being able to come to any conclusion. There are some of these issues I would like to vote for, some I would like to oppose—

Mr. Shulman: We agree—please tell that to the government leaders in the front benches.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): We do not discipline our members!

Mr. R. M. Johnston: —and, some of them I would like to speak violently against.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Shulman: The Minister had better instruct him, he is going to be in trouble.

Mr. R. M. Johnston: I do not take instruction from anyone. That is more than you can say.

Mr. Speaker, I have made a few suggestions. Now to be positive in one of the things that really concerns me in Ontario and Canada and all municipalities. May I take this opportunity to congratulate the hon. Prime Minister for his convening of the Confederation conference, which brought about the constitutional conference in Ottawa two months ago.

I honestly believe, and speaking as a person engaged in municipal work for a long, long time, that there is only one survival for Canada, for our provinces and for our municipalities. It requires that the federal authorities, provincial authorities and indeed the municipal authorities be brought together and bring about a rearrangement of financial responsibilities for taxation purposes as they are inter-related with the three levels of government. I am sure you know that what I am hinting at is that our Canadian constitution was fine one day, but the need for revision is long, long overdue. It should be and has to be brought up to 1967 standard, centennial year—

Mr. Singer: It is 1968!

Mr. R. M. Johnston: Now the new century, 1968—

An hon. member: Thank you.

Mr. R. M. Johnston: —thereby, we will be able to say to the people that we can give them the kind of money that is needed. Municipal level taxes for municipal purposes. We need education taken out of municipal hands. It needs to be taken by the national government and the provincial government, because I am sure you will agree that any educated child is not just an asset to that community but indeed an asset to the nation. After these levels of government are brought together—and our hon. Prime Minister has made a real good start, and I would call upon this government and all the members of this Legislature to support this move—then we can do the things for these municipalities whether it be in the north or the west or the east or the south. Then we will have the proper financial arrangement to do things for people at all levels of government.

May I, Mr. Speaker, join all the other hon. members who have spoken in the past few weeks in congratulating you on your elevation to that high office that you hold. I have known you as a responsible citizen and you are a responsible citizen for a responsible job. May I also publicly congratulate those members who have been elevated to Cabinet rank and thank you, Mr. Speaker, for this privilege of speaking to the members of this Legislature. And I express the hope that as we meet here year by year for this next four years at least, that we may, as Canadians, bear in mind at all times that we are here to represent the people of our community. And our nation's greatest asset, our community's greatest asset is our people.

So may I say this to you—I hope that I can make a contribution to their betterment and I believe it should be in the minds of all to do just that; to represent them for their betterment and make Canada a better place for all of us to live in.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): Mr. Speaker, it is indeed an honour to be in this legislative assembly and I wish to publicly thank the fine people of Essex-Kent riding for giving me this opportunity to represent them. Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate you on your appointment as Speaker of this House, a position that I am sure you will fulfill with dignity. I may say, Mr. Speaker, I have a little sentiment with regards to your position and the riding you represent. It so happens that my mother, my late mother, was born and raised in your area so I have a little touch of sentimentality in your area.

Mr. Speaker, I am one of the fourth generation of a family that settled in this country, came into Ontario in 1834 and settled in the township of Maidstone in 1845. I have had the privilege of being reeve of that township for the past six years. My forefathers carried on in the lumber and threshing and farming business, and I noticed that a bill was presented today to repeal The Threshing Machines Act by the Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. Stewart). It has a point, as it so happens that one of my grandfathers built one of the first self-feeding threshing machines in Essex county. My brothers still live on the family farm in the area.

I might say that I represent a population of over 40,000; they are French Canadian,

Scottish, English, and others. But basically we are all Canadians, and this is something I think that we all should bear in mind. I have had this mentioned on different occasions and I think that Canada needs an identity of its own. We should be proud that we are Canadians regardless of where we were born.

Mr. Speaker, with your approval I will pass on an interesting note. I have the honour of having as one of my constituents the youngest Cabinet member in the government of Ontario. I suppose that he lost his vote in the October 17 election, but he can be sure that with his co-operation and my most sincere efforts, the residents will receive adequate representation in this House.

Mr. Speaker, in a lighter vein if you will, I represent one of the new nine ridings in the province, as stated by the Premier (Mr. Robarts), but I take exception to him claiming the credit for this. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the people of Ontario were entitled to the representation due to the increase in population. This is their right in a democratic country, of course. I had the good fortune to have twin sons attain voting age in 1967, and might say that my wife and I have three more who will attain that age before long. So, Mr. Speaker, I believe the credit of the continued increased population of a country should belong to the people of Ontario and not the Conservative Party.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask you to bear with me although I will try to add dignity to the House. I would like to add a rather interesting experience I had on my first visit to this Legislature. I believe it was in 1961 and while visiting Toronto I dropped around to say hello to the old war horse of Essex North, Mr. Arthur Reaume, and I think most people know Mr. Reaume. He suggested that I sit in the members' gallery, so I followed his instructions and went up and sat down. However, before I came into the House I had bought my licence plates for my automobile downtown and placed them in my overcoat pockets. And after listening to the debate for some time I made my way to the stairway with my coat in arm. That is right, Mr. Speaker—the licence plates fell to the floor and made an awful commotion, and while I put my head down and made haste I never thought there would be a day that I would be here in this capacity.

I would at this time congratulate the Ontario Premier on his party's election victory in the centennial year of 1967, and at the same time assure him that my centennial project was completed with my win at the polls on October 17; which is more than can be said for province of Ontario centennial project which, I understand, may be completed by 1969. I also would like to congratulate our leader, and I am proud to have such a capable man to work with in this House.

I might say that I represent one of the finest areas in Ontario and it is indeed an excellent agricultural area as well as having beautiful towns and villages scattered throughout the area to give it a touch of urban growth. The largest town in my area, Essex, has about 3,700. And the town of Tilbury is similar. Our basic crops are corn, soya beans, fall wheat, tomatoes and sugar beets. Then there is dairy and mixed farming. Towns and villages are in some cases bedrooms for the city's industrial areas nearby. However, with the instigation of the federal government's recent auto trade pact with the United States we are enjoying industrial growth in many areas.

The number of dairy farms has decreased in the last few years due to the lack of a sound dairy policy by the government of Ontario and the famous moratorium on milk prices of the early 1960s.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that I should adjourn this debate, if I am correct.

Mr. Ruston moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Mr. Speaker, we will call items number 23 and 25 on the order paper to be taken together.

Clerk of the House: The 25th order; second reading of Bill 30, An Act to amend The Highway Traffic Act; and the 23rd order; second reading of Bill 22, An Act to amend The Highway Traffic Act.

THE HIGHWAY TRAFFIC ACT

Mr. W. Newman (Ontario South) moves second reading of Bill 30, An Act to amend The Highway Traffic Act.

THE HIGHWAY TRAFFIC ACT

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview) moves second reading of Bill 22, An Act to amend The Highway Traffic Act.

Mr. J. H. White (London South): On a point of order, if I may interrupt my friend. The Speaker earlier this afternoon made reference to the practice being followed in the private members' hours which take place twice a week. The procedures flow from a meeting, or rather a series of meetings, that took place between the leaders of the three parties and the three party Whips. I think that was two years ago.

Mr. Speaker Morrow read the agreement at which we had arrived at that time into the record, and I was hoping, Mr. Speaker, to give you that reference. I am not able to do so at the moment. The agreement between the three leaders and the three Whips had, I think, six clauses, which were put in writing and copies of which were provided to each of the participants in that series of meetings. As I mentioned a minute ago, Mr. Speaker Morrow read that agreement into the record, so that it forms part of the rules of this chamber.

One of the rules said that if a debate on a particular issue terminated before the hour was over, the item would be removed from the order paper and the next order of private members' public resolution or bill would be proceeded with. The reason for that, Mr. Speaker, was that we hoped to avoid the practice in Ottawa where each private member's period is exhausted on one order of business and where members stand up from the opposing side to talk out a private member's public bill or resolution. We thought that this was a wasteful procedure and one that we could very easily avoid here.

If a private member's public bill debate was concluded at the end of the hour, the item of business automatically was removed from the order paper, rather than going to the bottom of a list where it remained indefinitely.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Is the member on a point of order?

Mr. White: Yes, I am on a point of order. I am trying to refresh the hon. member's memory in view of the fact that the Leader of the Opposition was one of the participants in the meetings and a signatory, so to speak, to the agreement.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): No, he was not.

Mr. White: There is no reason, of course, Mr. Speaker, that those understandings cannot be modified, but I think, sir, it is highly inappropriate that the very people who assisted in arriving at that procedure should now complain about it unilaterally as if they themselves have no responsibility in the matter.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, and in reply to the uncalled for remarks of the member for London South, first let me say that the leader of the Opposition was not a party to that discussion. The former member for Dovercourt was, and the member for London South, being as exact as he is, should have caught that fact some time ago.

The second point, and let me refresh the memory of the member for London South, is that it was made quite clear to the members of the House by the leader of the government that if the private members' hour was to continue this was the only basis on which the government would allow it to continue. So we had no choice in it.

And the third point, Mr. Speaker, is with the greatest respect to my friend from London South—surely he would allow us the right of expressing opinions in this House with which even he might not agree. In summation, sir, I do not think he had a point of order at all, it was just a waste of time of the House.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Ontario South will resume the debate.

Mr. W. Newman: Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak to this proposal I would like to deal with it in two parts as laid out in the bill. First, I will deal with the coloured tail lights; secondly, with the safety helmets. May I read from the bill:

> No person shall sell, offer or expose for sale a new motor vehicle manufactured after the first day of January, 1970, other than a motorcycle, unless there is affixed to each side at the rear thereof in a conspicuous position a lamp which when lighted shall display a green light only which shall be clearly visible at a distance of at least 500 feet from the rear of the vehicle and when a stop lamp is incorporated with such lamp it shall, when actuated upon application of the service or footbrake, emit a red light.

I have received a number of letters on this particular portion of the bill from people in various parts of the province. I realize the many ramifications on this matter. People have suggested all kinds of things—coloured direction signals, tail lights that turn green to yellow to red, and many other applications of it.

The reason that I chose to pick on the red to green colour is because it is a fairly simple operation and easy to install on cars. The aim of this particular piece of legislation which I propose to you today is to provide greater safety—to reduce the increasing accident toll on our highways.

It is an additional device which I feel—and I am sure many other people feel—will save lives on our ever-increasing traffic lanes throughout the province of Ontario—as a matter of fact, throughout the whole of Canada. I know that all who travel on the highways at night are confused by the mass of red lights ahead. We are never quite sure what is happening, whether the traffic may be stopped or whether it is moving, whether it is accelerating or slowing down.

If green tail lights were mounted on the rear of cars we would know well in advance that the car was moving forward and that things were working all right, and we would have less cause for worry. If we saw a red light we would know immediately that there was probably a problem ahead, or trouble of some kind which was causing traffic to slow down, and we should exercise due caution. This one feature alone on the back of cars I am sure would save many, many lives in a period of one year, as well as reducing the number or rear-end collisions by many thousands on our highways.

I realize that by putting forth this legislation there are certain problems that would occur unless similar legislation were adopted on a national basis; unless the system was made uniform throughout the country—and preferably North America.

I understand that the state of Ohio now has passed legislation that all cars must have a light in the centre of the back which is green when the car is travelling, and that when the brakes are applied it will turn red.

The reason for suggesting 1970 is that it would give the government time and the auto manufacturers time to adapt their production to this type of light on the back of the cars. It is not an expensive thing, and because of the number of lives it would save the costs are really insignificant. This legislation deserves to be given serious consideration for the well-being of everyone who travels on our highways.

Statistical information on the value of this particular feature is limited, and for that reason one cannot state categorically that accidents will be reduced, or by how much. Nor can we prove beyond a shadow of doubt that the number of fatalities would be reduced by having the green light on the back of cars. The first step which our government should undertake then, I suggest, is a programme of research on this project to confirm our logical suspicions about the hazard or the inadequacy of the present system.

Brake lights of a brighter shade of red, as those at present, are most ineffective under conditions of poor visibility such as fog, heavy rain and snow.

I am convinced that the green running lights which will turn red with the application of the brakes would prove out to be a most worthwhile additional safety feature.

Now, may I turn to the other portion of the Act which is a much more pressing need much more urgent—something which should be done immediately in order to reduce fatalities on motorcycles this year.

I would like to give you some figures relating to motorcycle registrations and motorcycle fatalities in the years 1965 and 1966, and then I will touch on 1967 figures later.

	1965	*1966*	*Increase*
Registrations	19,350	38,000	196%
Killed	32	62	194%

The amendment I am proposing is a very simple one and I would like to read it to you.

1. No person shall ride on a motorcycle unless he is properly wearing a safety helmet which complies with regulations.

2. The Lieutenant-Governor in council may make regulations prescribing the standards and specifications of safety helmets which shall be worn by persons riding on motorcycles.

The statistics indicate that one motorcycle in ten is involved in an accident—and that one accident out of every 60 results in a death. Put another way, it means that there was a cyclist killed every sixth day, while ten suffered injuries each and every day of the year.

These figures, Mr. Speaker, I regard as very serious indeed. The statistics also show that the increase in dead and injured has risen alarmingly in proportion to the number of vehicle registrations. Thus, if registrations go up this year—as they are bound to do—we must be prepared for a proportional increase in the slaughter.

The encouraging fact is, Mr. Speaker, that ample evidence exists now to prove that we do not need to sit here and watch this toll of dead and injured increase in direct propor-

tion to the increase in vehicle registrations for another season.

I intend to read into the record today evidence to prove conclusively that by making the wearing of safety helmets by motorcyclists mandatory we can reduce the proportion of dead and injured—that we can save young lives, that we can prevent injuries this year by a simple piece of legislation one sentence in length.

The implementation of this legislation will not be without some opposition from persons who feel it would be an infringement upon their liberty; however, the overall gains are certainly worthwhile. There has been plenty of evidence of the saving of lives. As time goes on, public opinion grows stronger in favour of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I deeply regret the necessity of raising this matter today. In most of the areas discussed in this House our province bears favourable comparison with any other jurisdiction on this continent. Unfortunately the same cannot be said in respect to highway safety—and this matter of motorcycles in particular.

The argument that such legislation impinges on the individual's freedom or civil liberties is simply unacceptable. It is comparable to saying that the fire department has no right to come into my home or my apartment to put out a fire.

We have all seen how safety helmets have gained total acceptance by everyone in the construction industry, and how by means of The Department of Labour's effective advertising campaign the wearing of safety helmets has become a mark of the professionalism of those involved.

And as with the construction industry, there is almost unanimous agreement amongst the medical profession, insurance companies, motorcycle manufacturers, the Ontario motor league, American automobile association, plus many others, of the urgent need for helmets for all motorcyclists and passengers on motorcycles.

Mr. Speaker, another argument which has been put forward against compulsory use of safety helmets is that in this city of Toronto, for instance, almost 70 per cent of the accidents involving motorcycles and automobiles have been the fault of the automobile driver. The use of a brightly coloured helmet with reflecting tape for night-time visibility would be a big help in overcoming this particular problem. In other words, not only would helmets reduce the numbers killed and seriously injured—it would also reduce the numbers of accidents.

There is another unsatisfactory aspect of the situation concerning motorcyclists, and this involves their licensing. At present, all applicants must pass a written test similar to automobile drivers. This test deals with rules of the road, and so on. Having passed this test, the applicant is then given an appointment for his practical driver's test—usually two or three weeks hence.

On that date he is issued with a one-day permit, a permit which enables him to drive to the test area only, and he must be accompanied by a qualified motorcycle driver either in a car or riding on the rear seat. How, Mr. Speaker, is the applicant expected to learn to handle the bike? Legally, he cannot practise except on the date of the test. Surely this is ridiculous?

Temporary licences must be issued so that applicants can practice legally. Now I realize this is a dangerous period, but the hazards can be reduced by insisting that each learner-vehicle must carry a large white sign—front and back—with the letter "L" for learner inscribed upon it. This procedure is followed in England for both cars and motorcycles, and it is a good one. It is also true that temporary licences must be issued for a limited period, and be not renewable after, say, two test failures.

Also, I see no reason why suitable training courses cannot be organized for young motorcycle drivers similar to our school-sponsored car driver education courses.

Mr. Speaker, those of us who have ridden motorcycles know the enjoyment they bring on a lovely spring or summer day—the sense of power and freedom and speed not possible in a car. It is invigorating and fun.

Mr. Speaker, on the question of compulsory helmets it is re-emphasized that these are now recommended by the AAMVA—American Association of Motor Vehicle Administrators—the United States Department of Transportation report on highway safety programme standards, July 1, 1966, and the Canadian government specifications board, after long consideration and exhaustive research. The latter's *Guide to Traffic Safety* states:

> Many of the fatal and non-fatal accidents involve injury to the head and neck. A significant proportion of the injuries and deaths could be avoided by the simple expedient of wearing an approved motorcycle safety helmet. Research has shown that the use of helmets reduces the risk of

head injury by 33 per cent and death by 40 per cent.

A letter from John C. Kerrick of the AAMVA, January 18, 1968, says that 31 states and four provinces have adopted compulsory helmet legislation.

The Canadian government quotation above brings into sharp focus the fact that Ontario last year motorcycle fatalities rose by 40.4 per cent compared with an increase of only 3.9 per cent in all motor vehicle fatalities, according to the report of the accident statistics section, research branch, Ontario Department of Transport, February 9, 1968.

The coincidence of the two 40 per cent figures make it difficult, if not impossible, to reach any other conclusion than that compulsory helmets would have avoided the 40 per cent increase in motorcycle fatalities in Ontario last year. The restricted instruction permit will also save lives in the opinion of such authorities as the AAMVA and the chief instructor of the Ottawa safety council's motorcycle safety course, as cited in his 1967 report.

This is so, of course, because research has shown that far too many of the fatal motorcycle accidents are caused by operators who have not been allowed the legal opportunity and the legal discipline of doing their early road and highway riding under clearly stated restrictions as to speed, passengers, permissible times and places of operation of motorcycles, in the critical initial stages of their motorcycle careers. We urge that such instruction permits be identified on licence plates as a restraint on the motorcyclist, protection of prospective passengers, and assistance to other vehicle operators using the roads to identify Tyro motorcycle operators.

It is recommended that legislation be amended at the earliest possible time on these two, and perhaps other, important safety matters, so that the benefits and the resulting saving of lives will be effective in the motorcycle season about to commence.

However, the motorcycle itself provides no real protection to the driver or passenger, and consequently almost every accident spells injury or death. The proportion of motorcycle accidents is actually lower than that of automobile accidents—but unfortunately almost every motorcycle accident produces serious injury or death.

Research has shown that the use of helmets reduces fatal accidents by 40 per cent. In Ontario last year, motorcycle fatalities rose by 40.4 per cent. In British Columbia last year, after compulsory legislation, the fatal accident rate dropped 40 per cent. The need to take effective action now to reduce these figures to the absolute minimum seems to me most obvious and urgent.

Mr. Young: Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak to these bills, I want to say first of all, that it is interesting and encouraging to have a member on the government side introducing a bill of the nature of this one today. I do not know whether this means that there is going to be some changes in government policy in the future, but I hope that it does.

In the first part of the bill which the hon. member mentioned, in respect to coloured tail lights, members on this side of the House have brought this matter before this august assembly on many occasions. A man by the name of Mr. Harry Ryan has a patent on a device of this kind which gives the green running light, the amber stopping light, and the red light when stopped. He has been in touch with many of the members of this House, and we have brought it to the attention of the House before now. One of the members of our own group will speak more on the detail of this at some future time.

I hope that this means that some of the difficulties will be overcome. Ohio is giving the lead, and I think that on this continent this kind of common sense—bringing the auto tail light into harmony with the traffic lights—will be adopted by this Minister and by the corresponding Ministers across the continent. This, I know, will take time, and I know that it will not be an easy task to accomplish, and I think those of us on this side of the House are willing to give the Minister a bit of time, provided that he is serious about it and is pushing this forward in the assemblies in which he from time to time meets with his counterparts from the United States, and the other provinces.

So, we are very much in favour of this part of the bill. The second part of my bill deals with the matter of motorcyclists keeping within the lane of traffic. Again as I have on former occasions, I bring to this House, the importance of that being legislated. Too many of us have seen cases, where motorcyclists come up through the traffic between lanes, sometimes scaring the motorist and sometimes resulting in injury, and serious problems.

The sooner that we face this matter and realize that the motorcycle is a vehicle and that the same laws applying to the motor car, in this respect, should also apply to the

motorcyclist. He takes his place in the line of traffic, but when he wants to pass, he pulls out as a motor car would, into another line of traffic, and then he comes back to his own line of traffic again. I would hope that aspect of my bill would find support on all sides of this House, and by all the hon. members.

When we deal with the third aspect of the bill, then we come to a matter which this government has so far refused to bring to legislation. The Minister has heard many of us talk about this matter and we have introduced bills before. We have pleaded that helmets be made mandatory, and that standards be set up so that manufacturers could measure their accomplishments. So far we have gotten nowhere, but I would hope that with the introduction of this bill today—and I repeat it, by a member from the government side—it means that there is a change of mind taking place and that from here on in, we will find smoother sailing in this regard.

I was also very interested, in view of the debate in past years, to hear the member speak about compulsion because I understood that this was something that the members of the New Democratic Party had some sort of a monopoly upon. This has been the cry when we have talked about medicare, and about other items, and when we have talked about this kind of thing before. And yet, here is progress again, when a member of the government itself is now talking about mandating the helmets for young people who ride on motorcycles. Again I am delighted to see this happening in this House.

I think that along with the helmet, and I want to come to that again in a moment, the matter of teaching our young people effectively how to use a motorcycle is desperately important, and I was delighted to see that emphasis made.

A year or so ago, the Minister said that no person shall drive a motorcycle on our highways without passing a test to prove that he is competent. That is good, and we supported that, but the unfortunate part was that no provision was made for areas where such teaching might take place. Now I say with some degree of satisfaction that the borough of North York has undertaken, right in their own parking lot in their municipal building, to offer this kind of training. During this past year, many of our young people have learned to drive and then have gone to Downsview to take their tests, and I commend this kind of activity and leadership.

It is up to the municipalities across the province—and I would also ask this government to face up to its responsibilities and support and urge this kind of training activity. I am not going to make another case for the wearing of helmets, because I think that the hon. member who has just spoken made a very effective case. He has given the facts and figures which I have here, and which I do not need to repeat; they have been placed on record in *Hansard* in other years and they were again put on record today very effectively. I have in my hand a couple of newspaper reports, sir—one from the Toronto *Telegram*, on Friday, June 30, 1967. It reads:

> A coroner's jury yesterday gave impetus to the drive to make safety helmets compulsory for all motorcycle riders. The five-man jury was investigating the death of 17-year-old Hermil Cyr, of Holmwood Ave., following an accident on the Don Valley parkway on May 9, 1968. The 25-year-old brother of the dead boy told coroner Dr. Donald Bunt that Hermil had never owned a helmet, and so the jury urged that in future crash helmets be worn.

Again this year, on February 21, 1968, the *Globe and Mail* reports, and this is the headline: "Make cyclists wear helmets, jury suggests". And again at the inquest of Berry Blackburn, 16, of Queen Street East, the jury said that a helmet would have saved this boy's life and they make the suggestion that helmets be worn in future. So we have had this kind of activity in Metropolitan Toronto. Just within the last period of time.

This recommendation was made by the Metro council in October, 1966:

> Now be it resolved that the council of Metropolitan Toronto request that the necessary legislation be enacted by the provincial government to provide for the compulsory wearing of a crash helmet, designed and constructed to an approved standard by all operators and riders of motorcycles.

Other bodies have passed similar resolution. So public opinion is growing and expressing itself along these lines.

Some time ago, when we were talking of this matter, I had a call from a motorcyclist who had felt that we should do something about it; but he enjoyed the effect of the wind in his hair and he did not want to be forced to use a helmet, and he wrote a letter to me as I asked him to, putting it on record. He was objecting to the mandating of helmets but he did say this:

> You would be doing something more sensible to now introduce legislation making it unlawful for anyone to manufacture, sell, or wear any helmet in Ontario not meeting these standards.

This word "wear" sneaked into his letter for some reason or other, perhaps it was some subconscious wish.

> Include a law that it is also unlawful to misrepresent a helmet as meeting these standards when in fact it has not been approved by the Canadian standards association and to make the penalty severe.

He goes on in this vein that we should adopt certain standards.

Now up to this point, the hon. Minister has maintained that we do not have Canadian standards, but no longer is that true. I have in my hand the Canadian standards association certification requirements for motorcycle helmets. This was announced in November of last year and it is now available for the price of $2 to anybody who wants to see the standards.

The new standards are based on the British and American standards and are, as they say, as good as or better than these other standards. So that now in Ontario, in Canada, we do have Canadian standards and no longer is there any excuse for not adopting these standards; and if these bills were passed then I would hope that the Minister would then adopt the CSA for motorcycle helmets and make the helmets mandatory.

One of the problems has been that for many years, up until November last year, we have not had this kind of standard available to us in Ontario, unless we went either to Britain or the United States. Now this is still true. Even though the standards are here, they have not been adopted by this province as law, or regulation. So that today any manufacturer in this province can put out a jazzy helmet no matter what it may be like, and that helmet can be worn by the boy or girl riding the motorcycle. When an accident occurs the helmet may crash and splinter and become a lethal instrument injuring the head of the person concerned. Now this is one of the reasons why today, it is so important for those standards to be adopted, and for the helmets to be made mandatory.

I have here, Mr. Speaker, a motorcycle helmet.

An hon. member: Put it on!

Mr. Young: No, I am not going to put this one on, because it killed a young man some time ago. A nice-looking helmet. He thought it was good and was going to protect him; but he could very well have cut his throat while protecting his head. This is where the impact occurred, right here, and that helmet which the boy thought was protecting him, meant his death.

I have a second helmet here which is available to any youngster riding motorcycles. Again he thought he was safe, and for a long time he wore it. Then the crisis came and this boy paid; this helmet can be torn apart like that, in my hands. Unfortunately before somebody tore it apart that way, he had hit the pavement with disastrous results.

I have another helmet here, which as perhaps many of you recognize, is one which has been worn by the Metropolitan Toronto police. It is a helmet similar to those that have been worn from time to time by them. This helmet is unique in one way; it has been tested. Thus, up to this point, the Metropolitan Toronto police had no way within the nation to measure whether this helmet was safe or not and they still have no legal way. But this helmet was taken into the Canadian standards association laboratory and I was present when they dropped the weight on it. It did not stand the test, and there it is.

Now the Metropolitan Toronto police, aware of this problem and unsure of how safe this helmet might be are adopting another one similar to one I have in my hand, which passed the British tests. This one has passed the tests there, and will likely be worn by Toronto's finest in the days ahead. But the only way they are going to have any local standards against which to measure this helmet is for the Minister to write the regulations to set the standards in Ontario.

Do we have to go to Britain to determine whether this standard is safe for our policemen or for any motorcycle rider? So far that is what we have had to do. So, today, I am urging upon this Minister and upon this government, Mr. Speaker, that we take this matter seriously—that no longer should we allow young people in this province to buy this kind of unsatisfactory and lethal headgear. That no longer even our police force should have to go outside the country to test and to measure their helmets against standards because we have none here.

I urge upon this House that we finish with this kind of playing around with human life that killed 60 of our young people last year on motorcycles and injured 2,600 of them. Much of that is needless. This winter and spring, as the hon. member pointed out, the toll is going to mount tragically.

We, through our legislative facilities, can say to every company in this country: You cannot sell substandard helmets in Ontario, and if you are going to sell helmets for motorcyclists, then they must meet proper standards; they must meet the test. Then when young people buy them they are going to know that they are as safe to wear as science in this continent and in this country can make them.

Let us give them that assurance. If we are not going to vote on this bill today, Mr. Speaker, I would hope that the hon. Minister, keeping in mind some of these things that I have brought to his attention, will see fit to introduce his own amendments to The Highway Traffic Act. And I assure him that we will give him every co-operation in passing that kind of legislation.

Hon. I. Haskett (Minister of Highways): Mr. Speaker, may I put a question to the member who has just been speaking on this bill? Save only that last helmet that is being tested now for the Metropolitan Toronto Police force, I understand the member to have said the other three would not pass the tests of meeting the current CSA standards. Is that so?

Mr. Young: That is correct. These three will not pass the CSA standards which appeared in November.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: You describe these three as being lethal. I just point out to you, sir, that last year this same member urged us, before those standards were available, to make helmets mandatory which would have made the requirement to wear helmets such as those three lethal ones.

Mr. Young: Mr. Speaker, the hon. Minister is saying something which will not be borne out, because what I urged upon that occasion was that, since we had no standards of our own, we adopt the American or the British standards and mandate helmets meeting them.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Drop something on the Minister! That is what is needed.

Mr. D. M. De Monte (Dovercourt): Mr. Speaker, as I rise to speak on these two bills I am reminded of a letter received by one of my colleagues from someone that says that the wearing of safety helmets is undue invasion of a person's private rights. I submit with respect that such things are neither warranted nor—I just cannot think of a word—valid.

When we go to the Encyclopaedia Britannica, Mr. Speaker, we are reminded of the definition of safety. Safety is concerned with the taking of precautions against bodily injury caused by accident, either by preventing the occurrence or by mitigating its effect. I think that when we consider the mitigation of accident, which is safety, we are reminded that all devices used for safety are used for the saving of life and limb.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the problem in this 20th century of ours is to keep safety provisions in pace with the swiftness of technological advances, and the resultant stresses on mind and body which are particularly clear in motoring and motorcycling.

We are also reminded that in safety, there are three aspects. There is the engineering factor, the enforcement factor and the education factor. When we consider the new form of rear lights we are talking about engineering. We are saying that a person can see a light from 500 feet—sees a green light, then an amber light and then a red light and in seeing he knows that there is a change in the situation up ahead. Enforcement means that we pass a law and say that this is the way that we are going to show motorists who are approaching from behind that somebody is doing something up ahead.

The important factor in this consideration, Mr. Speaker, is education. I suggest, that if we are going to adopt this new system of rear lighting, it is going to take a system of education of our populace to accept this new type of warning and I think that this is a very necessary aspect of this whole legislation. We have been made used to a very old system of a flashing red light at night.

I am reminded, Mr. Speaker, that the workmen's compensation laws and the laws of The Department of Labour require a man working in construction and certain other industries like the mining industry, to wear a helmet. And there is no doubt—if we were to look at the statistics of the workmen's compensation board and of The Department of Labour—that helmets have certainly saved many lives in construction. I am reminded, Mr. Speaker, of a client of mine who had a hammer fall from five storeys high and hit him on the helmet. It saved his life; he had a bit of a fracture, but it saved his life.

I am also reminded of the police force in Toronto which uses the type of helmet—which is not acceptable, and with reason, to my friend from Yorkview—has saved many

lives in the police force and there is no doubt that with the improvement of the engineering aspect of the helmets, we can save more lives.

There is no doubt also, Mr. Speaker, that no self-respecting motorcycle racer will get on a course without a helmet and all we are doing here is asking the pleasure seekers to act like professionals. We also look at the football field; no self-respecting football player would go on the football field without his helmet, because if he went without a helmet he would be seriously injured.

In proposing that the government give support to this legislation—and I see that a member from the government has introduced it—I can only say, Mr. Speaker, that this type of legislation will only help to save lives in our province and make the roads and highways safe in this province.

I notice also that there is a certain theory that there should be separate cyclists' and motorcyclists' roads from the general-travel portion of the highway as they do in the plan of some new towns. The Minister might consider this aspect of marking off a certain portion of the highway where cars cannot travel, for the purposes of the motorcyclist and the cyclist. And I think that this aspect of motor vehicle and motorcycle safety is one that we should perhaps take cognizance of, Mr. Speaker, and in that we could reserve say, five feet on the right-hand side of every highway for the use of the cyclists and motorcyclists. I am also reminded, Mr. Speaker, that on our highways, the poor cyclist, the guy who wants to go along and paddle at five miles an hour, is completely disregarded. Well, I think that this suggestion, to give the motorcyclist and the cyclist a certain portion of the road that is not used by motor cars, might make our roads and highways more enjoyable to the general populace of Ontario.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak to these motions, I first of all would like to commend my colleague from Yorkview for the fine presentation that he made, and to say that if this government does not see the necessity of this legislation at this time, then it never will.

Mr. MacDonald: Do not bank on it.

Mr. Deans: I would like to add my voice to those who have asked for the implementation of a new warning light system for automobiles. And I feel that we should really go a little further than just the two-colour system that has been proposed by the member for Ontario South.

When driving on the highway, it is sometimes very difficult to determine whether the automobile ahead of you is still travelling at the same rate of speed as it was some seconds previously—as you drive along, unless you keep your eyes glued on the car ahead, it is very difficult to determine whether it is slowing down or speeding up. I feel that by introducing a three-colour system, we would be able to introduce into the driving habits of the country a new and very necessary safety feature.

The three-colour system has the endorsation of the United States standards safety council, and I feel that as you drive on the highway, and you are going along behind an automobile with one colour of light, as at present, you just cannot tell whether this automobile is travelling at 40, 50 or 60 miles per hour, or whether he is speeding up or whether he is slowing down—unless he puts his brake on. If we had a two-colour system as was proposed, we would then be able to tell whether he was travelling constantly or braking, but we could not tell whether he was speeding up or slowing down.

I feel that in today's society with so many automobiles on the highway, and coming on them so readily and so quickly, it is necessary that we be able to determine whether an automobile is travelling at a constant rate of speed or whether he is in fact reducing his speed.

I travelled last weekend in New York state, and on the New York state throughway they have introduced warnings that necessitate truck traffic to have a flashing light system when travelling under 40 miles an hour. I think that if we did not introduce a measure with the three-light system, we could at least make it mandatory that all automobiles travelling below 40 miles an hour on highways should have some way of indicating their speed to the people travelling behind them.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that if we are going to take any steps forward in the general safety on the highways, we have somehow got to bring about these necessary changes. I know that The Department of Transport has indicated its willingness to make some change at this time. What the changes are no one is able to tell, but I do feel that if we were now to go to a three-colour system such as the type that has been placed before the Minister of Transport by a private citizen by the name of Mr. Ryan, I am sure that this would add to the safety on the highways in Ontario.

I think that a red light should be used only for the purpose of indicating that you are about to stop. I think that a green light would be suitable to indicate that your rate of speed is constant. But between these two it is necessary there be another light and this should be an amber light indicating that caution should be observed by those travelling behind you and that you are at the process of decelerating; not necessarily stopping, but reducing your rate of speed. Because of this I would call on the Minister of Transport to take the necessary action to introduce this legislation to this House during this session.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few comments on this piece of legislation. Seeing that it has been introduced by a Newman I only thought that it would be fit and proper that I add my comments to the legislation; not only was it introduced by a Newman, but also by a Young, so now you have Young Newman up.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation as introduced by the government member certainly deserves serious consideration and implementation by the Minister of Transport. We in this House have discussed this now for quite some time. The hon. member for Yorkview has spoken on this time and time again and he has attempted to emphasize to the government the importance of this legislation. I was a member of the select committee on youth some 2.5 years ago when we delved into this problem —in fact, we obtained statistics concerning the number of motorcycles in operation in the province and the accident ratio. We found that in the year 1963, 8 per cent of all motorcycles were involved in some type of serious accident. In 1964 the percentage remained at 8 per cent. In 1965, when we had the sudden influx of the European and Asian motorbikes, the incidence went up to 10 per cent. So that one out of ten people driving a motorbike, either driving or being a passenger on the motorbike was involved in some type of accident.

Seeing that these statistics rose so dramatically over the periods from 1963 to 1965, then education seemed to have had an effect and as a result in the first six months of 1966 —and the first six months are not indicative of the whole year, really, because the motorcycle season does not start up until the summer vacation—the accident ratio dropped to 5 per cent.

However, in our studies, one of the recommendations made by the select committee on youth—it was 21(a) on page 46 under the education section was that crash helmets be made compulsory for both motorcycle drivers and passengers. So, Mr. Speaker, the implementation of this type of suggestion into legislation would only be following a carefully considered recommendation by the youth committee.

Likewise, another recommendation that probably could have added to the prevention of serious accidents on motorbikes concerned the use of crash bars. The word used in the recommendation was compulsory, not voluntary. Mr. Speaker, had these recommendations been implemented just over the past year we more than likely could have saved another dozen lives in the province of Ontario.

I can recall two students at a school in which I have the privilege of teaching in the off-season being killed as a result of being thrown from a motorbike and sliding head first into a curb. Had the legislation required them not only to wear helmets, but also to have them fastened to the head in a fit fashion, then more than likely these two young lads whom I knew personally would have been living today.

The legislation makes mention of the fact that the safety helmet must comply with the regulations, so regardless of the type of the helmets that the hon. member for Yorkview has demonstrated in here, the helmet would have had to have passed the regulations as drawn up by The Department of Transport. I would certainly think that their regulations would be such that the helmet involved would be able to withstand all types, or a reasonable type of crash.

Quite often it has been mentioned that the use of the helmet was an invasion of private rights. Mr. Speaker, in the athletic field there are all types of safety equipment worn by athletes. They know that when involved in an athletic competition where there is considerable amount of body contact, it is only proper and right for the athlete to protect himself. Coaches would not allow an athlete to engage in a lot of physical activities, or certain types of physical activities, without taking these safety procedures.

On construction sites, Mr. Speaker, even in industry you must wear safety shoes around certain types of machines, and yet the individual who wears them does not look upon this as invading his private rights. He looks upon this as being something for his own benefit.

The other portion of the bill makes mention of a three-light system. I can recall in the debates in this Legislature, in speaking

on The Department of Transport, making this suggestion for several years now. I know that states in the union have adopted the three-light system, or have adopted a green light system. The state of Ohio and the state of New Jersey both use a green light system.

Traffic lights use a three-light system, the green for proceeding through the intersection, the yellow for the caution, drive with care, and then the red for the stop. Adopting a similar procedure on automobile vehicles, Mr. Speaker, would certainly give warning to the individual driving behind the vehicle of the intent of the driver in the vehicle ahead. As a result he would be better prepared to avoid the numerous tail-end collisions that we are confronted with on today's super highways.

An individual driving a car, say, at 60 miles an hour does not realize at times that the vehicle ahead is the same size as his, at a greater distance, or a smaller vehicle closer up. If you had a three-light system and the lights were of intensity great enough that they could be readily seen in the daytime, and even on bright sunny days—the green would inform the individual that the vehicle is proceeding at a fixed rate of speed, the yellow that the foot is off the accelerator and the vehicle is slowing up, and then the red light to indicate that the driver of that vehicle now has contemplated action, foresees some type of danger and as a result has his foot on the brake pedal.

The adoption of such a recommendation, Mr. Speaker, would certainly be in the interests of safety, not only of the individuals involved, but the safety of the general public. I think it would be fit and proper at this hour on March 11, that the government of the day show its forward looking approach, show that it is really the province of opportunity and put this to a vote in the Legislature, and implement it.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I am sure the hon. member realizes that by agreement of all three parties, these matters do not come to a vote.

Before moving the adjournment of the House, I would say that the Budget will be brought down tomorrow, and after that we will resume the Throne debate, which will continue Wednesday, Thursday, Thursday evening and Friday, and we will see where we stand in the Throne debate at the end of the week.

Next week we will commence sitting on Monday night, as well as Tuesdays and Thursdays.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the adjournment of the House.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): Mr. Speaker, just before you put the motion, may I question the statement of the Prime Minister to the effect that it was an agreement by the three parties that there be no vote. It has been, in my opinion, a decision of the government that we not permit a vote, and we have always asked for one, and we have to agree.

Mr. Speaker: Order! I have seen the minutes of the agreement and I would be glad to show them to the member at any time.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 6:00 o'clock, p.m.

No. 21

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

First Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Tuesday, March 12, 1968

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1968

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Tuesday, March 12, 1968

Fifth report, standing committee on private bills, Mr. Carton 659

Budget Address, Mr. MacNaughton 660

Gasoline Tax Act, bill to amend, Mr. MacNaughton, first reading 669

Motor Vehicles Fuel Tax Act, bill to amend, Mr. MacNaughton, first reading 669

Tobacco Tax Act, 1965, bill to amend, Mr. MacNaughton, first reading 670

Race Tracks Act, bill to amend, Mr. MacNaughton, first reading 670

Resumption of the debate on the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Ruston, Mr. Snow, Mr. Jackson, Mr. Gilbertson, Mr. Knight 672

Recess, 6 o'clock 691

Appendix 692

The projected budgetary imbalance which is apparently in store for Ontario for some years to come.

Responsible budgeting demands that we raise our revenues to keep pace with the rapid growth in expenditures. Otherwise, we would have to rely excessively on our credit, which would detract from our future borrowing potential and would increase the pressure on an already tight capital market. Obviously, therefore, some tax increase in necessary.

In deciding by how much taxes should be increased in 1968-69, we must remember that a number of tax increases have already occurred or have been proposed. The federal government has increased its liquor and tobacco taxes and has proposed a 3 per cent surtax on personal and corporation income taxes and a speed up in corporation tax collections. Then, too, there are the increases in hospital and medical insurance premiums which I have just announced and the changes in LCBO prices effected earlier this year. Altogether, these measures will take over $300 million out of the private sector of the Ontario economy in the coming year. We feel that it would be inappropriate, therefore, to raise our own taxes by much more than $100 million at this time.

We have carefully considered the form of tax increases which are appropriate for the coming year. I have also indicated the intolerable situation, created by inadequate federal-provincial tax-sharing arrangements, in which we find ourselves driven to the regressive tax fields. Given the urgent need for co-ordinated reforms in the crucial areas of personal and corporate income and sales taxation, it would be premature for us to contemplate substantial changes in the use of these fields this year.

On the other hand, as the Smith report pointed out, there are elements of our tax system which need to be changed independently of any general tax changes. Here I am thinking of our various departmental fees and user charges which should be brought into line with the costs involved in providing these services. As well, there is the question of establishing a proper level of taxation on motor vehicles. At present, automobiles and other vehicles are taxed too lightly in relation to the total costs which they entail for the people of Ontario. Apart from building, maintaining and policing our roads and streets, there are the social costs of pollution and congestion. In addition to these factors, we must always try to ensure that any changes we introduce improve the equity and efficiency of our overall tax system.

With all these considerations in mind, I am proposing the following tax changes:

A 4 per cent increase in tax on cigarettes raising the provincial tax to 6 cents for 20 cigarettes, along with changes for other tobaccos. These changes should yield an addition $36 million in the coming year.

A 2 cent increase per gallon in the tax on gasoline and motor vehicle fuel and a 1 cent increase on aviation fuel. These changes should produce an extra $38 million of revenue in 1968-69.

An increase in the race tracks tax from 6 per cent to 7 per cent, which should yield an additional $2.5 million in the coming year.

All of the above changes will be effective at 12:01 a.m. tomorrow, March 13.

Increase of $5 to $10 in registration fees for cars, effective December 1, 1968. This will bring the licence fees to $20, $27.50 and $35 respectively on four, six and eight cylinder cars. An increase in licence fees of $10 for trucks weighing up to three tons, effective March 1, 1969. Registration fees for trailers, buses and other trucks to be raised along the same general lines, also effective March 1, 1969. Increases in other Department of Transport fees to come into effect during the course of the year, as listed in an appendix to this Budget statement. Altogether these changes should increase our motor vehicle revenues by approximately $23 million in the 1968-69 fiscal year.

Increases in various fees and licences issued by The Departments of Lands and Forests, Financial and Commercial Affairs, and Tourism and Information, to bring these charges closer to the costs of providing the associated services. These changes in minor fees and user charges will come into effect this year and are expected to yield an additional $5 million.

Minor adjustments in several other tax statutes, to remove nuisance features, improve administration and reduce the costs of collection.

In total, this package of tax changes will increase our revenue by approximately $105 million in the 1968-69 fiscal year. The heavier weight of tax on motor vehicles and on tobacco along with the increased user charges and other minor changes will round out our tax base and bring our overall tax system into a better balance. At the same time, our new tax rates are generally in line with those prevailing in other provinces.

I wish to emphasize that the tax changes I have just announced in no way prejudice, or serve as a substitute for, the fundamental provincial-municipal tax reform to which Ontario stands committed. They are designed to meet an immediate need for increased revenues. However, in financing our own requirements and in providing further tax relief to the municipalities, we recognize the limits to the use of the regressive tax fields presently available to us. This is why we must look to major federal-provincial tax-sharing adjustments along with our assessment of the recommendations of the Smith report to provide a composite source of sweeping tax reform. To be fully and equitably effective, such reform cannot be accomplished by any single jurisdiction; it demands the joint participation of all levels of government—federal, provincial and municipal.

I should like to review briefly our approach to the implementation of Smith recommendations and the staging of tax reforms in this province. We have invited views on the Smith report from all interested parties and we want the benefit of the advice and comments of our municipalities and local boards. After this first stage of public discussion on the report is concluded in May, the government will present a white paper outlining its general intentions on tax reform. This white paper will then be subject to further review and to full public discussion before our policies are put forward in the form of legislation. By that time, we should also have some idea of federal intentions with regard to tax reform, and we will be well into our re-negotiation of federal-provincial tax-sharing arrangements.

FINANCIAL POSITION FOR 1968-69: The tax increases which I have outlined will reduce our overall financial requirements in 1968-69 to $252 million. This balance must be met by some combination of increases in our public debt and internal financing.

We believe that this level of borrowing and use of liquid reserves is appropriate and desirable for a number of reasons. First, it will make a net contribution by the government to the total effective demand in the economy and thereby help maintain our economic expansion. Second, since a large part of our total expenditures is on capital facilities, it is reasonable and equitable to stretch out the financing of these investments to match the timing of resulting benefits. Third, the use of our liquid reserves as a substitute for new borrowing will reduce our reliance on the capital market next year. In view of the heavy demands on the capital market by other borrowers and the high interest rates now in effect, we believe this represents sound and prudent financing.

To sum up, our fiscal policy for next year is balanced between a modest tax increase and a judicious use of our liquid reserves and our credit. In this way, we are encouraging expansion while at the same time maintaining our high credit standing and keeping our finances in good order.

CONCLUSION: Mr. Speaker, this is a Budget which combines growth with moderation. It provides generously for the most urgent needs of this expanding and prosperous province. It invests huge sums in the human and physical resources upon which our future greatness depends. It seeks to reinforce the economy and to ease the pressure on the municipal taxpayer. Yet it faces up to realities. To control total spending, it applies rigorous restraint in all but the most urgent services. To reduce our demands on the capital market, it curtails investment in public buildings and other lower priority projects. To offset rapidly rising costs, it increases health insurance premiums. To preserve responsible financing, it raises taxes.

Our decisions and our policies alone, however, cannot solve all the problems confronting us today. We share the general concern about the pace at which government spending has been growing and apparently will continue to grow. We also are acutely conscious that costs and prices have been outrunning our productivity and that government deficits have contributed to the inflation which is undermining our ability to compete. What is needed to meet these problems is co-ordinated action by all governments. We must establish priorities for government spending as a whole. We must reform the entire spectrum of taxation. Above all, we must agree on a division of tax fields which will enable each government to finance its responsibilities and commitments effectively.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, let me summarize the major features of this 1968 Budget:

Expenditures will rise by $489 million to a total of $2,780 million. Almost all of this increased spending will be concentrated on vital activities such as education, health, and aid to municipalities and municipal taxpayers;

Lending and capital advances will rise by 17 per cent to $537 million. Most of these capital funds will be invested in essential social capital such as schools, universities, housing and hospitals;

Spending on education will rise by $201 million to reach over $1.1 billion;

Financial aid to local governments will increase by more than $191 million, with corresponding relief to municipal taxpayers;

Our investment in housing programmes will increase to $62 million, which will mean a total public investment in housing of about $400 million for the coming year;

Spending on health programmes will rise by $29 million, and there will be continued emphasis on investments in health sciences education and research facilities;

Spending and investment in areas other than education, health, housing and local aid will be held down or cut back in order to provide more funds for these four priority fields;

Taxes on cigarettes will be increased by 4 cents on a package of 20 and on gasoline and motor vehicle fuel by 2 cents per gallon, effective immediately. Licence fees for motor vehicles will be raised, and various departmental fees and user charges will be increased, to reflect the costs of providing the associated services. Altogether these tax changes will increase revenues by about $105 million;

Hospital and medical insurance premiums will be raised to levels that reflect the true costs of operating these plans. For coverage effective July 1, 1968, the new monthly rates for hospital insurance will be $5.50 for single persons and $11.00 for families. OMSIP's new premium schedule will be $5.90, $11.80 and $14.75 per month. Even with these increases in premiums, the province will be required to contribute $78 million to support the hospital plan and $37 million to subsidize OMSIP.

Mr. Speaker, the financial problems faced by this government in making a positive contribution to the Ontario of tomorrow are immense. We believe, however, that the investments which we are making in the economic and social development of this province will help to ensure progress and productivity for our people.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, we on this side are impressed with the change in the mood of this document the year following the election, when we compare it with the mood in the one we heard in this chamber just a year ago. But perhaps a more careful consideration of the fiscal plans that the government has put before us can wait for a few days, and with that in mind, sir, I move the adjournment of this debate.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Provincial Treasurer): Mr. Speaker, may I now request that you revert to introduction of bills?

Mr. Speaker: If it is the pleasure of the House, introduction of bills.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, since you are asking us to concur in this, perhaps the Minister would tell us why this reversion is necessary.

Mr. Speaker: Unanimous consent? Please proceed. May I just point out to the member for Humber (Mr. Ben) that we do not go into committee of ways and means until the debate on the motion that we go into committee of ways and means is completed, which is the end of the so-called Budget debate, so we are a long way from going into committee of ways and means.

The Minister will please proceed.

THE GASOLINE TAX ACT

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Gasoline Tax Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill, of course, will be obvious to the members of the Legislature; to make provision for the tax increases proposed in the Budget that I have just presented.

THE MOTOR VEHICLES FUEL TAX ACT

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Motor Vehicles Fuel Tax Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): Mr. Speaker, I understand from reading the Budget that these tax increases go into effect at midnight tonight. I would like an explanation of how they can go into effect before they have passed this House.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to say that there is a certain amount of technicality in what the hon. member says. It has been customary to deal with proposed tax changes in this manner. The legislation is required. There is much

to be said, of course, for pursuing the implementation of the tax recommendations to which I have made reference, certain of them at least, immediately.

Whether I need to go into this matter chapter and verse with the hon. member, I have some doubts, but the opportunities, if I may put it that way to you, sir, and to the members of the House, to evade certain of the revenues that we have proposed in the Budget as required, could have a very serious effect upon the revenue requirements of the province if they are not implemented now. So that this is the purpose of it.

There will be an opportunity to debate the bills of course, as they progress in the House.

THE TOBACCO TAX ACT, 1965

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Tobacco Tax Act, 1965.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Mr. Speaker, will the chair please enlighten me how we can make this law without these being through the House? I am asking the Speaker. I do not know.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): The member should ask his leader.

Mr. Speaker: The member has asked a question for which he knows the answer as well as I and I would—

Mr. Sargent: I am sorry, I do not know the answer.

Mr. Speaker: The member should know the answer as well as Mr. Speaker, both for the question asked by the member for High Park and the question asked by the member for Grey-Bruce. It has been answered in part by the Provincial Treasurer and as far as I am concerned, I think that answer at the present time is quite sufficient.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The public good and fairness to the general public I would hope would be uppermost in the minds of all the members here, and therefore the traditional method of dealing with the Budget and related legislation would be carried on as it is being done now.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. Mr. Speaker has intimated that I am rather stupid, but there are a lot of people in Ontario as stupid as I am.

Some hon. members: No, no!

Mr. Sargent: Or maybe no smarter than I am, but I would like the Provincial Treasurer to tell me how this can be law.

Mr. Speaker: Order. If the member would have listened to—

An hon. member: He should speak to his leader.

Mr. Speaker: Please resume your seat when the Speaker has called for order and rises to his feet! That is something of a tradition in this House which should be observed, and I will insist on it being observed.

I was giving my best thought to the member and I suggested he was as smart as Mr. Speaker, whether that was so or not, when I said if I understood it, the member undoubtedly would, too. I think this matter has been discussed long enough. The Provincial Treasurer will proceed with his bill.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, I am not satisfied.

Mr. Speaker: The Provincial Treasurer.

Mr. Sargent: I still do not know how you are going to do it.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is up to the government, not Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

THE RACE TRACKS ACT

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Race Tracks Act.

Mr. G. Ben (Humber): Mr. Speaker, I object to this bill being introduced without proper notice.

If you want to play by the rules, we will play it by the rules.

Mr. Speaker: I would point out to the member that at the beginning of the introduction of the bills the consent of the House was given to the introduction of bills.

Mr. Ben: The House was not given—I only heard one voice and no one asked—

Mr. Speaker: That is right; there was no objection. Shall the motion carry?

Mr. Ben: Mr. Speaker, are you going to act on our behalf or on behalf of the Crown?

Mr. Speaker: I am acting on behalf of the House and in the best interests of all the people of the province.

Mr. Ben: Well, you are not acting on behalf of this member and I do not give my consent, the consent is not unanimous to the introduction of this bill.

Mr. Speaker: The member did not object to the introduction of bills by the Provincial Treasurer.

Mr. Ben: I can object to any bill I want to, and I object to this one, and I will object to the next one. You made a ruling last time that I could object providing it was not given first reading and I object.

Mr. Speaker: Shall the motion carry?

Mr. Ben: No.

Some hon. members: Carried!

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion, the motion is carried.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Ben: Well, then you are breaking the rules. You are introducing—Mr. Speaker, you are breaking the rules by permitting the introduction of bills without proper notice.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Speaker, probably a little more explanation of this Act would be in order. Section 1 repeals a small administrative matter which abolishes the tax of $1 for each year of racetrack meetings, which I might say is a very insignificant amount of revenue.

In section 2 the amendment will remove from the Lieutenant-Governor in council the authority to prescribe the rate of tax under this Act and will increase the rate of tax from 6 per cent to 7 per cent.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, could I rise on a point of order, simply to say that the procedure that we followed here in the introduction of these tax bills is traditional in this House. These tax amendments, of course, as part of the Budget, are going to come into effect. And in order that taxes may be equitably collected and paid in the province it has been the custom, as long as I have been in this House, and I think if we searched the records we will find forever, that, when a Budget is introduced, if there are tax changes those bills are given first reading at the time the Budget is introduced, in order that the people of the province may know what tax increases are going to be imposed upon them, and that in order that these taxes may be collected equally from our people, and that there may be no one who could take advantage of the fact that the tax is going to be collected when the bill is finally passed.

I would say this, that if the House defeats us on these tax bills I suppose we will have to consider the possibility of resigning as a government.

Mr. Shulman: I am afraid it will not happen. May I ask a question of the Provincial Treasurer on this particular point of order? I would like some explanation of why there is only a few hours' notice given on these particular taxes, while on the increase in the liquor tax there was such a large notice given.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well, Mr. Speaker, I think it is well known traditionally and procedurely that notice of tax bills is not given prior to the presentation of the Budget.

Mr. Shulman: That does not answer the question.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, in order to straighten this out. The answer to the hon. member's question is really that the increase in the price of liquor is not accomplished through a tax bill of this House. The liquor control board of Ontario is a board of this province which acts as a retailer of liquor. It purchases liquor from those who manufacture it and it, in turn, sells it to the public at fixed prices. So, you see, no legislation, Mr. Speaker, is required to increase the liquor prices.

I might say, in addition, that in the last price increase it was a combined increase, when the federal government took another whack at that particular source of revenue as well, and it was well known, of course, weeks before the increases went into effect that the federal government also was taking action which would result in an increase in the price of liquor.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Speaker, I draw your attention to the rules which evidently no one else has done to my knowledge, and I draw your attention to rule No. 39A which states "two days' notice shall be given of a motion for leave to present a bill, resolution, or address". I will take it for granted that you, Mr. Speaker, can read the rest of that particular rule. Item "B" of rule 39 states:

> this rule shall not affect the right of the government to introduce one bill on the opening day of the session according to ancient custom.

It makes no mention of any other custom in this particular rule book.

Rule 40 states "a motion made in case of urgent and pressing necessity, explained by the mover, be made by unanimous consent of the House, without notice being given under standing order No. 39". It still requires the consent of the House.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Ben: Now, the hon. Prime Minister rose in this House, and if we are going to start having a credibility gap bigger than the United States, the Prime Minister is making a good start towards that. He said that any member can get up and raise his objections to a bill being read in this House without the proper introduction. Now I throw those words back ino the Premier's face and I say there is no credibility now in the statement of the–

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Ben: –Prime Minister, nor in yours. You have to uphold these rules because you also made that statement, and you are denying to the members the very thing that you admitted was your responsibility to give them, and that is representation. And I accuse you, Mr. Speaker, of being a servant of the Crown rather than of the private members of this House.

Hon. members: Shame, shame!

Mr. Speaker: Well the member, of course, will understand that in addition–and I take no notice of the immoderate language that normally is not used in this House, either with respect to a member or Mr. Speaker–the member will understand that in order to operate this House as any other House, and as I have said on many occasions, there are the strict and regular rules as laid down in the book, plus the traditions which affect those rules made either by Speaker's rulings in the past or by the customs and usages of the House.

And in my mind there is no question but that the procedure used today by the Provincial Treasurer, in introducing his bills was quite in order and in accordance with the usages and customs of this House, and I would further, of course, say that before the Minister introduced it I asked the House if there were consent for it, and one voice, that of the member for Brant was raised, and the matter was dealt with. Nothing further was said and the Minister proceeded to introduce his bills. And therefore, in my opinion, and I so rule, that the bills have been quite properly introduced.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Speaker, I again draw your attention, on a point of order, to the first rules of procedure–

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Ben: –and that is that you have no right to make any rules which would contradict or amend the rules already written in this book.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Ben: Look, we have another police bill and this place is run on that system in this House. You ought to be ashamed to call yourself a Prime Minister of a province like this.

Mr. Speaker: The 1st order.

Clerk of the House: Resuming the adjourning debate on the amendment to the amendment to the motion for an address in reply to the Speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor at the opening of the session.

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): Mr. Speaker, I feel that my speech is rather small compared to what we just heard here in the last hour or so; but, however, I shall carry on from the text of it. The latest milk problem in our area was the milk marketing board's recent announcement of milk pooling for Ontario, and this has indications of a big takeover of the farmers' quotas that they had purchased or worked years to build up to obtain a small margin of profit. The Channel Island milk producers case is ably put forward in this quotation from the town and country newspaper, and in fact compares to other dairy herds as well: "Brand Milk Fight Pushed."

Rumblings from the Ontario Jersey meeting this week showed pretty strong indications that the Channel Island milk producers are going to wage their battle against the Ontario milk marketing board to the bitter end. Producers of all Jersey and Guernsey gold, who have spent thousands of dollars successfully promoting brand-name milk, maintain the

board is discriminating against them. Rightly so, if through their own efforts and promotion Channel Island producers have been able to sell all their milk in the top-price bracket, they should continue to do so as long as this market exists. Sales of all Jersey and Guernsey gold two per cent milk have sky-rocketed over the past three years.

In the face of this, the board's famous "milk-is-milk" ruling is ridiculous. The whole purpose of the Ontario milk marketing board is to give farmers a better price for their products. To achieve this goal, by sacrificing producers who have achieved this end through their own efforts is poor policy.

Farmers have long been told to get off their fannies and do something for themselves instead of relying on the government. This section of the board does not provide much incentive for those who follow this advice.

Competition within the industry for the consumer dollar will give the industry strength. If competition cannot be built into the board's proposed milk pooling, the pool should be scrapped.

Let us face it, the board cannot do much more about getting more money for the dairymen and face the competition from synthetic dairy products. Producer money perhaps would be better spent in research into new products, and new outlets for milk in world markets rather than staffing another bureaucratic organization apparently dedicated to reducing all farmers to a common denominator.

Destruction of the initiative of the small group of producers, to temporarily guarantee the success of the majority, smacks too much of rank socialism which farmers would rather starve than accept.

This province must take steps to ensure that our agricultural products will be continued to be produced in this area and the saving up of one crop, such as sugar beets, is necessary. For, the taking out of production of this crop may only add problems to increases in acreage of other commodities.

If we are to have economic development in regions, this surely is a case of the necessity of clear cut action in this area, and I quote, from a telegram directed to myself:

> Please be advised that the Kent county federation of agriculture will endorse any action the government of the province of Ontario might take, that will assure the continuance of the production of beet sugar in southwestern Ontario.
>
> *Signed,* Gerald Morgan, President,
> *Kent county federation of agriculture.*

Field tomatoes are grown in large quantities in our area and they serve a distinct place in our economy, as they not only increase the income of the farmer, but the increased employment means a great deal to many families, who find this a means of supplementing their income by working in the factories and also in the fields, and this added income is felt in many areas of our economy.

The taxation for education on farm lands has reached a saturation point and the amount so taxed has no bearing on the final net income of the farmer or his ability to increase the price of his products to compensate for the ever growing tax on his property.

It is the responsibility of the government of Ontario to take the necessary steps to reverse this trend as it not only has effects on the farmer it is now stemming and slowing down the building of homes so necessary for our ever growing population.

The education of our children is of prime importance, but we must ensure that the burden is equally shared by all segments of the economy. I would like to quote from March 2, 1968, Windsor *Star,* by Mr. Ernie Bizzaire:

> William Stewart, Ontario Minister of Agriculture, was investigating this and that he might get someone to look at the implications of the Smith report and its effects on agriculture. Ontario farmers pay more taxes in the municipal coffers than they pay anywhere else. In most of the Essex county municipalities the annual tax bills on lands and buildings have gone up about 12 times in the last two decades. In some areas, taxes went up 35 per cent in 1967, and will probably go up another 35 per cent this year. Taxation can become so onerous that farmers might not be able to farm economically. At present prices for agriculture products, the tax bill is rapidly approaching the point of no return. Who will be able to pay taxes on high priced agricultural land if the farmer cannot farm it?
>
> All very well for the urban oriented people at Queen's Park to operate on the general bull moose principle, that what is good for Toronto is good for everybody. Agriculture is still the largest industry in the province, even if it does not have the

political importance it once had. Cripple agriculture and you do more than just hurt the farmer. Agriculture is responsible for the considerable farm employment and it is high time that other people beside the farmer realize this.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to comment on another matter in our area, and that is the continuing problem of the Thames River erosion and flooding.

This is a matter that must be solved by joint participation of the provincial and federal government and I hope it will not be passed back and forth, each one claiming the other has the responsibility. This is a matter that has been with us for many years and it seems incredible that a sound programme to alleviate the situation has not been agreed to by now.

The announcement last fall by the Premier (Mr. Robarts) that the county would be the area basis for boards of education was indeed a surprise to many, but no surprise of course, that this was not announced until after the election.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Even to the Minister of Education (Mr. Davis). He did not know about it.

Mr. Ruston: This announcement was made without any white paper in conjunction with the order, and in turn caused a major upheaval in the education field of the province. School boards who have been hard working, low paid, public spirited citizens, were faced with total extinction. The citizens of the province, where this legislation was so seriously affecting them, were appalled to think that they were not informed of this.

This type of legislation is too serious a matter to be announced in such a manner and there are too many unanswered questions as to what is going to happen to the four to ten room schools in the villages and townships that have been built in the last few years.

I would like to quote from the association members of the Essex county trustees and ratepayers association:

> Members of the Essex county trustees and ratepayers association met in Essex and issued a statement that they cannot support the larger county units of legislation administration proposed by the Ontario Department of Education.
>
> And, members said they recognize that larger administrative units in the township school area might be desirable and suggested four units of administration for Essex county. One unit would be established within the present boundaries of the Leamington-Kingsville high school district. A second unit would comprise of present Essex and North Essex high school districts. A third unit would take in Amherstburg, Harrow and Windsor suburban high school districts and the fourth unit would comprise the part of Tilbury high school district, within the county of Essex.

The trustees contend that this will provide units which are large enough for efficient administration but small enough to keep down cost and leave control locally.

The meeting also felt that with permissive legislation, future amalgamation of boards might be progressive, if they appear desirable. The trustees contend that a large administration unit is inconvenient, excessively costly and provides travel and communication problems.

I might quote, Mr. Speaker, from a copy of a letter that was addressed to the Premier of Ontario:

> We, of the public school board of the township school area of Romney request the further implementing of the proposed merger of public school boards and the county boards be withheld until the school boards concerned receive more information for their consideration and comment.
>
> Yours truly,
> Blair Dawson, Chairman,
> Arlene Metcale, Secretary

A letter from the township of Tilbury East, addressed to myself:

> Contained herein is a certified true copy of a resolution passed by the municipal council of the township of Tilbury East, that: The regular meeting held February 19, 1968 moved by George Cook, seconded by Bert Ramaleare: Be it resolved that the municipal council, for the township of Tilbury East go on record as being vigorously opposed to the proposed reorganization of school jurisdictions in Ontario and respectfully urge your member to oppose the proposed legislation.
>
> *Signed,* Reeve Arnold Davison

The Ontario water resources commission should be geared up to ensure more adequate service to the towns and villages in assisting them in installing proper sewage disposal systems and safe and sanitary water for their ever extending population.

Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that the Smith report on taxation be given very serious

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

TUESDAY, MARCH 12, 1968

The House met at 2:30 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are always pleased to have students visiting the Legislature while it is in session and today in the east gallery we have students from Preston high school, in Preston, Weston collegiate institute, Weston, Norwich high school, Norwich, Cornell public school, Scarborough; and in the west gallery Poplar Road public school, West Hill, Glendale training school, Simcoe, and Sheridan college, Brampton.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Mr. G. R. Carton from the standing committee on private bills, presented the committee's fifth report which was read as follows and adopted:

Your committee begs to report the following bill without amendment:

Bill Pr32, An Act respecting Cardinal Insulation Limited.

Your committee begs to report the following bills with certain amendments:

Bill Pr21, An Act respecting the county of Peel;

Bill Pr35, An Act respecting the city of Welland;

Bill Pr45, An Act respecting the township of Pelee.

Your committee recommends that the order for second reading of Bill Pr6, An Act respecting the county of Renfrew, be discharged and the bill be referred back to the standing committee on private bills for further consideration.

Mr. Speaker: Presenting reports.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I have here two messages from the honourable the Lieutenant-Governor, signed by his own hand.

Mr. Speaker: W. Earl Rowe, the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor, transmits estimates of certain sums required for the services of the province for the year ending March 31, 1969, and recommends them to the legislative assembly, Toronto, March 12, 1968.

And the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor transmits supplementary estimates of certain additional sums required for the services of the province for the year ending March 31, 1968, and recommends them to the legislative assembly, Toronto, March 12, 1968.

Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The 10th order. House in committee of ways and means.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, before the Provincial Treasurer makes his motion in his Budget address, I would like to rise on a point of order and draw to your attention, sir, that for the first time in many years the leader of the Opposition has not been provided with a copy of the provincial Budget before it was presented in this House. Now this is in spite of the fact that the press has had access to it since 9:00 o'clock this morning, admittedly under tight security regulations.

As you know sir, the people of the province are deeply interested in the financial matters that we will be discussing here this afternoon and I would hope that in the future some way can be found whereby this information can be put in the hands of the Opposition leader in reasonable time so that comment on the decisions taken by the government will have had the opportunity of at least a pre-reading of it.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, I would just like to add a word to that. I thought we had worked out arrangements yesterday whereby all the necessary security would be met, but changes were made and we were not provided with an opportunity to see the Budget until we are faced with the difficulty of making comments almost spontaneously. The government accuses us of doing that on occasion, but we try to avoid it.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): The hon. member has not let it stand in his way.

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Provincial Treasurer): Mr. Speaker, I should say that yesterday I did endeavour, and hoped to accommodate the leader of the Opposition and the hon. member for York South and visited with them for this purpose.

Subsequently I was obliged to phone the leader of the Opposition personally and the office of the leader of the New Democratic Party to point out that following my visit with them it had come to my attention that the security we had hoped to provide for was in fact—and I am not making reference to the leader of the Opposition or the leader of the NDP party at this point—was in fact being breached.

I believe it is my responsibility to provide for required security as far as the Budget of the province of Ontario is concerned, so it was on this basis that I phoned both the offices of the leader of the Opposition and the NDP this morning.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Mr. Speaker, may I say a word on this point of order? There are two aspects of it I want to draw to your attention.

It has been the custom over many years as I have observed them for the Provincial Treasurer to brief the press. Never in my experience, eight relatively short years, have I seen the inauguration of anything around these buildings that so reminded one of some medieval fortress as the preparations that were inaugurated this year. Never have there been so many provincial policemen in all parts of the lower floor of the building extending right to the doorway and, indeed, some of them outside.

I have no idea what is in that Budget, but as a rational human being, I can conclude that it does not need all those preparations unless it panders to the Provincial Treasurer's personality; that is one aspect of it.

Mr Speaker: Order, order!

Mr. Sopha: There is another matter—

Mr. Speaker: Order!

The member has made his point as have the other members, and I would anticipate that prior to the production of another Budget that suitable arrangements can be made both for the courtesy of supplying the information to the leaders of the two parties and most definitely for security with respect to which it is the government's responsibility.

Now if the member has a further point of order I will be glad to hear it.

Mr. Sopha: Another aspect of it was that this corroborates a feeling I have had around this place that the private member is the least important variety of *homo sapiens* you can find.

This morning the Provincial Treasurer preempted committee room number 1 and so far as I heard from the chairman of the private bills committee, it was not by his leave that the largest committee in the House was required to move to committee room number 3. We had an extremely large delegation from the public this morning making representations on all of the bills before us and we were all jammed in a relatively small room up there, which did not provide anything near adequate accommodation for those representations to be made in surroundings of dignity.

Now I take it once again the Provincial Treasurer suddenly decided he would go along and take committee room number 1 which, after all, has been the preserve of the private bills committee during its deliberations—which last only until the end of March. I, sir, as a private member want to protest my right to use the accommodations provided for members of this House and protest that right against what may be alleged to be the prior right of the Provincial Treasurer of this province which, in my view, he has not got.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton moves that Mr. Speaker do now leave the chair and that the House resolve itself into the committee on ways and means.

BUDGET ADDRESS

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Provincial Treasurer): Mr. Speaker, in bringing down the Ontario Budget for 1968, my statement is a serious but, I trust, not a solemn one. The facts which I will present to you are sobering but not, I believe, discouraging. The message I bring to the members of this Legislature is a preview of the profound changes which lie ahead of us in the Ontario of tomorrow. It is a reflection of the great strength of our economy and the faith and confidence of the people in the future of this province. It is a declaration that this government is determined to play a purposeful part in the economic and social development of the province and

our people. This Budget is a yardstick of what we can do and how quickly we can do it. It is an affirmation that we must do first things first and lay a foundation upon which growth and development may continue to be based. It is an investment Budget—an investment in our people, their economy and their governmental institutions. Finally, it is also a plea for a more rational approach to economic management, to intergovernmental taxation arrangements and to the significant issue of the relationship of the government sector to the private segments of the economy. For such are the economic and financial conditions confronting this nation that honesty, objectivity and surefootedness in our fiscal policy are necessary today as never before. In the process, however, we must not let momentary gloom becloud the rich and buoyant future that lies ahead for this country and this province. Such is the approach which we have taken to this Budget and such is our belief in what is to be.

In introducing my first Budget statement in 1967, I announced our determination to reorganize the budgetary process in order to provide a solid basis for the development of effective provincial economic and fiscal policy. Since that time, three important steps have been taken towards this objective.

First, at the federal-provincial meeting of the Ministers of Finance in January, there was general agreement among the participants on the need to establish effective mechanisms for intergovernmental budgetary consultation. Combined with the work which has begun on the rationalization of federal-provincial tax sharing, this latest development should move us a step closer to the objective of co-ordinated federal and provincial fiscal policy.

Second, as announced in the Speech from the Throne and elaborated upon by the Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) in this Legislature, we will bring forward legislation to convert The Treasury Department into two distinct organizations: a Department of Finance and Economics and a Department of Provincial Revenue. The core of necessary changes has already been introduced within the present department to bring together, under Finance and Economics, the economic, financial, fiscal, taxation and intergovernmental policy staff. The closest co-operation has been developed between the staff of Finance and Economics and the Treasury board secretariat to ensure that policy planning and administrative efficiency are twin tools of good financial management. The specialization which has been developed by our revenue group in the administration of tax statutes and the collection of revenues will permit the most effective application of effort within the various tax fields.

The third advance concerns the continuing improvement of the budgetary process and of the Budget presentation itself along the lines announced last year. Our work on the development and implementation of a programme budgeting system is progressing satisfactorily. Furthermore, apart from the emphasis in this statement on the organization of the government's vast range of activities within an overriding economic policy framework, the supporting Budget papers have been developed to provide a clearer and broader perspective of this year's budgetary policy.

This year's Budget papers are divided into three main parts. The first part contains a comprehensive review of economic developments in 1967 and the prospects for 1968. This assessment forms the basis for our judgment of the required form and direction of economic policy. The second part contains an analysis of the framework within which the annual Budget is developed and deals mainly with the growth of its overall financial capacity and the structure of its commitments to existing programmes and other agencies. Finally, within part three, the government's financial statements have been extensively revised to provide a clear and precise view of the full range of its budgetary operations and relations with other agencies.

THE INTERGOVERNMENTAL FRAMEWORK: Before setting out the details of this Budget, I want to come without delay to a matter of paramount importance—a matter on which the success or failure of governmental financial activity in this nation will turn. I refer to the fact that no government in Canada is an island to itself and failure to recognize this fact and, more important, to act upon it will result in the quite unnecessary failure of all of us to attain our objectives.

The details of this situation are elaborated upon in our second Budget paper which provides incontrovertible evidence that our fiscal affairs must be viewed in a total governmental framework. Above all, one lesson is clear: the solution to the problem of a growing burden on the municipal taxpayer does not lie with the provincial government alone. Nothing short of comprehensive tax reform and a major redistribution of taxation fields will provide an intelligent solution to this problem.

Where are the inexorable pressures for government expenditure today? In the burgeoning urban communities, on education and transportation and in other fields where services must grow as our population grows —pressures which must be met by provincial and municipal governments.

Who presently has principal access to the growth-fields of taxation—the personal income tax and the corporation income tax? The federal government. Who possesses the regressive tax fields—the retail sales tax and the various consumer taxes? The provincial government. And yet, what does it profit the hard-pressed municipal taxpayer to substitute one regressive tax field for another? Meanwhile, encouraged by the alluring prospect of growing revenues from the progressive tax fields, the federal government is in a position to invent new programmes, largely within provincial jurisdiction. Through the shared-cost mechanism, the provincial governments must then resort further to regressive tax fields to finance programmes which may not conform to their priorities.

It is evident in budgets of other provincial governments in recent weeks that the situation is endemic. The federal government may well answer, as it did at the last round of tax structure committee negotiations in 1966, that the provinces can increase their use of the personal and corporation income tax fields. But then what is there ever to awaken us from the taxation nightmare? Such a solution is no solution at all to the obvious problem: the fact that there is only one taxpayer for all levels of government and he requires some control over the composite of government expenditures.

As this government stated to the tax structure committee in October 1966, we believe that the federal government can well abate up to 60 per cent of the personal income tax and 33 per cent of the corporation income tax while still retaining adequate leverage for fiscal control. The projections undertaken for the tax structure committee and the Ontario committee on taxation indicate that such radical measures will be essential to prevent an ever-widening gap between revenues and expenditures at the provincial-municipal levels of government. The alternative is fiscal discord, a taxation catastrophe and competition between governments for programmes, three conditions which are totally unacceptable to our people.

The tax fields presently available to the provinces simply have no growth potential. Further relief to the property taxpayer, which we believe to be essential, will only come with greater access to the progressive tax fields. This, in turn, will only be achieved as a result of total tax-sharing reform among the three levels of government. It is not just the present problem which we must consider, but also what lies ahead. We regard some solution to this issue to be among the nation's top priorities. Whereas this government has underlined the importance of constitutional change in Canada, its value will be greatly diminished if we do not make adequate provision for financing the responsibilities which presently confront us.

SUMMARY OF FINANCIAL OPERATIONS FOR 1967-68: It would appear that our financial operations for 1967-68 will turn out to be very close to our expectations in last year's Budget. On the basis of eight months' actual and four months' forecast, our net general revenues should amount to $2,112 million. Net general expenditures—excluding provision for sinking fund—will likely run to $2,291 million. Overall, then, our budgetary deficit in 1967-68 will approximate the $162 million which I forecast a year ago. We now estimate that we shall end the current year with a net capital debt of $1,538 million, which is well within the capacity of this growing and prosperous province to carry and which we could retire with only eight months' revenue. As shown in the Budget papers, the burden of this debt is equivalent to just over $200 per capita or 6.9 per cent of our provincial domestic product and is below the limit suggested by the Ontario committee on taxation.

THE ECONOMIC SITUATION: The Ontario Budget is an economic as well as a financial plan of action. It sets out a fiscal programme based on our assessment of the prospects and requirements for the Ontario economy in the year ahead. Let me review the economic situation, therefore, and outline the main thrust of our budgetary policy for 1968.

I should like to begin by reporting briefly on the performance of the economy last year. The year 1967 was one of solid economic achievement for Ontario, but not a year of maximum growth and performance. Like the economies of Canada and the United States, the Ontario economy geared down to a slower rate of growth in 1967. Our gross provincial product rose by 7.8 per cent to reach $24.9 billion, which is slightly higher than I had predicted. The number of jobs increased by 95,000 and there were good gains in exports, tourism, housing and retail sales. On the other hand, our construction and manufactur-

ing sectors operated below their full potential and unemployment edged up. For the second year in a row, our productivity improvement was inadequate and costs and prices increased more than we would have liked. These adverse developments marred our overall performance and put us below our long-term targets for real growth and efficiency.

Barring possible difficulties in international trade and finance, 1968 promises to be a better year for the Ontario economy than 1967. Whereas growth was slowing down at the beginning of 1967, momentum in the economy is now picking up. The recovery in manufacturing evident at the close of 1967 should continue and quicken in 1968. This rising level of activity in the key manufacturing sector will give a much-needed boost to overall productivity.

The acceleration of economic activity in the United States and in Europe should result in expanded exports by Ontario industries. Rapid growth in our labour force plus rising personal incomes should also ensure a substantial rise in consumer spending. Construction and business investment, on the other hand, will be slack in 1968, and the outlook for private housing starts is very uncertain. All in all, however, the balance of forces clearly points to continued expansion in 1968. We forecast, therefore, that Ontario's gross provincial product will increase by at least 7 per cent this year and our real output will expand by 4 per cent.

Yet, we should not be satisfied with anything less than full potential. In 1968, we face the same major economic problems as in 1967. Because of the weakness in investment and construction, the Ontario economy will still be operating below its full potential. Overall productivity will be lower than we would like and unemployment may well be higher as a result of a greater growth in the labour force than in the level of employment. We still have to cope with the inflation of costs and prices which is threatening to erode our competitive position in world markets. The challenge for policy in 1968, therefore, is to raise productivity, to reduce price pressures and to increase overall growth and employment in the economy.

OUR FISCAL POLICY: This particular combination of circumstances—rising costs and prices, rising interest rates and tighter capital market conditions along with slower growth and higher unemployment—creates a complex of conditions which almost defy rational policy-making. However, the key is to be found in the critical balance between the private and public sectors of the economy. This delicate relationship explains why it is too simple, for example, to assume that the introduction of a national medicare programme, at this time, would be merely a transfer of expenditures by individuals from the private to the public sector.

The point is that governments in Canada are mainly operating on deficits. This means that they are relying on the capital market for borrowing. This pressure has helped to drive up interest rates and to reduce credit available to the private sector for investment in productive activity or basic social requirements such as housing. To raise taxes to finance major programmes such as medicare leaves no alternative but to increase borrowing for other purposes. None of these matters can be treated in isolation; our concern must be for the total organic operation of the body economic.

In this 1968 Budget, I am proposing a fiscal programme to meet both the aggregate and the particular needs of our economy. In terms of total impact, the Budget will be moderately expansionary. Total expenditures and investments will exceed total revenues to produce a net stimulus to overall demand. This positive fiscal stance will help to maintain steady growth in production and employment in Ontario and will bring our economy closer to its full potential performance.

The 1968 fiscal programme is also tailored to have maximum impact on our price and productivity problems. In preparing our 1968 spending plans, we sought, as far as possible, to give priority to long-run growth programmes, such as education, which increase the productivity and efficiency of the economy.

We have also allocated substantially more funds for housing this year. This will help to relieve the housing bottleneck in our major cities, stimulate the construction industry and reduce price pressures emanating from the shortage of housing and serviced land.

Our policies for 1968 will also help to relieve pressure on prices from such key points as health services. We have postponed medicare, but we are continuing to encourage an expanded output of doctors, dentists and nurses. We believe that increasing the supply of health personnel and extending health services to the needy must have precedence over a universal health insurance scheme.

On the capital investment side, we have delayed $43.5 million of public investment projects. We hope that this will leave the way clear for an extension of private investment,

particularly in housing. To the extent that this is not so, and if unemployment becomes more serious, then we have a shelf of capital projects ready to inject into the economy. In sum, we have constructed our Budget to promote steady growth and to meet the major problems facing our economy in 1968.

GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURES: The expenditure programme which I am presenting to members today is a programme of priorities. It recognizes that our resources are limited and that we cannot do all the worthwhile things we would like to do. It also recognizes that there are certain essential things which we cannot afford not to do. For these most pressing needs of our growing society—for education, housing, health and local aid—this Budget provides more funds than ever before. For other requirements, particularly departmental activities, our approach has been a virtual "hold-the-line" Budget. A total of $240 million was trimmed off departmental requests for next year. Outside the stated priority areas, our spending was held to an increase of only $52 million or 6 per cent. Most of this increase was unavoidable because of the normal growth of our inflexible commitments and the increased costs of maintaining existing services.

Education: Of all our activities, education must be given the highest priority. Education is our principal tool for increasing the productive capacity of the economy, for creating a better society and for providing the opportunity to every citizen to develop to his fullest potential.

Our whole educational system has been under severe pressure for some years now as the post-war surge in births and immigration pushes enrolments steadily higher. Our past efforts have accommodated this enrolment pressure at the elementary level. Now, and in the immediate future, we must cope with burgeoning student populations at the secondary and post-secondary levels. At the same time, we must continue to upgrade our standards and to develop new techniques in order to ensure the best possible education programme for our people.

For the past several years, we have concentrated vast resources on the expansion and improvement of Ontario's university system. As a result, our universities have been able to accommodate a student body that has been growing and will continue to grow by 10,000 students a year. In addition, we have embarked on an ambitious programme to develop colleges of applied arts and technology. These new institutions broaden the range of post-secondary education opportunities and meet particular manpower needs of our economy. The success of these colleges is a source of real gratification and pride. They are now becoming fully operational and enrolments are sky-rocketing. This fall, enrolment in our colleges of applied arts and technology is expected to rise by more than 50 per cent to well over 30,000 students.

These enrolment pressures and the cost pressures associated with our new programmes and improved facilities inevitably demand much larger outlays on education. In the 1968-69 Budget, we recognize the priority of these educational needs. Our programme for next year allocates an additional $201 million to education, or 41 per cent of the total increase in our 1968-69 budgetary expenditure. This includes increases of:

$65 million in legislative grants to school boards, bringing the 1968-69 total to over one-half billion dollars.

$48 million in capital grants for vocational school construction;

$40 million in university operating grants, which includes an increase in the basic income unit from $1,320 to $1,450, bringing our total grant to $209 million;

$19 million for the operation of our colleges of applied arts and technology;

$5 million in the Ontario student awards programme.

In addition to the outlays I have just mentioned, we are budgeting for some $350 million in loans and advances to universities, colleges of applied arts and technology, Ryerson polytechnical institute and the school boards to enable them to meet their critical requirements for new classrooms and facilities. This is made possible by Canada pension plan funds and avoids the unecomonical and expensive system which would be entailed if our school boards and educational institutions had to arrange their own capital financing. We also plan to raise our share of the capital financing for university construction from 85 per cent to 95 per cent of the total cost of approved projects.

Aid to local government: We continue to be impressed by the severe financial straitjacket on local government with its implication of a rapidly rising property tax burden—a straitjacket not unlike that on the provincial government whose revenue sources are also limited. Last year, we received the report of the Ontario committee on taxation—Smith report—which provided an excellent and thorough study of provincial-municipal finance. This report will prove invaluable in our future

efforts to improve our tax structure when combined with the federal-provincial negotiations which must take place later this year. The report documented quite clearly areas for possible reform and the need for relief of the municipal taxpayer. Two of the major recommendations, which we have already adopted, will have important financial implications for our own Budget this year.

The basic shelter tax exemption recommended in the report was adopted immediately and this will require a total expenditure of some $150 million in the next fiscal year. This amounts to a very substantial increase in our already large financial transfers to local governments. In addition, the Smith committee endorsed, and the government has now met, the repeated requests of the municipalities that we assume the full costs of the administration of justice. This new policy will mean greater efficiency in the administration of justice and provides further assistance to the municipal taxpayer. The greater resources of the provincial government and centralization of responsibility should combine to this end. This new policy will affect the estimates of The Departments of the Attorney General, Reform Institutions and Public Works. The net cost to our government in assuming the costs of the administration of justice is expected to amount to some $18.5 million.

These, along with other changes, will increase our aid to local governments by more than $191 million in 1968-69. This very large commitment to local governments accounts for 39 per cent of the total increase in our budgetary spending in 1968-69.

Health: We have placed major emphasis in this Budget on our programme in the field of health. In particular, we have allocated more funds for health sciences education and research. In order to avert a serious bottleneck in the supply of health manpower, we are continuing to build up our facilities for teaching and training doctors, dentists, nurses and health personnel. This Budget provides $30 million for such health sciences teaching facilities, half of which will eventually be repaid out of the health resources fund. We also propose to increase our grants for the construction of teaching hospitals and for schools to educate hospital personnel. We are again raising the amount of bursary funds available to medical and dental students and other health personnel. Other expenditures on health will also be increased substantially. An additional $15 million is being provided for our mental health programme including over $3 million to expand our services for emotionally disturbed and mentally retarded children. This will bring our total outlay on mental health to $117 million.

Our hospital and medical insurance plans continue to make heavy claims on provincial funds. Costs in these areas of health services have been rising extremely rapidly. In 1967-68, the total cost of operating our hospital insurance plan exceeds $500 million, up over 20 per cent from the year before. Costs of OMSIP have also risen substantially, both because of a higher Ontario medical association fee structure and because of steadily expanding enrolment.

As announced in the Speech from the Throne, the government has decided to increase the benefits provided under both these plans in the coming year. We propose to broaden out-patient benefits and to include ambulance services under the hospital plan. As well, OMSIP's benefits will be extended to include optometric examinations. These additional benefits, plus steadily mounting costs, will boost next year's expenditures for the hospital plan to about $628 million, while the cost of operating OMSIP is estimated to rise to $129 million in 1968-69, excluding approximately $16 million for recipients of social assistance.

With cost increases of this magnitude in store for next year, we cannot contemplate maintaining premiums at their present levels. For the hospital plan alone, a provincial contribution of over $150 million would be required in the coming fiscal year. Our subsidization of OMSIP would also have to increase markedly. Rather, we are proposing to restore premium income to levels which more closely reflect the true cost of operating these plans. Therefore, for hospital insurance coverage beginning July 1, 1968, the monthly rates will increase to $5.50 for single persons and $11 for families. At the same time, the OMSIP premium schedule will be adjusted nominally to $5.59, $11.80 and $14.75 per month. These new premium levels will remain in effect for a period of at least two years. Even with these increases in premiums, however, the province will still be required to provide very substantial contributions to finance the hospital and medical insurance plans. For 1968-69, we are appropriating $78 million to support the hospital plan and $37 million to subsidize OMSIP.

Housing: In this Budget, we have recognized that housing merits a top-priority claim on Ontario's finances. To meet our goal of good housing for every citizen, Ontario needs an average of 90,000 new housing units each year from now until 1970. This will

require large-scale expansion of private housing output plus a greatly increased effort in every facet of our public programme.

We have provided the funds to carry out the greatly expanded and accelerated public programme which is required. Our total capital advances to the Ontario housing corporation and the Ontario student housing corporation have been increased more than 30 per cent to over $62 million for 1968-69. This level of spending by our agencies will bring in over $300 million of central mortgage and housing corporation capital financing. Thus, the total housing programme for next year will amount to almost $400 million.

Our plans call for a total investment of $215 million in family and senior citizen housing and over $100 million in student residences and community housing projects. Our new land assembly programme which is designed to increase the supply of serviced land and stabilize housing costs will take up a further $73 million. As well, we intend to press ahead with publicly sponsored urban renewal and to continue to provide sewerage services under The National Housing Act. Altogether, this comprehensive programme adds up to a massive and concerted attack on our housing problems.

SUMMARY OF EXPENDITURES FOR 1968-69: The preceding major increases in expenditures and capital aid plus inescapably higher interest payments on our public debt have made the preparation of this Budget unusually difficult. In order to do all that is urgently required in education, health, housing and local aid, and still contain our total spending and lending within reasonable limits, we have had to exercise rigorous restraint in other areas. This has meant sacrifices and hard choices among other programmes which in themselves are highly worthwhile.

We have restrained our ordinary expenditures in the lower priority fields. Generally speaking, we have budgeted for only minimal increases or no increases at all in most departments. In some areas, we were able to actually cut back from previous levels of spending. As I have mentioned, we have elected to stretch out our public works capital programme by deferring certain projects. Restraint in this area, however, does not mean that our overall capital investments will be lower. We have been able to maintain our highway construction programme at the 1967-68 level, and we are increasing our capital aid for universities, school boards, hospitals and housing. This adds up to high total investment which should stimulate our construction industry.

I should now like to summarize the overall magnitude of our spending and investment programme for next year. Excluding $39 million for sinking fund, our net general expenditures for 1968-69 are estimated at $2,780 million. This is $489 million higher than the expenditure programme for the current year. On top of this, our loans and advances—excluding advances to Ontario Hydro—will amount to an estimated $537 million for 1968-69. This is $79 million higher than the capital aid programme for 1967-68. The table accompanying this statement (see appendix, page 692) shows that we have deliberately concentrated almost all of this additional spending and investment in those areas where we face inexorable growth and where needs are most urgent.

REVENUES AND TAX CHANGES: Let me now turn to the question of how we propose to finance the government's expenditure and investment programme. As I have already indicated, our total budgetary spending is expected to increase by $489 million next year to a total of $2,780 million. On the other hand, our existing tax rates and base can be expected to produce only $2,400 million of revenue. Such a situation would leave an estimated budgetary deficit of $380 million.

In addition to our budgetary expenditures and revenues, we engage, of course, in very substantial non-budgetary transactions. For 1968-69, we plan on non-budgetary outlays of $584 million, largely in the form of loans and advances to school boards, universities, hospitals and to our own corporate agencies and commissions, and an additional $61 million for debt retirements. Offsetting these will be non-budgetary receipts and credits of about $668 million generated through the Canada pension plan, other funds and miscellaneous sources. Thus, non-budgetary transactions will produce a surplus of $23 million which can be applied against the estimated budgetary deficit of $380 million. Our overall financial requirements for 1968-69, therefore, will be in the order of $357 million.

In determining how to finance the requirement of $357 million for 1968-69, we have taken into account a number of important considerations including:

The appropriate mix of taxes and borrowing to exert a moderate expansionary impact on the economy in 1968;

The existing level of public debt and the receptiveness of the capital market to public issues in the coming year;

Social and Family Services (Mr. Yaremko) is not here because he pointed out at a luncheon at the Toronto board of trade that on his trip through northern Ontario, he did not see any rough roads.

When he questioned someone about the lack of rough roads that we have been speaking of, he told him that they had had six graders out working all night so that he could have smooth roads to drive on. He thought that was very funny, but I would like to make a standing invitation to anyone in this House to come to northern Ontario and I can show them the rough roads. I can show them so many rough roads they will bulge their eyes out, in fact, more than likely shake their eyes out, if they ride over some of them.

Something else we have; we have two farmers at Boston Creek who pay a road assessment because it is an unorganized township. They do not even have a road. You cannot get into their places by a road, you have to leave your car on the highway and walk in. And yet the government collects their assessment every year. The nature trails through High Park are in better condition than most of our roads.

Point number two, Mr. Speaker: I regret very much that this government, through their intelligence or lack of it, has decided to delay medicare. The one valid argument, or maybe valid argument, that it put forth was the cost of medicare. Today we got a slap in the face when they told us that not only could we afford medicare but they have raised the price of our premiums on hospitalization and OMSIP. The premium raise, plus the arguments that this party has put forth and the party of the Opposition has put forth, have proven to me and to many people in Ontario that we can afford medicare and we have no valid excuse for not implementing it today.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): They threw away $160 million this afternoon.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Jackson: However, Mr. Speaker, we in northern Ontario, although we regret we do not have medicare, regret very much more that we do not have even medical care. In most of the more isolated areas, and I speak of the more isolated communities as those being 50 or 100 miles away from the nearest hospital, of which we have many in the north, they do not have so much as a first-aid man or a local nurse.

We have no doctors. We have no hospitals. In Matawatchan, a small town that did have a Red Cross hospital, they took it out when the last gold mine closed. It proves something else to me, that the gold mines not only run our economy, they run our everyday life.

So the people of Timiskaming and the people of northern Ontario are not impressed by this government's colourful speeches on the quality of medical care in Ontario. We cannot be impressed when so many of our fellow citizens are denied the right to even having the basic elements of medical care, and because of this lack of medical care, some of them are going to be denied the right to live.

But to go on a little farther into medical care, the town of Gowganda has no facilities, no first aid. It is 100 miles away from the nearest hospital. Ambulance service is nonexistent. If someone has to go to the hospital, they have to ride in a taxi or work on the good wishes of their neighbours and get them to drive them into the nearest hospital.

If a person is seriously injured, or seriously ill, or a woman is in labour, I can assure you, sir, that more people have died because of that ride than they ever did because of their injuries.

In Matachewan, we have the same situation. And let me just tie it back to the roads, that even if these roads were good, they would have a very small chance of living, some of these people, but with the fact that these roads are not—I cannot even call them roads, because they are cow paths, some of the holes are a foot deep and when you speak about them to the hon. Minister of Highways, he sits there with a smile on his face.

Mr. Sargent: But he cares.

Mr. Jackson: That is a good thing, because I could really get angry then. But to go back to the highways, sir, we are not impressed by this government's impressive plan, and we are not going to be impressed with their impressive plan until we see the roads.

I am quite sure that will not be before the next election, at least I hope not, because it will teach the people in the north that they have kept this government in power far too long, if they have not learned it now. There is not much chance of you doing it anyway, so why not say, "We will do nothing", and give me a chance to be elected again.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): This member was elected by a protest vote.

Mr. Jackson: When they brought out their impressive programme of highways, they said we are going to build highways throughout Ontario and the first thing they said, we are going to start it in Ottawa.

Then the second one is going to be Highway 402. I did not hear anything about the roads in northern Ontario. I did not hear anything about roads that are badly needed in eastern Ontario, and I heard far less about roads that were going to be built in western Ontario, except through the major areas.

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Let us look after eastern Ontario.

Mr. Jackson: The hon. Minister is not worrying enough, sir.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Jackson: Point number three, Mr. Speaker, is development of our resources, and I am very happy that the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Brunelle) is in the House, because I really have only one point to illustrate, that this government is not honest, that this government has no intentions of developing our resources and I could use much stronger words—but I am sure I will be ruled out of order again.

Let me ask—through your good offices—let me ask the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests how we are going to develop our vast timber resources, when over one-fifth of my own riding is held by one company? In the Thunder Bay district, in the Sudbury district, when Brown Industries controls over 100 townships? I say 100 townships and I am quite sure that is a very small estimate of their actual holdings.

Mr. Sopha: The Brown company creates a good deal of employment.

Mr. Jackson: If we are going to have development of our resources, this government is not going to do it, the private companies are going to do without any assistance from this government and without any push from this government, because the government has been unwilling to push them.

But again I would like to go back to a question I asked in this House on the E. B. Eddy Company, the holder of 1,641 square miles of territory in my area. A senior official of The Department of Lands and Forests stated in Timmins that they were negotiating with the E. B. Eddy Company to establish a sawmill or a timber mill or some sort of wood processing plant. I question the word negotiating. They have had over 30 years to negotiate. E. B. Eddy still holds that land. E. B. Eddy has made no move towards establishing a mill and for this government to say they are negotiating, I question the integrity and I question the honesty of the people that say it.

But even when they do establish a mill, they cut down what we have. They leave us with barren rock, or land that will not grow anything but trees and that is just exactly what they do leave us with, because the people of Ontario, through The Department of Lands and Forests, in almost every instance have to regenerate that forest. We plant it at our expense, not the people who have depleted the resource, but the people who have owned that resource and have allowed it to be depleted.

To go on to point number four, Mr. Speaker, the establishment of secondary industry in the north, and especially in the riding of Timiskaming, and this is one point I do not intend to belabour, because my colleagues have done a pretty good job of this and I would only be adding very little to what they have said. But I would like to point out the primary industries that have been established in the last few years in my own area, for which this government took great credit, especially during the election campaign, and I would like to point these out, and I will give them credit, if they want that credit. I will give it. I will concede that point.

We have the Adams Mine, which is a multimillion dollar iron mine just built at Kirkland Lake. We have Kokotow's mill, that this government took the credit for. It was built partially through federal grants and partially through loans from the industrial development bank. We have Grant and Wilson in the Elk Lake area, which is still under construction and has not come into production yet. We have the Upper Beaver Mine, which this government took credit for establishing—or helping to establish.

And I might point out at this time, the Upper Beaver Mine is the old Argonaut Mine that was closed down many, many years ago under this same government. We have the Sherman Mine, which is not in my riding, but affects the people in my riding.

I will give this government the credit for those. I will concede that. I have said so before and I will say it again. But let us hope that the government will take the blame for the companies that have closed down in the same period of time, the companies that have gone out of business, the companies that have left thousands of men in Timiskaming riding without jobs and without any chance to make a livelihood.

We have Gordon's Mill at Latchford. We have Murphy's Mill at Latchford—the last mill in Latchford. Latchford at this moment is without any industry whatsoever. We have Haileybury Lumber, we have Loeb's warehouse that was established not too many months ago and is closing down now, mainly because there is nobody to buy their goods. We have the Wright-Hargreaves Mine, we have the Sylvanite Mine, the Lakeshore Mine, the Teck-Hughes Mine, four mines that were the major source of employment in the Kirkland Lake and Teck township area. They are closed.

But I ask them, if they are going to take credit for the first part of this, the new industries, Mr. Speaker, I hope they will take credit for the ones that closed down too.

When the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) spoke on the Throne Speech, he mentioned the growth in Ontario, and I believe it was something in the neighbourhood of 170,000 people. But I would like to point out the growth in Timiskaming. In the year 1911, we had 26,000 people; in the year 1961 we had 50,000 people. But let me go on from that, Mr. Speaker. In 1941, in the township of Teck, we had 20,000 people. Today, or should I say for the year of the last figures I have, in 1966, we had 15,000 people. That is a drop of 5,000 persons.

In Matachewan, in 1951, we had 1,400 people. In 1967, we have 700 people. Elk Lake—they did not even bother to list that.

The town of Latchford, and I have already indicated that their last industry has closed down very recently. In 1911, we had 428 people; in 1961, the last figure we had was 479. The figure right now, Mr. Speaker, is about 500. In Larder Lake, in 1951, we had 2,129; in 1961, we had 2,187.

If this province is growing, why are we not growing?

Mr. Speaker, I just ask this government, if it is going to take credit for what we have, then it had better take the credit or the blame for what we, in northern Ontario, in Timiskaming, have not. And I disagree with the gentleman, the hon. member who stated the other day that we hate to be classed as "have nots"—we do hate that. But I take exception to him when he says that we are not the "have nots" because we are the "have nots" of this province.

But to go on to my next point, Mr. Speaker, and this I will not belabour either, because I intend to do it a little later when I have a a bigger stick and I have more room to swing it.

I have many, many compensation cases coming from my area; many with silicosis. This government does not recognize silicosis. Through its commission, the government says it is emphysema or it is carcinoma of the lung —everything but silicosis. I have an autopsy report in my briefcase of a person that died of right heart failure. According to the workmen's compensation board, he had emphysema and chronic bronchitis. We are still arguing about it. But he had to die before they would even look at the case.

They have pensions based on 1910, and that is where they are going to remain unless we get something done about it. And I think the only thing we can do is change the government.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Jackson: They tell us that they are fair in all their dealings with the workman, and yet they tell a man who lives in Kirkland Lake that he has to travel to Timmins in order to appear before a tribunal; he has to travel to Toronto to appear before the board. And then they tell him that he has to pay his own expenses.

Mr. Speaker, if these people had the money to pay their own expenses to take these jaunts, most of them would not be applying for the paltry pension they get from the workmen's compensation board.

In the McGillivray report, the one thing that stood out in my mind above all else—and the one thing that stood out in my mind when I read the Throne Speech—was that this government classes The Workmen's Compensation Act as model legislation. And then, Mr. McGillivray, in his report, turns around and uses the other nine provinces as his models in order to bring our legislation up to date. The other nine provinces have already used our province as the model to establish their legislation and now we are turning around and using regressive legislation to upgrade ours.

I go on, sir, to the private members' hour; what an exercise in futility and stupidity. We come here and we speak for an hour and then we sit down like good little boys because the hon. Prime Minister says that we should not have any say in what goes on in our government.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Jackson: That is right. I brought a bill before this House and I hope to speak on it, and I will speak on it, with the honest belief that it will do some good. However, it will not be because these people are not willing to listen. I find myself unwilling to go on believing that this is the only way that we can run this private members' hour. And I am going to be saying much more on it, Mr. Speaker, as time goes by.

Over the past month or so, we have had several questions directed to the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests on the new fishing licence. The fishing licence was bad enough; it means that people who helped plant those fish and helped pay for the stocking of the lakes now have to go and pay another $3.00 to fish in their own lakes. It means that the persons on limited income—we have many of them—is going to find it very difficult to dig up that extra $3.00 to fish. But then we are slapped in the face with not only a fishing permit, but an increase in the resident hunting licences. And I can put my comments in a very small package on that. As far as I am concerned, and as far as many people in the northern Ontario areas are concerned, we have just opened season on game wardens.

One of my colleagues brought up the point that northern Ontario had moved toward separation. I had not been for separation from this province, but I can tell you that I am now.

Well, you people laugh at what we want—you go ahead and laugh—Mr. Speaker, because I am going to spend my next three years doing something about it. Thank you.

Mr. B. Gilbertson (Algoma): Mr. Speaker, I deem this a great privilege to be here in the legislative assembly representing the new Algoma riding, and I deem it a privilege to be on the government side of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad that I am fortunate enough to have this privilege of speaking after the lamentation from Timiskaming. I do not want to be rude, but gentlemen, it gives you the impression that the Conservative government is not even in power; that it is not even around. But I am glad this afternoon that I have the privilege of being here on the government side of the House.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Gilbertson: I would like to say too, Mr. Speaker, that although we have had members from this far-flung riding of Algoma —about 300 miles long—it is the first time in history that we have had a member from St. Joseph's island.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Gilbertson: I would also like to say that we are looking forward to getting a few things done that we have been wanting to get done for years. I am saying, Mr. Speaker, that we have now a member from St. Joseph's island and things are going to be getting done up in the Algoma area.

I might say that although I am a new member to the legislative assembly, I am not new when it comes to living. I feel, Mr. Speaker, that living is an art in itself and there are many people who need to learn how to live.

I feel it is a great honour to be elected to represent the Algoma riding and I would like to insert humbly, Mr. Speaker, that I believe in God and I appreciate the assembly being opened with prayers. No government can get along without God.

> If I speak with the tongues of men and of angels and have not love, I am become as sounding brass or a tinkling cymbal, and though I have the gift of prophecy and understand all knowledge and have all faith so that I can remove mountains and have not love, I am nothing; and though I bestow all my goods to feed the poor—

Mr. Speaker, though the Conservative government tramples over the poor innocent people, according to the NDP, it says here we bestow all our goods to feed the poor. What more can you do than that?

Still, that is not the answer; there are some things that we have to do for ourselves.

> —though you bestow all your goods to feed the poor and though you may give your body to be burned, it still profiteth you nothing.

I would like to continue on, Mr. Speaker, that:

> Charity suffers long and is kind; charity envieth not; charity vaunteth not itself, is not puffed up; it does not behave itself unseemly nor seeketh not her own, is not easily provoked and thinketh no evil. It

rejoiceth not in iniquity but rejoiceth in the truth. It beareth all things, believeth all things, hopeth all things and endureth all things. Love never faileth but whether there be prophecies they shall fail; whether there be tongues, they shall cease; whether there be knowledge, it shall vanish away.

My purpose, Mr. Speaker, in inserting this portion of scripture from the word of God is to show that though we do take the attitude of the NDP and just give all our goods, it still is not the answer.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): I think that he is showing us that they are a godless lot.

Mr. Gilbertson: I would like now to hand out a few bouquets. I would like to congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, on your promotion to Speaker of the House. I would also like to say that you are doing a wonderful job. Keep it up.

I would also like to congratulate the members who have recently been promoted to Cabinet positions. We are looking forward to seeing that these men perform, and I believe that they are going to do a good job.

I might say that though I was born in a foreign country—when I came to this country I could not speak a word of English, and I started school and had to learn the language —I did not have anything handed to me on a silver spoon. But I still say that Canada is the land of opportunities for those who are willing to take the initiative and go out and do something for themselves and who are not always looking to the government for handouts.

An hon. member: That is the way this country was built.

Mr. Gilbertson: I consider it a privilege to be here this afternoon. When you think of my coming over here as an immigrant boy, and having to learn the language and living three miles from a public school away out in the country, I think today that we have come a long way. Conditions are pretty nice today, I would say. There are school buses taking your children to centralized schools and we have a wonderful opportunity for education. I would certainly like to pass another bouquet out to the Minister of Education (Mr. Davis) for the wonderful job that he is doing.

I would like to take this opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to refer to my riding of Algoma. I would feel that I would want to start on St. Joseph's island and then spread out onto the mainland and cover my riding from end to end.

St. Joseph's island is a beautiful island with a population of 1,200 people. We are about 900 feet from the mainland and we have a ferry which operates between the mainland and the island. We are hoping that before very long we will have a bridge across there.

We have some main projects that we want to have accomplished up there and I am hopeful that these things are going to be done. I would say one of the first ones is a bridge to St. Joseph's island; a second project is a composite high school for central Algoma which will give us the secondary education that our students need.

I would like to continue on down to Blind River, another beautiful town in Algoma.

I think the hon. members are aware of the news we received here recently about a huge McFadden lumbering or Domtar operation that is the largest east of the Rockies, and that their operation is going to phase out in two years' time.

As the member for my riding, I would urge the government to take note of this and let us do something about it—to get something to replace the industry that will be phasing out in a couple of years.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): The hon. member will never get it.

Mr. Gilbertson: Then from Blind River, I would like to continue on up that beautiful riding of Algoma, up along the Mississagua river up to Iron Bridge—it is a lovely tourist town—and continue on from there on up through to Thessalon, where we are hoping there will be an industry coming in shortly.

It makes me feel good because after hearing all that lamentation, I am glad that there are still bright spots in the world and that our government is going to be doing something about establishing these industries along the north shore.

Algoma is a wealthy riding. We have a lot of natural resources; we have timber; and we have our mines—the Tribag mine north of Sault Ste. Marie, also the copper core mine. We have beautiful Lake Superior that covers about half of my riding along Highway 17 which follows pretty much along Lake Superior; and we have that beautiful clear water of Lake Superior which I do not believe, gentlemen, is too badly polluted.

I would like to commend the government on the wonderful work that they are doing in

getting rid of the lamprey situation up in Lake Superior. Now they tell me that the commercial fishermen can go out and catch lake trout again. So I feel that that is a step in the right direction. And who has been doing that, Mr. Speaker? It is the Conservative government.

There are a few things we would like to see changed and I expect they are going to be changed. As you know, up in the north we have now got almost an industry in itself in winter sports. It has been revolutionized. We now have snow toboggans, they call them skidoos and snow cruisers, and they have revolutionized the winter sports in the north. Where we used to have long winters and people would complain and say, "Well I will be glad when spring comes"—now, you hear them making comments that they hate to see the snow go away.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): The hon. member can take our share.

Mr. Gilbertson: They are getting great enjoyment out of the winters up in the north. So I would say to the hon. members that if they want to get some real good fresh air, take a run up into our Algoma there and see what we have.

An hon. member: A lot of hot air, too!

Mr. Gilbertson: The member should come over on St. Joseph's island and we will treat him to pancakes and the best maple syrup in Ontario, made up there on St. Joseph's island.

Mr. C. G. Pilkey (Oshawa): How does one get across?

Mr. Gilbertson: Well, we can get across, it is just 900 feet across.

An hon. member: Across the island?

Mr. Gilbertson: We have good roads on that island.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Gilbertson: I am enthused, Mr. Speaker, when I think of the future and if the Conservative government is as bad as they say it is, one would wonder how they are re-elected from time to time.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): I cannot understand it.

Mr. Pilkey: It is difficult to understand.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): So the hon. member thinks the electors are stupid, does he?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Gilbertson: When I was running as member, and especially when I got elected, people would come to me and say they were glad there were some good straight thinking people in the world.

Mr. Speaker, I think good, honest, straight thinking people do not expect to get everything handed to them on a silver spoon, and expect the government to do everything for them.

The conservative minded people are those that want to do something for themselves.

When you hear the New Democratic Party get up, they are running down the large corporations and big industries all the time. I wonder what they want, what are they after, how much do they want?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Gilbertson: There industries would not be here—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Gilbertson: These industries would not be here, gentlemen, if there was not somebody to initiate them.

Mr. Speaker: I would bring to the member's attention that he will address the members of the House through the Speaker, and even if he were doing it as he has been doing this afternoon, he would be incorrect because we have two very fine lady members in the House.

Mr. Gilbertson: Mr. Speaker, what impresses me is when you hear the Opposition ridiculing the government. It is like biting the hand that feeds you.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to stick up for the country, and for the type of government that we have got. I think that it is wonderful when one thinks of the free enterprise system that an individual can come over to a country, and if he has the initiative, he can eventually become a member of Parliament.

And then we have nerve enough to say that you do not have a chance in this country. I still would like to say that this is the land of opportunity, and anybody that wants to, can have a chance.

I want to mention a little more about the extreme north end of my riding. We have the towns of Wawa and Hornepayne and some of the projects that they would like to see accomplished include the highway from Hornepayne to White River. I am pleased that we have come along as well as we have on it, and I would say that perhaps within two or three years, you will be able to come through from Highway 11, to Hornepayne, and on through to White River. Now that will be quite an accomplishment, and it will stimulate the economy in that western part of the riding.

I would say another project is that I would like to see The Department of Lands and Forests do more to help the tourist operators, not perhaps just The Department of Lands and Forests, but the government in general to help the tourist operators get their feet on the ground and get operating properly. I am pleased that our government is willing to give assistance where they see it is going to do the most good.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would say again that this is a privilege for me to be here representing the new Algoma riding, and I am looking forward to serving my constituents and representing them in the legislative assembly of Ontario.

Mr. R. H. Knight (Port Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I am the member for the riding of the "sleeping giant" situated some 500 miles north of the riding of the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Gilbertson)—Port Arthur, situated, I might add, at the crossroads of the airways, the waterways, the seaways and the roadways of this great nation of ours—a very strategic position.

Mr. Speaker, I do not relish looking at the clock at this time and realizing that in just 15 minutes I am going to have to interrupt my speech, to slice it right down the middle. However, I am willing to go by the rules of the House. Although I think that after listening to a very moving Budget this afternoon, perhaps the members might like to get away a little bit earlier this afternoon and I would be most happy to move an adjournment of this debate.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Knight: All right, I can see that I do not have the reaction I hoped to get from the House so I will carry on and slice my speech in half.

Mr. Speaker, I begin as have most of my colleagues by extending sincere congratulations to you, sir, for your willingness—

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, may I just assure the hon. member he can adjourn the debate and resume at eight and speak as long as he likes this evening, so that it is not necessary for him to complete his remarks by 6.00 o'clock.

Mr. Knight: Thanks, I understood that point; I just do not like splitting my speech in half. However, I was about to say, sir, I would like to do like most of the other hon. members have here and extend my congratulations to you for your willingness to assume a most difficult and responsible part of the deliberations of this House, and also for the manner in which you have discharged these duties so far.

I would like to say that I see that Porth Arthur has now been properly changed to Port Arthur on the seating programme, and I would like to assure you that my objection from the outset was strictly wrought of the pride that I have for this city of Port Arthur and the name that designates it.

The election victory of October 17, you will understand, filled me with great anticipation of what I might now be in a position to do for the people of my Port Arthur riding. For the past eight years, since I first adopted the Lakehead as my home, I have been, as a radio-TV news director, closely observing and reporting on the activities, the potential, the hopes and the needs of the residents of northwestern Ontario. In 1965, I decided it was time to seek an active part in the development of the area so I was elected alderman in Port Arthur's sister community of Fort William, and between October 17 and December 31 of 1967 had that rare privilege of serving both communities simultaneously, one as alderman, the other as member of the provincial Parliament.

I think, Mr. Speaker, this should refute, once and for all, the antiquated notion held in some parts that our Lakehead cities are continuously in disagreement. I think this should also clear up the other misconception to some members of the press who have reported that the new MPP from Port Arthur is nothing but a "hotshot disc jockey" with no political experience.

I believe it would be proper at this time to pay tribute to a man highly respected and loved, not only by the people I now represent in the hill city, but also, I believe, by the members of this legislative assembly which he served for 16 years. I refer to a gentleman we still refer to up in the north as the hon. George Wardrope.

I can think of many others whom I would have preferred to run against and I am glad to see that you have already joined me in your recognition of Mr. Wardrope. I hope you will also join me in wishing him many more years of health and happiness.

Mr. Speaker, as a new member I was very impressed to hear the Premier extend such a warm welcome to those of us who sit in this Legislature for the first time. It made me feel a little bit more comfortable and I want to thank him. Although we be on opposite sides of the House, I hope we will always agree to the basic right to disagree. It is a wonderful thing. I take courage in the realization that I am a member of the Liberal caucus of 1968—and I mean that; the Liberal caucus which has very definite views on what course legislation in this province must take. I have been inspired by our leader (Mr. Nixon) whose wisdom belies his years and whose youth is a tribute, I think, to our Liberal members and all Ontario Liberals who have had the foresight to elect him leader.

Mr. Speaker, I have travelled almost 900 miles here to the seat of government, not today, but when I first came down, fully expecting to voice the views, the needs and the wishes of the 60,000 Ontario residents that I represent and to be listened to. And I am glad to see that there are quite a number of hon. members in the House tonight. It reassures me a great deal. I must say I felt sorry many times in the last couple of weeks for members standing and trying to get a word across, trying to say things that were very important to them, and having so few people listening.

At this point, I must say that I have my doubts as to whether I will be listened to all through this speech, in a manner that I would like to be, and I say this because I have observed certain aniques here among members. May I correct that from "antiques" to "antics". My wife told me I would say that. I have observed at times here certain antics among members during the deliberations of the House which have led me to wonder whether indeed I was not seated in the funny farm.

I see hon. members heehawing and cackling at one another back and forth across the chamber; other members coming and going from their seats or rudely conversing while a member speaks to the House and seeks to be listened to; other hon. members not here at all. The Speaker is interrupted and challenged, charged and accused with little respect to personal pride and reputation. I was not aware that once you became a member of the Ontario Legislature you were not entitled to common courtesy and decency and I am afraid some members of this House are not accorded that when they are standing and speaking. Of course, all the while in public, including impressional school children and members of the press are looking down on us from the galleries, and well they might look down because I think our manners here are often nothing to look up to. I think humour, sarcasm and criticism are necessary, but they are definitely overdone here.

I know you are probably saying to yourselves: that is politics—you know. Business is business, politics is politics, or how naive can this young member be. Well it is just too bad if I am running against the grain, but I do not believe we were sent here to show off or have a good time at the public's expense.

Surely today, when government is assuming more and more control over the lives of Canadians—we saw that today in the Budget that was brought down—and Ontario residents like those in the great northwest where I come from depend so much on the decisions of so few of us here, it is a time to upgrade our procedures and conduct in this House. It is important for me to have my say here on behalf of those I represent and, if it is important to be listened to, then I know the same is true of every one of my colleagues when his opportunity comes along.

If politics today is regarded as something less than respectable then, naturally, we who are in politics share the blame. I think it is time to say the challenge remains for someone to put respectability back into politics.

Mr. Speaker, another observation I have had during my short stay in this assembly has been that the government and the hon. members are devoting considerable time and concern to the dangers of our country splitting in two with little or no concern about the possibility the same might occur right here in our own province. Yet I guarantee you the seeds of division are being nourished by certain ineffective action by the government.

I call your attention to some of the developments of the past year which are fact, not fiction; remember I am a former reporter. About a year ago at the time the federal member for Port Arthur, Robert Andras, —without condoning it—raised the possibility that the north might form a separate province apart from Ontario. I repeat, he did not condone it but he said: "Let us look into it." Shortly after a "Join Manitoba" movement started in the Kenora area. Not much later

consideration before some of their recommendations are carried out and one, that causes grave concern to me, is the lowering of business assessment from 150 per cent to 50 per cent. The crux of this is the giant corporation that is capable of paying a larger amount will benefit the most, and the small businessman, who is indeed having a trying time to keep in the swim of things, will have his raised considerably.

So I would urge the towns, villages and townships to make representation to the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. MacNaughton) immediately to inform him of their feelings.

The basic shelter grant is about to be a classic example of government bureaucracy. If the government of the day wishes to assist owners and renters to pay their municipal taxes, why do they not increase the grant to schools or increase the per capita grant? This would have saved setting up a completely new method of tax exemption or whatever you want to call it.

The machinery is there now to have this done, but here again is an example of building up a big administration to have at your disposal.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that another government failure are the regional development councils. I have yet to see one shred of tangible benefit brought about by the information of these councils. At present there is a great duplication of effort with many of the programmes and meetings of such regional development councils covering topics already the concern of other municipal organizations. This has resulted in a waste of both effort and funds.

I would suggest that these annual grants provided by the province can be better utilized. To this end I recommend that the provincial government immediately review the functions of these regional development councils.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate the government of Ontario for making improvements in the highways in our area, but at the same time we must always consider that there is room for improvement, and I might say that at the present time I would suggest a few:

In the town of Essex, Highway 3 at times carries more traffic than the Macdonald-Cartier freeway. This has been proven by traffic counts and yet this road running through Essex has come into a bad state of disrepair, and the excuse is that there is going to be a bypass built around Essex and this road does not need repairs.

I have had conversations with Mayor Michael, Reeve Cascadden and Deputy Reeve Shaw and the town is very disturbed about this; and this is a connecting link highway and must have improvements done soon.

Highway 2, through the village of St. Joachim and in the township of Rochester, is another example of neglect of an area, and the township of Rochester council has made representation to The Department of Highways and to myself, and Reeve Dunn has taken a strong stand and the council wants action on this because the improvements are very necessary.

In the township of Raleigh, the famous Bloomfield road has been a bone of contention for some time, and I believe that this would be cleared up if the department would take this road and make it an access road officially, and assume the costs of improving the same.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to comment on boards and commissions and some of their duties—and I am quoting here from the association of Ontario counties. A committee was set up from the association, I had the privilege of serving on it, and I will just state a few remarks in the closing part of it:

> Provincial legislation provides for the establishment of a wide range of elected and appointed boards and commissions. Some, a municipality must provide; some are conditionally mandatory while others are optional. These local boards and commissions perform many specialized and valuable services in municipal government and help to involve greater numbers of the electorate in the operation of the community's business.
>
> With the rapid urbanization of many sections of the province and the constantly growing demands for an increase in both the numbers and the sophistication of services to be provided by the municipality, new special purpose bodies have been created to assist the elected council in performing these varied duties.
>
> The authority of others has been extended. This trend has resulted in a bewildering assortment of boards and commissions and a weakening of local government. It has created confusion for the electors who do not know whom to blame if something goes wrong. It has produced frustration for the elected representatives who must answer to the people for actions over which they have little or no control, and who must raise moneys for programmes they have not intitiated.

> Finally, it has produced a paradoxical situation of subjecting these very persons to criticism and contention who are public spirited enough to accept appointments to special purpose bodies, thus using their specific skill and knowledge in the general interests of their municipalities. This trend must be halted. Not only is there an over abundance of special purpose bodies, but their powers are too great.

Murray Jones in his report on the Ottawa-Carleton county area stated:

> In local government the test must be both the ability of the governed to attach responsibility to the governors and for the governors—elected councils—to be responsible to the needs of the people.
>
> Your committee contends that the present situation, with its fragmentation and dispersal of authority, its diffusion of responsibility, its lessening of accountability to the electorate and its lack of co-ordination among the myriads of boards, commissions and elected councils does not pass this test.

Mayor Lester Cooke of the city of Barrie, in his presidential address to the Ontario association of mayors and reeves last May, devoted some time to these problems. He concluded his comments on special purpose bodies by saying that they:

> —are sometimes tempered by the touch of democracy by adding a minority of elected representatives, but they lack the benefit of a loyal Opposition to their budgets and policies because they do not have to appear at the treasury tables in municipalities where the elected members of councils set the tax rate with the wind in their faces.

I spoke briefly on problems facing my riding, but at the same time I wish to go on record, Mr. Speaker, that I feel the province of Ontario must prosper as a whole. And with many wide range problems to deal with, I would suggest that serious consideration be given by the government and by the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. McKeough) to making a survey of all municipal councils as to their size, population and assessment basis and discuss this thoroughly with the county councils and local councils and then, if it is a decision to consolidate some of these into larger units of government, that the local people will have been heard and allowed their opinion before any decision with regard to any changes that are made by the government.

I believe we must maintain a two-tier layer of local government. In other words, a county government covering large areas of responsibilities and local municipal government for areas of local control such as services to lands and buildings.

I would like to quote from the committee set up by the association of Ontario counties on local government reorganization and its conclusion is:

> This, then, is the blueprint for local government reorganization which your committee has prepared for your endorsation. Before we present the summary of our recommendations, let us briefly recap our proposals: We have not advocated any revolutionary measures as have several of the local government reviews, but have offered what we consider to be a practical start.
>
> We support the idea of indirect election of representatives to county councils, so there will continue to be a strong liaison between the member municipalities and their counties.
>
> We advocate that the heads of all member municipalities sit on county council, but since the office of the head of the county council will be an extremely heavy one, we recommend the direct election, on a county-wide basis, for this post.
>
> The strength of local government rests in its ability to meet the individual needs of its citizens. The representations formula and the allocation of funds—both perplexing problems throughout the province—should be determined by each county.
>
> Local government reorganization can and should begin immediately, since the problems are now universally urgent across the province.
>
> Your committee recommends that all legislation required to make the necessary changes in governmental operations be permissive rather than mandatory. This would guarantee local control over local government and its changing form.

Mr. Speaker, we are in changing times and I, for one, am not in favour of change for the sake of change. But I am in favour of changes when we are satisfied after thorough investigation that the change will be better for the majority, and if we still maintain our democratic way of life—and let us never legislate that most precious heritage away from our children.

Thank you.

Some hon. member: Hear, hear!

Mr. J. W. Snow (Halton East): Mr. Speaker, as I rise to participate in this Throne debate, may I first congratulate you on being elected to this office as Speaker of this 28th Parliament of the province of Ontario. May I also add my voice of congratulations on the fine and fair manner in which you are carrying out the duties of this office.

May I say, Mr. Speaker, how pleased and proud I am to be the member for the newly created riding of Halton East which consists of the east half of that great county of Halton, and which includes the towns of Oakville, Milton and Georgetown, along with the township of Esquesing.

This area has been so ably represented in the past Legislature by my friend and colleague, now the member for Halton West (Mr. Kerr), and the previous 20 years before that by my life-long friend, and a great friend indeed to many of the members of this Legislature here today, the late Mr. Stanley Hall.

This is a total of 25 years of steady strong representation by members of the Progressive Conservative government for the county of Halton. I am very pleased to have received the honour, last October 17, and the privilege of carrying on this representation as a member of the government.

Mr. Speaker, my riding consists of a very highly diversified community of residential, industrial and agricultural interests. Oakville is the home of one of Canada's largest industrial plants, the Ford Motor Company—the truck and automobile assembly plants are both located there. Also located in Oakville are such major industries as the Shell Oil Company and B.P. Canada Limited refineries, Mack Truck Company, Xerox, General Electric, Duplate Company, Long Manufacturing and Proctor Limited.

In Milton, is located one of Ontario's oldest industries which is widely known the world over – the P. L. Robertson Manufacturing Company, which was founded by a native Miltonian, the late Peter Robertson, who invented the socket head screw nail. This company now manufactures and exports many types of screws and fasteners to a great many different countries throughout the free world.

In Georgetown are located two large paper mills which were established on the Credit River in the early 1800's. As well, we have the large Smith and Stone manufacturing plant. There are many other industries, much too numerous to mention here today, but each one equally important and contributing its share to the strong industrial community which we enjoy. Our industries are participating in and benefiting from the Sheridan Park research centre which, although located in the riding of my friend to the right, the hon. member for Peel South (Mr. Kennedy) borders our eastern boundary.

The industrial plants in my riding, and employment, have almost doubled since 1960. However great the rate of change has been, there seems little doubt that the opening of the Sheridan Park research centre in 1964 has had, and will have, an even greater economic and social impact. The Sheridan community is devoted solely to industrial research and development.

Backed by the Ontario government, its aim is to research and develop new and better products and processes in order to keep Ontario companies competitive in world markets. Situated in the community are nine companies, including the Ontario research foundation as its nucleus. All these units are now in operation, including such companies as Dunlop Rubber, Abitibi Paper, British American Oil and that great profit-maker, INCO, which we hear so much about, and many others represented at the site which covers 350 acres of former pasture land.

The Ontario government has already spent $1 million at Sheridan Park in the provision of water, natural gas, electricity and storm and sanitary sewer facilities. Thirteen hundred scientists, technicians and supporting personnel are presently working at the park. By 1970, it is expected that there will be $100 million worth of buildings, with a total of 6,000 employees on staff, researching and developing for the benefit of Ontario industries.

The concept is already acting as a magnet for new industries in the area. During 1966, 23 new manufacturing establishments located in the area and 27 existing manufacturing plants proceeded with expansion programmes.

A new multi-million dollar research centre, separate from the Sheridan community is to be constructed in the town of Oakville by the Shell Oil Company of Canada Limited. Our industrial community, Mr. Speaker, is most vigorous and healthy and providing virtual total employment in our area.

Mr. Speaker, approximately nine months ago, our government opened for business one of the greatest assets since Confederation to lakeshore communities of our Metro area. I am speaking, of course, of the GO transit system. This modern commuter service has had a valuable impact and effect in my riding. As approximately one of every three workers

in Halton county travel to the Metro area to work, the existing service is being used to capacity and must be expanded.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that an expansion of the GO transit via the Canadian Pacific Railway existing line to serve Cooksville, Streetsville and Milton and, via the Canadian National Railways through Malton, Bramalea, Brampton, Georgetown and Acton, would have the same success and acceptance as has been experienced with the lakeshore route.

This expansion of services, as I suggest, would allow these areas to develop as planned satellite cities as has been suggested by so many planners. The nucleus for these centres exists at this time with the small towns that we have there. The agricultural community in my riding is, however, causing me considerable concern. Halton county has been known, since the time of the early settlers in Ontario, as a fine agricultural area and I might say is still one of the leading agricultural counties in our great province.

Despite the rapid urban growth, agriculture still occupies approximately 85 per cent of my riding as far as area is concerned. I was born and raised on a farm near Milton in my riding, where my father and grandfather had farmed for two generations.

I might mention here on a personal note that my father, who was born in 1892, was named Wilfrid Oliver Snow. Now I do not know whether anyone can figure out where he got that name but it was after, I assure you, Sir Wilfrid Laurier and Sir Oliver Mowat. Maybe that is why when they arranged the seating of the House, they sat me over on this side, I do not know.

I still maintain a farm operation and hence I am deeply concerned about the status of agriculture today, not only in my riding but in Ontario, and, Mr. Speaker, in fact, in Canada. It is my confirmed opinion that the farmers of our country are not sharing in the improving standard of living to the same extent as other sectors of our community. Mr. Speaker, when I first became an active partner in my father's farm, in 1945, the price of hogs ranged from $20 to $22 per 100 pounds dressed weight.

Today, Mr. Speaker, the price of these hogs is approximately $28 per 100 pounds. This represents an increase of approximately 30 per cent over a 23-year period. My costs have increased a great deal more. As an example of increased costs of articles a farmer buys, in comparison with his sales, I will submit the following example:

In 1946, Mr. Speaker, a farmer could sell 600 bushels of Ontario winter wheat at approximately $2.15 per bushel and with the receipts from this sale, buy a new three-plow tractor. Today, the same farmer, if he is still on a farm, must sell 2,500 bushels of the same wheat to buy the equivalent tractor at today's prices.

Mr. Speaker, at the prices quoted today for eggs on the Toronto market, which is approximately 42 cents for grade A large, the most efficient large producer is probably losing two to three cents a dozen on every egg produced.

In the last few years, the egg producer has had two years in which he, no doubt, showed a loss, one year a minor profit and one year when a reasonable profit was possible.

In my riding, large acreages of farm land are owned by investors, but are still farmed by the remaining farmers in the area on a rental basis. My concern is what will happen to the remaining productive land when these farmers find it uneconomical to carry on, and decide to sell their land also to the investors. I contend, Mr. Speaker, that the larger and major portion of the increase in the net worth of farmers each year especially in my area, is derived by the increased value of his real estate, and that a very small portion is brought about by profits from his labours and capital investments in stock and equipment.

One group of farmers, the Channel Island breeders, who have through their own initiative and expense, created an expanded market for their high class products—two per cent Jersey and Golden Guernsey milk—must be encouraged to continue in this programme and their market be given every consideration. Mr. Speaker, these farmers have created their own market, for their own product, and they should be allowed to benefit from their efforts, when the final decision on this milk marketing system is implemented.

With the establishment of large feed lot operations in southern Ontario, and the increase in cow-calf operations throughout the north, the beef raising industry is an important factor in our Ontario agricultural economy. In 1963, the Ontario Department of Agriculture assisted in organizing the Ontario beef improvement association, of which I was privileged to be one of the original board of directors. This organization has made great strides among its membership in improving the breeding and raising

of beef cattle and marketing a higher grade and more desirable quality of beef carcass.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I would also like to make a few remarks with regard to the proposed changes in the municipal assessment of farm lands and buildings in the agricultural area surrounding our urban areas. The assessed value of farm land must be maintained at a level that, when the applicable mill rate is applied, it will not spell economic ruin for the genuine farmer.

The value must be related to the use of the land. The working farm must be designated in the assessment manual. The farmer's share in the economy today, and prices available to the farmer for his products, does not leave any room for increase in taxation on his farm lands and buildings. Mr. Speaker, it must be remembered that the farmer located adjacent to the urban development areas who is being threatened by this large increase in municipal taxation, is competing with the farmers in the completely rural areas in the sale of his products.

Whether the apples or wheat that a farmer grows is grown within the town of Oakville, or whether it is grown in the Collingwood area, the price received is basically the same. With regard to cattle, it does not matter whether the farmer's feed lot is located in Halton county or Huron county, the cattle generally end up on the Toronto market and fetch the same price.

There may be a slight saving in the shipping charges to bring the finished cattle to market, but this is usually offset on a reduced shipping charge in bringing in the feeder cattle; or a reduced freight rate, which would be enjoyed, for instance, by a farmer from Huron county on the purchase of his western grain.

In finalizing my remarks on agriculture, Mr. Speaker, I submit that the time has come when the farmer cannot maintain his profitability any longer by enlarging his units of operation and improving his efficiency. We must come up with an improved agricultural policy for Canada and, Mr. Speaker, I emphasize "Canada." Our hon. Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. Stewart) and his department, have implemented many programmes for the benefit of Ontario farmers. I submit, however, that one province alone in this great country cannot completely correct the problems of its farmers.

While Ontario has been building programmes to improve the agricultural economy, the federal government has been tearing down their programmes. In the January farm letter received by Ontario and, I expect, all Canadian farmers, on February 21, 1968, from the federal Minister of Agriculture, it was announced that five long-standing and important federal programmes were being withdrawn or curtailed. These include:

1. The reduction of the premiums for grade A hogs from $3 to $2.

2. The reduction of the premiums for choice lambs from $2 each to $1 and the deletion entirely of the premium for good quality carcasses.

3. The removal completely, on April 1, 1968, of the two cents per pound premium for quality Canadian cheese.

4. Deleting completely the grant programme for the improvement of conditions and increasing refrigerated storage in cheese factories.

5. At a time when Ontario has been increasing assistance to farmers for the improvement of farm wells, ponds, buildings, water supplies, drainage and fence removal, the federal government have cut in half their assistance to the prairie farm rehabilitation dugout or farm pond programme.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the objectives we seek for the agricultural economy of Ontario will never be achieved until we have a federal Department of Agriculture capable of developing and implementing a truly national agricultural policy which is in harmony with provincial programmes.

If I may now spend a few moments to deal with the housing shortage and housing programme being carried on in this province today, I believe the present programmes of the Ontario housing corporation are excellent.

The rent-geared-to-income low rental programme is assisting greatly in relieving the housing shortage in Ontario. The expansion and continuation of this programme is the only way that proper housing can be provided for a certain sector of our population.

The HOME plan is also excellent, and is being expanded. Land assembly in economically large units must take place by the government with services to be installed and the serviced land sold, or leased, at an economical price for not only single family homes, but for duplexes, town houses and for condominium.

Another area which I support and which would be of great assistance in the supply of the most economical housing for our citizens, would be the establishment of a standard building, fire and safety code for the province

of Ontario. A resolution stands on the order paper in my name calling for this action. This type of standard code is sorely needed. At practically no capital cost to this province, we could accept and implement the use of the national building code for all municipalities in Ontario, and the cost of constructing every housing unit built could be reduced substantially.

I have dealt at length with this matter when this resolution was up for consideration. I will not say any more on it at this time.

Mr. Speaker, in my riding, we are blessed with some very beautiful and important provincial buildings. There are also plans for the addition of more provincial institutions in the riding. We have the new provincial school for the deaf located in Milton which has been built over the past few years and is a great asset to that community.

We also have the new Sheridan college of applied arts and technology which has recently purchased a 100-acre site, and plans are underway for the construction of the new campus just north of Oakville at a cost of over $10 million. In Oakville is also to be the new Ontario reception and assessment centre for juveniles, which is planned to be built on a 25-acre site.

In the northern part of my riding is to be constructed the new regional detention centre along with a medium security training school and reformatory which will supply accommodation for 450 inmates and a staff of 225 people.

These provincial, educational and institutional facilities are wonderful assets for any municipality. They provide a great deal of employment and they add to the overall financial stability of the area but, Mr. Speaker, these should not be a tax burden on the residents of the area.

I will not repeat, but will support the hon. member for Kingston and the Islands (Mr. Apps) in his urging the Provincial Treasurer to make immediate grants of at least 75 per cent of normal taxation, until such time as the recommendations of the Smith report relating to taxation of government buildings is considered and implemented.

Mr. Speaker, for a moment I would like to mention the commendable job that has been carried out for the housing of senior citizens in my riding. We, of course, have the Halton county centennial manor, and Martin house located at Milton, and operated by the county of Halton and The Department of Social and Family Services. But I would like to pay special attention to the senior citizens' housing which has been provided in the town of Oakville by the Oakville Rotary club.

Some years ago, the Rotary club built their first 12 units of senior citizens' housing and eventually added a further 16 units to this first stage. In 1967, the club completed their third stage which was a new 11 storey, 81-suite building. This makes a total of well over 100 units of ideal accommodation for senior citizens which has been built with the co-operation of central mortgage and housing corporation, the Ontario housing corporation and the municipal council—but at no cost to the local municipality.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that this is an ideal example of the type of work that can be carried out by local independent organizations, provided they receive the co-operation of the municipal, provincial and federal governments.

One item mentioned in the speech of the honourable the Lieutenant-Governor which interests me considerably, is the proposed provincial airports Act, under which municipalities in northern Ontario may be assisted financially in acquiring and developing airports and airstrips. I say, Mr. Speaker, that this will be a great programme, but should be for all of Ontario as, although the need may be more pronounced in the northern part of our province, it exists throughout the whole of Ontario.

The federal Department of Transport has a programme where $1 million per year is budgeted to assist municipalities in building airport facilities. Under this programme, the municipality must supply the land requirement and enter into a maintenance agreement with the department. Then, as approved and as the needs exist or develop, the federal department will make the capital expenditures required to supply the runways, taxiways, navigational system, and certain other public facilities.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, our airport Act should be designed to assist the municipalities further by implementing a programme of subsidizing the land costs for the new airport, and subsidizing certain operating costs. Now, Mr. Speaker, this programme is going to cost money and, unlike the Opposition who feel that the government has a money tree, I believe that if we are going to provide money for such programmes, then we must make provision for raising the necessary revenue.

On this point, I also have a proposal. From reliable sources I understand that approximately ten million gallons of aircraft fuel is

sold in Ontario each year, not including the fuel for the scheduled public carriers, which would not use the airports constructed under the proposed plan. If a tax of 10 cents per gallon were levied on this ten million gallons of fuel sold for use in corporate and private aircraft, an annual revenue of $1 million would be raised and could be used to finance the provincial airport Act.

I believe that as the value of a private or corporate aircraft to its owner is increased with the addition of every airport or every landing strip, aircraft owners should, and I am sure would, gladly pay my proposed fuel tax if this money were earmarked for the municipal airport development programme.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the private aircraft, as an everyday means of transportation and the corporate aircraft, as an individual aid, are here to stay and will continue to become more prominent in our future. We should plan now to provide airport facilities for the future, as our predecessors planned and built the highway system to accommodate the automobile.

Mr. Speaker, before I finalize my remarks today, I would like to make mention of the great work being carried out in Halton county by the Halton region conservation authorities, in conjunction with our provincial authorities. They have been carrying out a variety of extensive programmes for many years. The project of most prominence, Mr. Speaker, is one which you have, no doubt, observed many times.

It is the Kelso conservation area and Kelso Lake, at the break in the Niagara escarpment and abutting Highway 401 just west of the town of Milton. This park is now complete with picnic areas and swimming pool. It is the home of the Halton county museum and this last year it was completely equipped with a chair lift on the ski hill, and ice-making machinery for the skiing area. Kelso proudly states that it has the skiing area with the highest vertical rise in southern Ontario. In 1967, over 125,000 people made use of this conservation area.

As an added attraction to the Kelso area, we are looking forward to the establishment of the proposed Ontario agricultural museum which was announced some time ago by the hon. Minister of Agriculture and Food. It is proposed to maintain and operate a museum to preserve and display the agricultural and horticultural machinery, tools, paintings and other objects of historical interest. In addition, a permanent location will be provided for the Ontario steam and antique preservers' association's collection of steam-powered equipment and agricultural antiques.

This association has been operating for several years and has, each year, staged what I believe to be one of the largest and most complete displays of antique agricultural equipment at its annual steam reunion held in the fair grounds at Milton each Labour Day weekend.

Mr. Speaker, may I say in closing that, under the outstanding leadership of our vigorous Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts), and guided by the principles that have been the hallmark of Progressive Conservatives since 1867, and especially as they have been applied in the province of Ontario for the past 25 years, I look forward, along with my colleagues in the government, to the second century of Confederation with great anticipation and confidence.

Mr. D. Jackson (Timiskaming): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in this House, and I can assure everyone that I am shaking, but it is not through fear of what is going to happen today, it is with anger about that piece of garbage.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): It is the government which should be shaking.

Mr. Jackson: In Timiskaming, through the largest of the mining companies, and through the policies of this government, we still have use for those little outhouses, and I am sure that this Budget will make a welcome addition to those outhouses.

When I came to this House, I came with an open mind, because I believed that everyone here had an open mind. But with every hour I sit here, I realize that I was wrong; the only open minds happen to be in this group here.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate you on your election to your high office, but I will not make any statements on your ability, because I wish to reserve my judgment until I have had a chance to observe your conduct in this House. However, sir, I would like to point out that more than likely my judgment will not be favourable, because the three times that I have stood to speak in this House, I have been ruled out of order.

Most of the speakers have mentioned the fact that they represent a certain riding, and I am not going to deviate from that. I represent the riding of Timiskaming, which takes in a land area of 10,000 square miles. In representing Timiskaming, I represent the

E. B. Eddy Company, and I say this because they control 1,641 square miles of 10,000 square miles. I will get back to them a little later.

In the Throne Speech, and the comments on the Throne Speech, I found very many points of interest, interests common to everyone in Ontario, but of far more interest to the people in northern Ontario. During my chance here, I am going to try to relate those interesting points to problems, points, conditions and situations in this riding of Timiskaming.

Point number one of interest to me, is roads and this government's statement of intention to introduce an impressive programme of highway expansion and development. When they made that statement, everyone in this House welcomed it because there is no doubt in my mind, and there is no doubt in anyone's mind, that we need more roads and we need better roads.

We all agree that if we need a highway link in Ottawa, we should build that link; and if we need Highway 402, we should build Highway 402. And while I am speaking of Highway 402, I would like to point out to the member for London South (Mr. White) that I completely agreed with him for a change, in that we should not build Highway 402 through the centre of London. But I would like to point out something else that he missed.

While we are thinking of building Highway 402, we should also take into consideration the blunder The Department of Highways made when they built Highway 401 across the top of Toronto. They built four lanes and before they had the four lanes built, they had to start engineering for 12 lanes. Not only did they have to start engineering for 12 lanes but they had to start expropriation proceedings to acquire the land for those 12 lanes at greatly inflated prices—prices that were inflated by the very fact that Highway 401 had been built through that area, and because this government did not make adequate provision, in fact, no provision, for any expansion or any extension of the road through that area.

But to follow along with Highway 402, the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Gomme) stated that it would be delayed about one year while they completed engineering. I have here a letter from a Mr. White, district engineer in New Liskeard. He has given me a copy of a letter that was sent out to the Milberta women's institute concerning Highway 65. It is dated April 26, 1967 and I would like to read just one paragraph of that letter:

> I regret to say that the interval between planning preparation and construction must be lengthy because of the nature and magnitude of the pre-engineering process. However, I wish to assure you that we shall go ahead with all reasonable speed.

I have travelled over that road since 1959. They have been preparing it since then, and they still have not done anything. I do not think they are going to do anything this year, and I question the hon. Minister of Highways when he says they are going to do Highway 402 in a year, as it has taken them nine years and they have not even started on Highway 65.

The hon. Minister of Highways also pointed out something else when speaking to this House—that highway construction is improving in Ontario, that we have better engineering, that we have superior materials which make roads last longer, and that we have improved lighting. I agree with him, we have these things, but we have them in only certain areas of Ontario.

Driving along Highway 401 or Highway 400 to the north, or Highway 11 to the north, you will find lighting at almost every intersection—and again I would like to relate it to something that has happened in our area. I have a letter from the town of Englehart. I have many of these letters and I am quite sure the Minister of Highways has just as many of them. They are asking for a few lights to be placed at intersections on the highway at Englehart.

During the election campaign there were three accidents at one of these intersections. In each one of the three, there was at least one person hospitalized, and yet the government says we do not need lights. They are asking for 12 lights, about as many as they put at an intersection in this city of Toronto.

I would like to point out, when I look across this House and I see smiling faces when I mention a few lights, that if one light saves one life, or if 100 lights saves one life, it has been paid for forever.

But to go on with our roads, in Timiskaming we have two highways and I mean that literally, we have Highway 11 and we have Highway 66. The rest of them are wheel ruts—

An hon. member: The people make them themselves.

Mr. Jackson: —cow paths and snake trails. I am very sorry that the hon. Minister of

northern mayors and reeves resolved to investigate the advisability and the feasibility of forming a new province.

At the start of this session, northern members of the Legislature were queried by the press as to whether the formation of a northern caucus of MPP's might lead to formation of a northern province. Let us not forget that the growing dissatisfaction of northern Ontario residents was reflected in the defeat of two Cabinet Ministers in the north during the past provincial election.

I heard something I did not think I would hear in this House—not this soon at any rate—just a little while ago. A member rose and said he was going to go about this very actively now; this business of a separate province for the north. And I attended personally the meeting of the northwestern Ontario associated chambers of commerce, 34 men strong, with the Cabinet last week and the first thing that the president of that northwestern chamber group said was: "We know there are a lot of rumours coming out from the north to the effect that, you know, there might be division" and so on. "Let us assure you that this is not so with our particular group" and so on. Now why did the president of that group take the time right at the beginning of his speech to try to reassure the Cabinet that this was not so if indeed there is not something stirring up there?

So these are the facts that I present before you, and I do not think they should be considered with anything except seriousness. I do not think we should laugh at these reports that come out of the north any longer. As far as I am concerned, there is a danger. Even if it is small, it is worth paying attention to; it is worth probing to find out what are the reasons for this type of feeling.

I suggest the hon. Ministers heed the words and the requests of those leading businessmen who came here last week very seriously, because they have no guarantee that the delegation will bother to return next year.

Now, despite these serious signs of unrest I think that I should say here and now that I do not believe at the present time that northern Ontario should seek to form a new province. That is my opinion as of this moment. However, should the Ontario government continue to leave northwestern Ontario at the bottom of its priority list, then I shall be most anxious to take my place beside my northern colleagues to chart a new course of action that will put our area at the top of the priority list.

Mr. Speaker, I can inform this assembly, sir, with knowledge and experience that my people have grown impatient for a plain commitment from this government; for a definite plan of development in place of the piece-meal, hit-and-miss legislation that has been coming. The new incentives to industry programme introduced by the Tory government during the campaign was a good and welcome gesture, believe me. However, seven months later I know of not one new industry which has started in northwestern Ontario because of it. I know of the applications, but I mean an industry that has actually happened. If it has happened, I do not know about it.

I know of only one existing industry in this same area which has been able to expand with the aid of the new plan. And I use as reference a monthly report by the northwestern Ontario development council. That is what it says, and it must know what it is doing because it is working for the government on behalf of the people up there to look after development and new industry that comes in.

It is not surprising to me that we do not have too many new industries to report up there at this present time, because we who live up there do not know what direction our development will take. We just do not know exactly what way we are going to go. And I do not think this government here knows either. And therefore we cannot tell a prospective new industry or private citizen who might be interested in establishing there what can be expected in the future from northwestern Ontario. You cannot blame a business man for not going somewhere unless he is pretty sure that he is going to be able to make a go of it. I am not saying that a new industry cannot make a go of it in the northwest—if there is anywhere an industry could make a go of it is up where I come from, but I still think industry is entitled to be told a little bit more.

I have more to say on this subject, Mr. Speaker, but I have been reminded of the hour.

Mr. Knight moves the adjournment of the debate.

It being 6:00 o'clock, p.m., the House took recess.

APPENDIX

THE 1967 AND 1968 BUDGET YEARS COMPARED
($ million)

	Expenditures		*Loans and advances*
Total—1968 Budget year	2,780		537
Total—1967 Budget year	2,291		458
Increase	489		79
Distribution of Total Increase			
In expenditures:			
Education programmes	201	=	41.1%
Aid to local government (excluding school boards, health agencies, and so on)	191[1]	=	39.1%
Health programmes	29	=	5.9%
Public debt-interest	16	=	3.3%
Normal growth of other commitments	52	=	10.6%
	489[1]	=	100.0%
In loans and advances:			
Education (Ontario education capital aid corporation) (Ontario universities capital aid corporation)	69	=	87%
Housing (Ontario housing corporation) (Ontario student housing corporation)	15	=	19%
Health (Loans to hospitals)	5	=	7%
All other loans and advances	(10)	=	(13)%
	79		100%

[1]Includes small amount of offsetting revenues, previously collected by local governments, in connection with the takeover of administration of justice costs.

No. 22

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

First Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Tuesday, March 12, 1968

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1968

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Tuesday, March 12, 1968

Resumption of the debate on the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Knight, Mr. Burr, Mr. G. E. Smith, Mr. W. Newman 695

Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. R. G. Hodgson, agreed to 721

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to 721

Erratum 722

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

TUESDAY, MARCH 12, 1968

The House resumed at 8 o'clock, p.m.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

If I might crave the indulgence of the member for a moment, I would like to point out to the members that I sent the page boys home at 6:00 o'clock because the weather was very bad and I did not want to have any of them in difficulty; so the members will understand why we are short the page boys tonight.

An hon. member: What about the members?

Mr. Speaker: I regret that I cannot deal with the members as I do with the page boys.

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE
(Continued)

Mr. R. H. Knight (Port Arthur): Mr. Speaker, as the sitting ended at 6:00 o'clock, I was dealing with my favourite subject, northwestern Ontario. Now I know that the Premier of the province (Mr. Robarts)—the hon. Premier, Mr. Speaker—mentioned a week or so ago that his government would undertake certain studies of northwestern Ontario. I was not too impressed with his proposal because it seemed to be on a very liimted basis.

What our citizens want, and what most of us feel we must have, is something far more thorough, a complete long range programme of development. We are asking for a detailed economic and social study of northwestern Ontario, to be undertaken by 1968 experts, and that from this study a blueprint for progress—if I may call it that—be drafted for our area. Then our course will be clear and our development will follow a sensible, orderly pattern that will inspire everyone with confidence in northwestern Ontario.

I want to ask the government if this is too much that our people ask? In other words, we want to know where we are going.

Is the government perhaps afraid to commit itself to us because it fears that in doing so it will offend the heavy population of southern Ontario? If so, Mr. Speaker, then I suggest that the government insults the intelligence of our southern Ontario residents for surely they realize, as we do, that in assisting the north to develop they are quickening the pace of development in the south and in the entire province.

Indeed, perhaps the solutions to the problems of pollution, overcrowding and over-industrialization of southern Ontario will lie in the proper development of northern Ontario which would cause industry and people to spread out in this province.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Knight: So I support similar remarks to this effect by the member for Thunder Bay (Mr. Stokes) a week or so ago in this House.

The federal and provincial governments co-operated in the type of study I refer to in the maritimes and in northern Manitoba and as a result millions of development dollars were poured into both of those areas; and also, I understand, a similar provincial-federal study is being undertaken in the eastern townships of Quebec.

Now our federal member, Mr. Bob Andras, last year convinced the federal government to participate in a similar study of northwestern Ontario; and those federal dollars, I understand, are ready and waiting for us. Only a decision by the Ontario government stands in the way.

Mr. Speaker, we want that study and the blueprint for progress that should follow from it, along with a long range development of the rich resources of our area. Now Mr. Andras is, as we know, a Liberal member of Parliament, and I certainly hope that party politics does not have anything to do with the delay. I would not think of suggesting that.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to express my support for the proposals from my northern colleague, the hon. member for Fort William (Mr. Jessiman), when he addressed this House last week for completion of the road to the Indian

mission across Mount McKay in the city of Fort William, as well as improvement to Kakabeka Falls provincial park and the road to the marvellous Ouimet canyon.

As for his statements to the effect that everything is "coming up roses" in northwestern Ontario, and that the provincial government has done absolutely "wonderful" by us, and his complete opposition to any form of united effort among northern MPPs—well I can only say to the hon. member, through you Mr. Speaker, that I pity him.

I could refer you to an editorial in the Port Arthur *News-Chronicle* of Thursday, March 7, which was the day after the hon. member made his remarks; and that editorial is anything but complimentary to the hon. member and the Progressive Conservative Party. I would not like to see this House misled and I had thought to present part of this editorial as an affidavit. However, I will instead just refer members to that editorial, if they are interested in seeing which side of this argument most closely resembles the opinions of the people of northwestern Ontario. I do feel, from the knowledge of this newspaper, that it does most often reflect the opinions of the people of the area.

Very soon the "hub" of the great northwest, as we call it, the Lakehead cities with adjoining townships of Neebing and Shuniah may be married and then their combined populations of some 120,000 people will speak with a loud voice indeed and may very well seek to take matters into their own hands.

I suggest to this House that we do not underestimate the courage, the ability and the intelligence of a people who have pioneered life in the vast stretches of the northwestern part of Ontario. I am an adopted son and I had to learn this respect, I am very happy to convey the respect I have for them to hon. members now.

Some people down here may enjoy referring to our homeland as the frozen frosty north, but we are very much aware that we lie on a geographical parallel with the great western cities of Winnipeg, Regina, Calgary and Vancouver; and the Lakehead is anxious to catch up to their pace of development. Do not make it wait too long.

Our people are equally fed up to the teeth with hearing travellers complain about the condition of the trans-Canada highway as it traverses some 900 miles through the northwestern part of the province.

A newspaper columnist, Gwyn Kinsey, perhaps hon. members have heard of him, after journeying the coast to coast length of the big highway last August wrote the following:

> After the good and often superb construction of the trans-Canada highway through the western provinces Ontario's Highway 17 comes as a painful shock. Much of the road is in fact a disgrace, particularly along its northwestern Ontario stretch.

Now without any influence from the north, Mr. Kinsey goes on to level the most blistering commentary on Highway 17 that any highway could receive. Members only have to travel the highway to know that this Kinsey report is true. I do not have to explain what importance good roads have to a vast area like northern Ontario, and the trans-Canada highway, of course, is the big daddy of them all. Yet there is no excuse, I feel, for its unfinished condition. Here again the federal government, as I understand it, is offering to contribute a major part of the cost of bringing Highway 17, the trans-Canada highway, up to Highway 1 standards. So what is Ontario waiting for? Can it afford to go on waiting in the false hope that this federal offer will be forever renewed?

One further consideration, Mr. Speaker, in this regard. Pulp and paper and mining are most productive industries, as you know, but they can only grow so far so fast. In terms of straight revenue, tourism, on the other hand, has whatever limitations the Ontario government places on it. All the advertising below the border—and we do plenty of that, and I commend The Department of Tourism and Information for it—all of our efforts at friendliness—and we in the north do plenty of that—and good courteous service and proper tourist facilities are watered down by a highway that sends visitors away mad in broken cars.

The great Mississippi highway that stretches up to Canada from the Gulf of Mexico might very well funnel millions of American visitors into northwestern Ontario if only they would have a modern highway to travel on once they reach here. The Lakehead sits approximately at the geographical centre of the trans-Canada highway, and perhaps a lot of people did not know that, but it will never feel the full benefit of that position until the trans-Canada is brought up to top standards, and I suggest renamed Highway 1. That is something I would like to find out from this government before the session ends—when will the trans-Canada highway, or Highway

17, be renamed Highway 1, as it is in other provinces?

Mr. Speaker, I am sure we are all aware of the difficult plight of our Indians up in the north; I certainly am. I would like to say at this time that the Ontario government has done much good, through the community development programmes introduced on the reserves, toward helping the Indian to help himself, and that is what is important. I think the Indian in the north, as I see him, is regaining his pride; he is reorganizing and he is now demonstrating his desire and his ability to improve his own situation, and that is a great improvement from eight years ago when I first went to the north.

As liaison representative between the Fort William city council and the Fort William Indian mission reserve in the last few years, I have had the opportunity of taking a very active interest in the Ojibway Indians, and I can state without hesitation now, that community life has improved on the reserves and a far better education is available to Indian children. However, what we lack is proper follow-through. Once educated and ready to take their place in the business community, most of these Indian youngsters are unable to find proper employment. I would respectfully suggest that a new concentrated effort be launched by The Ontario Departments of Education and Labour in conjunction with the federal departments of Indian affairs and manpower to guarantee these industrious young Canadians that their hopes will be realized in proper employment and a good life.

I have a suggestion to make in connection with this, Mr. Speaker. The average northwestern Ontario Ojibway Indian, like the rest of us, enjoys doing what he knows best, and by that, I mean hunting, fishing and canoeing through the great northern Ontario woodlands. If our Department of Lands and Forests could see its way clear to establish a compulsory guide system for non-resident hunters in this province—similar to such systems that I understand are now in force in British Columbia and Alberta – it would create hundreds of jobs for our Indians. I personally know of more than one Indian whose whole life would be far different if he had been able to earn his living in his preferred profession. In the bush, an Indian is a giant; in a city he is very often destitute.

I urge The Department of Lands and Forests to seriously consider the possible formation of a non-resident hunters' compulsory guide system, not only to provide jobs for Indians but for many other reasons. A qualified guide would get the visiting hunter in and out of the bush safely, most often. He would see to it that our hunting laws are upheld. He would lead the hunters away from the community and the highway and away from the favourite hunting haunts of our residents. Most often, he would guarantee the hunter his game, inducing him not only to go home happy, but to return another season.

As it is, farmers complain about hunters shooting their livestock and damaging their property. We had a bill introduced in relation to this during the session. Hydro complains about hunters shooting up their pole insulators causing costly electrical interruptions. Many lives are lost because of negligent hunters. The proper guide system, I suggest, is the solution to all of these problems, and I certainly hope, Mr. Speaker, the hon. Minister in the department will give some consideration to that suggestion. I have heard some support for it previously in the north from people who know a lot more about hunting in the bush, and so forth, than I do.

Et maintenant, Monsieur le President, en autant que je suis bilingue, etant capable de m'exprime en français aussi bien q'en anglais, j'espere que les membres honorable de cette assemblée et tous ce de langue française au Canada accepteront ce que je vais dire dans le propre esprit.

And now, Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as I am bilingual, being able to express myself in French as well as in English, I hope that the hon. members of this House and the French-speaking people of Canada will accept what I am about to say as a Canadian in the proper spirit.

I firmly believe in one Canada, with one main language, be it English or French, and I am disappointed to think that no one has had the courage to make that decision. Once again I feel that we are following the route of the compromise in the illusion that dividing Canada into two languages will unite it.

I am, as you see, of English-French origin and I am very proud of it. My ancestors on both sides can be traced back 100 years in this country, but I do not want to be singled out as an English Canadian or a French Canadian, but if I am deserving, simply a Canadian.

I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, if I have to be the one dissenting voice in this House on the Canadian language issue, but I cannot sit

here silently as a hypocrite when I have such strong personal reservations on this matter. I feel I should remind the assembly that the Ontario Liberal caucus has made its position on this subject very clear and it should be obvious that the view I now express is strictly a personal one, and I alone accept the responsibility for it.

However, I do have good reason at this time to believe I am speaking for the majority of the constituents I represent in the Port Arthur riding, and some out beyond that. Several weeks ago, sir, I took the time to seek the written views of residents in Port Arthur riding on the proposals to introduce French in some official capacity into Ontario. I was overwhelmed by the response, which proved to be five to one opposed and none of the reasons were bigoted. The letters came from a cross section of nationalities. The predominant arguments echoed over and over were simply: "We do not want French forced down our throats"; and: "One Canada, one language".

In addition, Mr. Speaker, you might be surprised to hear that the day-by-day conversations during my train trips from the Legislature to Trenton, where I keep my mobile home, have revealed that a surprising number of southern Ontario residents express the same opposition for the same reasons.

I have been amazed to see almost all political parties at both levels of government agree so easily to divide our country officially into two main languages. But this, do you not see, has left the proponents of one Canadadian language without a voice in this Legislature. And this leaves the principle of two languages untested, thereby weakening democratic laws, because I feel it will be tested after it has become law.

Officially recognizing the French language may or may not close the open wound we believe to be in the province of Quebec. I think not, but I have every reason to believe it has created a new and festering wound among those Canadians who firmly believe in oneness for Canada. I have great misgivings about the day when these utopian dreams become a reality. I think we may be putting the cart before the horse in the province of Ontario. Why are we about to make this law before we have any realistic estimate of the cost before us, and when we have no justified reason to believe it is even feasible? History, our own Canadian history, has proven most French-speaking Canadians have always been able to learn English. The English-speaking Canadians have yet to prove on a vast scale that they can master French. And we have only to look at Canadian politics to know that this is true.

I believe that French-speaking Canadians have taken pride over the years—as a matter of fact I know this—in being able to do what most Canadians have not been able to do, be bilingual, French and English. And this has now become a part of the French Canadian culture, the French Canadian pride; whenever they have moved to English-speaking areas of Canada they have proven themselves ready and able to learn the language. Is it not possible that now, with the best possible intentions, wrought of concern for the very survival of Canada, we are levelling the worst imaginable insult on the Canadians of Quebec, by suggesting they would actually destroy Canada if we do not give them full linguistic rights? I think I have heard quite a few politicians who are suggesting that, because whenever they refer to this thing it is always: "The French are going to destroy the country if you do not give them their language rights".

What we will be doing with our token effort here in Ontario, in effect, is putting the French language and not the French people on a parallel with English. I believe that what they really want from Canada is what we who live in the northwest region of this province want from Ontario: Economic security, equal opportunity and a chance to develop their own area.

The current linguistic crisis in Belgium, I think, stands as a warning to us of what could occur under a legalized bilingual system in Canada. The predominantly French-speaking New England states, where I lived and learned the French language, stand as an example on the other hand of how French and English people can live in harmony and prosperity under a language system decreed by custom not by law. If Ontario wants to afford equal opportunity to everyone, I think we should institute a crash programme to teach all of our citizens, who represent a multitude of origins, to speak English, not French; in all due respect.

I say it is up to each individual Canadian, regardless of his origin, to prove his worth to Canada; and this cannot be accomplished by special privilege to any minority. Having been born in this country or having a heritage that can be traced back 100 years does not make one a good Canadian.

Before I conclude these words, Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank this Legis-

lature and the members assembled for allowing me to do a very difficult thing here. I feel very very strongly about this and I want to thank the members for giving me a chance to finish.

Now I would like to conclude my talk this way, Mr. Speaker: I have a few thoughts for our Canadian socialists. Christ was the greatest socialist who ever lived and I am a follower of Christ. He healed the sick; he visited the imprisoned; he cared for the poor and the oppressed; he loved and taught the little children; he respected the aged; he understood and redeemed the adultress; he gave hope and courage to the masses in the face of tyranny from the state—but he did not do it by walking over the body of anyone else. The bitter venom of sarcasm, slander and calumny, subterfuge and hideous arrogance had no place in his methods. He did it all in a soft, inoffensive, positive way, without interfering with the democratic rights and prerogatives of any individual. There was no hypocrisy; he led but he did not mislead. That, as I see it, is what is wrong with the extreme socialists of today who seem to think their ends justify almost any means. That is why I am a Liberal, because I believe true Liberalism is neither far to the left nor far to the right, but lies in the middle where virtue is with the Liberals whose policies are flexible enough to meet the needs of the people—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Knight: Do hon. members want to out-talk me?

The Liberals, whose policies are flexible enough to meet the needs of the people without interfering with the rights and the prerogatives of the individuals.

I say we are blessed to live in one of the great ages of man. Let us, in the Ontario Legislature, prove that we are equal to the task.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. F. A. Burr (Sandwich-Riverside): Mr. Speaker, I wish first to congratulate all the members of this House on their choice of a Speaker.

I wish to congratulate the Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts). As a native of London I believe that he is the best Prime Minister who ever came out of London.

I should like to congratulate the leader of the official Opposition (Mr. Nixon) on his survival during the election and, just to be impartial, to congratulate the member for York South (Mr. MacDonald) for doubling the popular vote for his party during the election. And I should like to express my appreciation to the many members for their many kindnesses to me so far.

The riding of Sandwich-Riverside, which I have the privilege of representing, is an area that could have been called a few years ago the suburbs of Windsor. Windsor recently annexed most of this area without its consent and in spite of its objections. Further, because the predicted economies have not resulted in lower taxes, there is considerable resentment towards the provincial government which brought about its annexation.

Many citizens in the townships of Sandwich South and Sandwich West, which constitute the rural part of this riding, have been further disturbed by the recent announcement that there will be one school board for all of Essex county except Windsor. One of their fears is that each county will now have a new central administration office with additional staff, and that Parkinson's law will start to operate in earnest.

There is a fear too that in the pursuit of bigness, we may lose that intangible, but very real benefit of democracy; the feeling that each person is important in and important to his own community. Not a mere punch card in a political computing machine.

Human dignity can be undermined in many ways and on many pretexts. For example, Ontario's delay in introducing medicare means that many citizens in this province in the next year or two will have to accept medical help as charity, rather than as a service to which they are entitled because they have made a financial contribution.

I shall not take the members' time relating the merits of the people of Windsor, Riverside, Tecumseh, Sandwich East, or Sandwich West, pleasant though that would certainly be. Instead I intend to tell you of the air pollution difficulties peculiar to our city and the adjacent townships.

In 1949 an international joint commission was established to study the pollution of the atmosphere in the Detroit River area. In 1960 a voluminous and alarming report was published showing that about ten per cent of our air pollution was produced in Windsor, about 80 per cent came from the Ecorse—Zug Island industrial complex on the Michigan side of the Detroit River and the other 10 per cent from elsewhere in Michigan.

Windsor has done much to clean up its own backyard, but the pollution from Zug Island

continues to pour into Windsor. In fact, the city hall receives daily complaints. According to the pollution control officer's reports, on numerous occasions ships on the Detroit River, which is the busiest river in the world, must depend on radar even in daytime. While on Highway 18B, motor traffic has been forced to a halt at mid-day because of the huge pall of smoke coming from the American side.

The Windsor utilities commission reports frequent blackouts in the area closest to Zug Island, the cause of which is attributed to iron oxide deposits settling on insulators during foggy weather.

In September, 1967, air pollution in Windsor was reported at "an excessively high level." Twice as high as that which the United States public health service sets as a maximum safe amount.

Air pollution in the west end of Windsor is so bad that, according to one of our recently elected aldermen, the housing authorities are making some land virtually unavailable for building homes, although it is completely serviced property.

On January 24 of this year, an agricultural researcher of the Harrow soil research station told Windsor chemists that air pollution in the Windsor area is cutting farm crop yields, claiming that ours is the most seriously affected agricultural area in Canada.

When the news of the Dunnville affair broke, indignation in Windsor against our own air polluters in Michigan ran high, but all that happened was this: The international joint commission announced that it would increase from 15 to 20 the number of air sampling stations. The announcement in the Windsor *Star* was an anti-climax. I quote:

> The 20 Windsor area sampling stations will collect data on local air pollution conditions for a two year period, forming the basis for recommendations on what can be done to improve this situation.

When I asked the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond) recently what action was being taken to reduce the trans-boundary flow of air pollution into Windsor from Zug Island, he referred to the international joint commission as currently investigating this trans-boundary flow, quote: "To determine the source and extent of it". Now sir, Windsorites have known for 20 years the source of our pollution and we had been told in 1960 and again in 1967 the extent of it: "excessively high". And we know what the recommendation will be in two years' time. Install anti-pollution equipment. Just as simple as that. We have the know-how, we have the need. What are we waiting for?

We have been told that the state of Michigan will bring about a substantial reduction in the next few years. We should be much less apprehensive, however, if our federal government at Ottawa were as concerned about air pollution as is the federal government in Washington, for the United States has recently passed an air quality Act which gives the federal government the power to enforce air pollution control over those industries that emit pollution to foreign countries. However, this applies only if the foreign country—in our case Canada—reciprocates with similar legislation. This would mean that we, in Windsor, could appeal to the government in Washington to control the air pollution originating in the Zug Island area, if our government in Ottawa would assume responsibility for controlling trans-boundary flow of air pollution from Canada to the United States.

Unfortunately, according to a November, 1967, issue of *Civic Administration*, quote:

> The federal government at Ottawa keeps insisting that responsibility for controlling pollution lies with the provinces. Why the government of a country shirks substantial involvement in a grave national crisis is both inexplicable and lamentable.

Mr. Speaker, so far the government at Ottawa has not seen fit to come to the aid of the citizens of Windsor by passing this very necessary legislation, despite an urgent plea in 1965 from the Windsor city council asking them to do so. That is why a group of concerned citizens in Windsor is even now launching a city-wide petition to draw the attention of governments at all levels to the urgency of Windsor's plight.

On May 18, 1967, Windsor city council again appealed to the international joint commission in a brief, which included this sentence:

> The degree of trans-boundary flow of impurities showed a marked increase in the last few years.

As recently as Januuary 29 of this year, our medical officer of health, Dr. John Howie, attributed some of the increase in respiratory deaths in our area to air pollution.

I should like to read three letters from Windsor doctors. The first one:

> Mrs. X has been a patient of mine for four and a half years, and I have found that her sinusitis and respiratory problems are definitely connected with the air she

breathes, which is badly polluted in this area.

I have seen a great rise in sinusitis and respiratory problems in my patients here in Windsor.

Signed, Dr. Maurice Bull

Another one reads:

I have found in my practice, which is specializing in nose, ear and throat diseases, that there is a great rise in rhinitis and sinusitis from September until warmer weather sets in, in the Windsor area. I feel this is directly connected with air pollution.

Perhaps I should not read the doctor's name. A third one reads as follows:

As a diagnostic radiologist in practice in this city of Windsor for 17 years, I find an ever-increasing request for my services in the investigation of upper respiratory and pulmonary conditions. This increase is conspicuous in the last five years. The incidence of disease in the accessory nasal sinuses in these maladies for study is disturbing and well-known to be related to atmospheric conditions, including air pollution.

I vigorously support further research and legislation to minimize air pollution to our community.

I ask the hon. Minister of Health to use his good offices on behalf of the men, women and children of Windsor to persuade the federal government to help to remove this menace to their health.

The other evening, a government member claimed that there is no pollution in Dunnville. If this is true, Dunnville is the only place on this continent which can make such a claim. Wherever there are moving automobiles on the ground, and wherever there is ozone in the atmosphere, and wherever there is sunlight acting on oxides of nitrogen and hydrocarbons discharged as pollutants from the combustion of fuels, especially in the exhaust gas from motors—in short, wherever 20th century man lives—there you will find air pollution.

There may be less in some rural areas, but it is there. It is serious and it is getting worse.

About a year ago, a panel of the American association for the advancement of science and I quote:

—indicted sulphur dioxide, ozone, fluorides, chlorine and ethylene in that order, as the killers that should become principal targets for anti-pollution technologists.

That was in *Chemical Week,* January 7, 1967.

Because there are still some who are unaware of the gravity of this problem, I intend to give a brief history of the role of fluorides in air pollution.

Since time immemorial volcanoes have polluted the air and the earth with fluorides. In Iceland there are records going back to A.D. 100 of a disease of domestic animals, especially sheep, that appeared after each of several volcanic eruptions.

In 1845 the volcano, Hekla, once again erupted and once again there followed the disease that is now known as fluorosis. You can find this in the bureau of mines information circular 7687, the United States Department of the Interior, June, 1954.

The oldest source of man-made air pollution through fluorides is the burning of coal, and over 60,000 tons of fluoride gas is now given off by the earth's annual coal consumption alone.

The next oldest source is the brickyard, for the clay used there contains several hundred parts per million, much of which is driven off when the bricks are fired. The same applies to the making of tiles and ceramics.

Damage to vegetation caused by fluoride emissions from brick works was reported in 1913 in Germany and in 1948, fluorosis was reported in animals in England from the same type of industry. In 1927, the same disease occurred among cattle on a farm close to a superphosphate factory in Italy.

Since that time numerous battles have been fought by numerous farmers in numerous countries against numerous factories and corporations for similar damage to cattle.

Fluorosis in cattle in the vicinity of aluminum plants was first reported in 1911 in Switzerland and in 1934, in Norway. In the United States fluoride fumes from aluminum plants have caused extensive damage to orchards, cattle, other livestock and human beings. I will skip over some of this; even I find it very trying.

In 1955, Paul Martin was awarded $37,292.90 for proven harm to the health of his daughter, his wife and himself. I should say that this Paul Martin lived in Oregon and he was a rancher. During the trial, testimony disclosed that as much as two tons of fluoride a day was emitted into the air—enough to etch the windows of the

Martin ranch. By installations costing over $2 million, it was possible to reduce the emission of fluorides to one-half ton a day.

An interesting experiment took place at another community in Oregon, the Dalles. Fluoride determinations were made on seven crops within a one mile radius of the site of an aluminum plant which was about to open. About nine weeks after the operations began at the aluminum plant, the average fluoride content of these seven crops had risen from an average of three parts per million to an average of 140 parts per million. This study was made by the Oregon state college of agriculture in 1958 and, according to the *Wall Street Journal* of March 17, 1966, 30 fruit growers in this area had sued this company for more than $2 million damage to their crops.

In Hillsborough and Polk counties of Florida the fluoride gases escaping from 17 phosphate plants have damaged shrubbery and citrus trees for a distance of 50 miles in every direction. Some 25,000 acres of citrus trees have been destroyed. An account of this is given by Howard R. Lewis in his book, *With Every Breath You Take.*

In Polk county, the people, too, suffer respiratory and other ailments. A senate committee was told by a witness:

> Fluoride eats up the paint and etches glass. It kills trees, it kills cattle; it is an irritant to mucous membranes and we have sore throats. Tears run out of our eyes, we sneeze and we have nose bleeds.

From the earliest developmnt of phosphate factories there have been claims for damages, both to vegetation and herbivorous animals starting in 1891, and lawsuits running into millions of dollars have resulted in Tennessee and Florida and elsewhere.

The role of fluoride in air pollution was not fully appreciated at the time of the Meuse Valley smog disaster in Belgium, back in 1930, where several thousands of people were made ill, and on the fourth and fifth days 60 died. Even then, at least three authorities pinpointed fluorine as the lethal factor.

I will edit some more.

In October 1948, a similar smog disaster occurred at Donora, Pennsylvania. There, of the 13,000 residents, 6,000 were made ill and on the fourth and fifth days 19 died. The consulting chemist called in to investigate found evidence of acute fluorine poisoning and people already suffering from chronic fluoride poisoning. Blood concentrations of fluoride were from 12 to 25 times greater than normal. Dyspnea, that is, distressed breathing, was found in hundreds of cases. Vegetation was severaly damaged in the area, including corn crops which are known to be very sensitive to fluorine. Glass was etched by acid gases and a report of this Mr. Speaker, was given in *Chemical and Engineering News* 26: 3692, 1954. Now because virtually all vegetation contains some fluoride, forest fires and even wood burned in fireplaces make their contribution to the total. At least 100 minerals contain fluoride in varying amounts and man's use of them in industrial processes makes an ever increasing contribution. In the production of high test gasoline, sulphuric acid, once used almost exclusively as a catalyst has been replaced gradually by hydrogen fluoride. Although we do not know how much of this is discharged into the air in the process and how much remains in the gasoline and is later emitted, we do know that one refinery in Los Angeles uses between 500 and 750 tons of hydrogen fluoride annually and that a year after this process was introduced in Los Angeles, smog sufferers began complaining of eye irritation.

I have a long list of the other uses but I will spare you those.

Even in 1949, F. J. McClure of the United States Public Health Service stated that:

> The uses of fluorine in industry were increasing so rapidly that the health hazard was worsening correspondingly. In the Canadian council resource Ministers' national conference held in Montreal From October 31 to November 4, 1966, on the theme pollution and our environment.

I will read one short paragraph:

> It is apparent that fluoride emissions from industrial sources must be carefully controlled because prolonged exposure to ambient air concentrations of less than one part per thousand millions—

That is not one part per thousand or one part per million, but one part per billion, Mr. Speaker—

> —by volume this may create a hazard to sensitive agricultural crops and forest species or to farm animals feeding on exposed forage. In this respect fluorides are more than a hundred times as toxic as sulphur dioxide.

And, one final quotation, from *Chemical Abstracts,* page 9051:

> Fluorine in the atmosphere increases the sensitivity of the thyroid gland to the damaging effects of atmospheric sulphur dioxide.

Now I have discussed this matter at a considerable length Mr. Speaker, because despite the long history of atmospheric pollution by fluorides, the Ontario Department of Health appeared in the Dunnville area affair to be taken almost by surprise. They seemed never to have suspected that human beings might be affected. In fact, on October 28, 1967, the Canadian Press reported the hon. Minister of Health for Ontario (Mr. Dymond) as follows, when asked what were the symptoms of fluorosis:

> I cannot tell you. I do not intend to get into a clinical discussion. I do not know enough about toxicology.

Now the damage suffered by Mr. Paul Martin, to whom I referred before, and by his daughter and by his wife, included the liver, the kidneys and the digestive functions. The symptoms of fluorosis are as follows—by symptoms, of course, we mean the signs that accompany the disease or the sickness—and this quotation is from the Surgeon General of the United States, Doctor William Stewart, in a prepared submission before a Senate sub-committee on air and water pollution on June 8, 1966. He said:

> Among workers exposed to fluorides and to some degree among people living near industrial sources of fluorides, adverse effects attributable to these compounds have included: irritation of the skin and mucous membranes, eye irritation, nosebleeds, inflammation of the respiratory tract and difficulty in breathing.

Those, Mr. Speaker, are the symptoms of fluorosis and I was interested to read in the *Globe and Mail* on the same date, October 28, 1967, that the Minister said, and I am quoting the *Globe*:

> Two doctors from his staff were making a house to house check of the Dunnville area, asking residents whether they had fluorosis symptoms. Any who replied affirmatively would be advised to have a medical check-up and suspicious cases would be referred to specialists.

Now I wonder how the two doctors carried on this survey.

The hon. member for London South (Mr. White) treated us to a dream, not so long ago, so I dreamed up a kind of interview for this.

The doctors knock on the door and they say: "Hello, Mrs. Jones, have you any symptoms of fluorosis?" And Mrs. Jones says: "Well, I do not know. What are the symptoms?" The doctors say: "We cannot tell." Mrs. Jones says: "Well, my eyes often water, is that a symptom?" They say: "We do not intend to get into a clinical discussion, Mrs. Jones." Whereupon Mrs. Jones says: "Well, I have had trouble with my breathing, is that a symptom?" They say: "We do not know enough about toxicology." "Well," says Mrs. Jones, "if you want a yes or no answer, suppose I say yes." They say: "Well then, Mrs. Jones, we advise you have a medical check-up."

Mr. Speaker, the danger from air pollution, whether from sulphur dioxide or ozone or anything else, is a very real and very urgent one.

Doctor John Hanlon, Wayne county health commissioner of Michigan, who lives in sight of Windsor, has said:

> Mankind will die of massive epidemics of respiratory diseases and suffocation within the next hundred years. There is an aerial sewer 12 to 14 miles thick all around the earth and there is just no more space to dump this pollution in the air.

Mr. Speaker, for the sake of our children and for the sake of our grandchildren and for future generations, if not for ourselves, I call upon the hon. Minister of Health to put teeth into our pollution control laws and to urge the federal government to join us in this fight.

On the question of auto insurance as it is presently sold in Ontario, I wish to make two points.

First. There is one feature that cries out for a remedy. The average motorist feels, when he pays his annual or semi-annual premium, that he is protecting himself and his family adequately against any serious or even fatal accident that may happen to him. Now this is an illusion. Perhaps even a delusion. Actually, he is paying the insurance company to assume his financial obligations, if he is the one responsible or the one judged responsible for an accident. If he is killed in an auto accident, for which he is not responsible, his insurance company is of little or no help to his family. His family will have to try as best it can to seek compensation, probably through protracted legal proceedings from the person judged responsible for the accident.

As each member of this House drives home tonight, there is not one who will have any valid reason for believing, or for feeling, financially protected against the consequences of a serious auto accident in which he may be involved, unless he has some special insurance not associated with ordinary auto insurance.

Let me read a few excerpts from the *Wall Street Journal.* I never thought, Mr. Speaker, when I was elected to this office that I would ever read from the *Wall Street Journal,* but miracles happen all the time.

This is the issue of November 7, 1967, page 1, and it has several headlines, the first of which is "Insurance Innovation"; the second "A Canadian Province Finds A Way to Slash Auto Crash Litigation"; and the third "Compulsory No-Fault Policies Sold by Saskatchewan Pay All Victims Automatically"; and the final one "Similar Plans Urged in United States". This is by John F. Lyons, a staff reporter for the *Wall Street Journal.* I should like to read it all but I will pick out just a few pertinent paragraphs. It starts off:

> Regina, Saskatchewan: The accident was a bad one; two cars going in opposite directions on a narrow road crashed into each other on a dark night; of the five occupants, four were killed. Had it happened anywhere but in Saskatchewan chances are that little, if any, liability insurance benefits would have been paid, because it was impossible to establish which driver was at fault. Because it did happen here in Saskatchewan, however, damage totalling $35,000 were paid to families of the cars' occupants and nobody had to hire a lawyer or file suit to get the payments. The reason, Saskatchewan's automobile insurance policies provide death and injury benefits—relatively modest ones to be sure—that are payable immediately in many cases and that are paid to the parties involved without regard to who is at fault in an accident.
>
> The policies, which are compulsory, are sold by the Saskatchewan provincial government. In broad outline, the Saskatchewan plan, as the scheme is called, resembles workmen's compensation insurance in the United States, under which an injured employee gets workmen's compensation payments whether his own or his employer's negligence caused his injury.
>
> When an accident victim feels that he has been inadequately compensated under the schedule of automatic payments, he is free to sue for additional damages. The province's compulsory insurance policies provide for liability payments up to $35,000 to protect the driver found liable in such cases. However, only a small proportion of injured persons sue, a situation that helps keep the back-log of liability cases low in Saskatchewan courts. Also working to keep the provincial courts uncongested, is the prohibition against lawyers handling liability cases on a contingency basis, in which the lawyer takes his fee out of any award he may obtain for his client. The uncrowded court dockets in Saskatchewan, which has just under 1 million residents, means that a suit filed today—

this was November—

> —would probably be disposed of by Christmas. By contrast, in metropolitan United States areas, it takes 30 months to wind up the average liability suit that goes to a jury.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Same in Ontario.

Mr. Burr: To continue:

> In Chicago, which has an especially big back-log of liability cases, it takes 69 months.

And as I said, I should like to read you more of this but I am sure all members will rush off to the *Wall Street Journal* and read the rest for themselves.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Burr: Mr. Speaker, we in Ontario need a non-profit, no-fault, automatic-payment, litigation-free, insurance plan for automobiles.

The present method in Ontario has not worked, it does not work, it cannot work, and it never will work to the satisfaction of the people of this province.

I must mention one other serious flaw in auto insurance in Ontario. Our young drivers are discriminated against. I propose a system under which all new and inexperienced drivers, whether they are 16 or 60, will pay an extra premium, possibly a double premium, and perhaps for a period of one year. At the end of this initial period, if the driver shows himself to be a good, safe driver, then let him pay the same rate as every other good, safe driver. Young drivers should be considered innocent until proven guilty, in accordance with the best principles of British justice. Instead, from the age of 16 to 25—

Mr. G. A. Kerr (Halton West): No good for the insurance companies.

Mr. Burr: Our young single drivers are compelled to pay what amounts to an annual "fine"—

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): It would be nice if they paid their share.

Mr. Burr: —even though year after year most of them have driver's permits to prove that they are not guilty. In short, they are innocent but punished, punished simply for being young.

I should like to put in an earnest plea to the Minister of Transport (Mr. Haskett) or the Minister of Highways (Mr. Gomme), or the Attorney General (Mr. Wishart), to help eliminate this discrimination against our young people, a discrimination of a most expensive kind.

An hon. member: Hear, hear.

Mr. Burr: And I come, you will be glad to hear, to my final quarter. As a new member of this House, Mr. Speaker, I have been surprised to hear the word "socialist" used so frequently.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): They do not know what it means.

Mr. Burr: Sometimes by government supporters in condemnation, and sometimes by members of the Opposition in commendation. My friend, the hon. member for Lakeshore, spoke at some length on the subject in his maiden speech, the theme of which was, if members recall, "We are all socialists". I too should like to say something on this subject. Socialism is not a dirty word. The word "socialism" comes from the Latin "socious", meaning a friend, and "ism", a belief. Socialism is a belief in friendship as a way of life.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Martel: I am glad you reactionaries realize that then.

An hon. member: Don't you want to be friendly? Come on.

Mr. Burr: Because this is one of the most misunderstood words in the English language, may I venture to explain what I mean by democratic socialism by giving about ten definitions.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Burr: I thank the hon. members for allowing me to catch my breath.

Mr. Lawlor: Tell them, tell them.

Mr. Burr: Socialism is a firetruck rushing to a fire, its crew risking their lives without thought of gain, to save the property and perhaps even the lives, of fellow citizens.

Socialism is the Ontario elementary and secondary school system by which the opportunity to obtain an education is offered to every child.

Mr. Lawlor: They fought against it for years, the whole 19th century.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): I am not that old.

Mr. Burr: Socialism is the public utilities commission providing water and electricity to every home at the lowest possible cost.

Socialism is a credit union which is run, "not for profit, not for charity, but for service."

Socialism is a church congregation devoting its time, its talents and its money without any thought of material gain.

Socialism is a service club helping some neglected segment of the community.

Socialism is a hospital plan providing through low cost, government subsidized insurance complete hospital care as long as necessary, and as a right to everyone in the province in need of such care.

Socialism is a road, a sidewalk, a boulevard, a park, a municipal swimming pool, a public library, all provided by a community for the benefit, recreation or edification of the citizens.

And if war can be justified, socialism is a soldier serving his country at the risk of life and limb.

Socialism—this is number nine, I think—is the application to politics and economics of Christ's teaching, which means living not for ourselves but for others.

And socialism lastly is the philosophy of life which insists that modern man can, in fact must, live in friendship with this fellow man.

Now just as some parts of our economy are capitalist while other parts are socialized, or partially socialized, so the attitudes of most persons are partially capitalist and partially socialist. The chief motivating force of capitalism is individual selfishness.

Mr. Lawlor: That is right, that is right; straight greed!

Mr. Burr: The essence of democratic socialism is unselfish service.

An hon. member: Put the halo back on!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Chickening out, chickening out.

Mr. Burr: Because all of us, Mr. Speaker, are influenced in varying degrees and at various times by both of these motives, it is doubtful whether anyone could be classified accurately as 100 per cent capitalist or 100 per cent socialist.

An hon. member: Except the member for London South.

Mr. Lawlor: He is 100 per cent.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): There are exceptions.

Mr. Burr: The Conservative Party of Ontario is in some ways a socialist party. To give only one example, Mr. Speaker, only last year, the Conservative government of Ontario introduced a legal aid system which has enabled several thousand citizens, who would other wise have been unable to do so, to fight a case in court. At last the slogan, "justice for all," shows promise of becoming a reality. This is a great socialist measure, introduced by the socialist-Conservative government of Ontario, which prefers to call itself Progressive Conservative because of its members' traditional antipathy towards the word "socialist".

The Liberal Party, both federally and provincially, is in many ways a socialist party. To give one example, last week our friends in the official Opposition gave vigorous support for a tenants' bill of rights. The New Democrats, at their founding convention, accepted the principle of a mixed economy based partly on social enterprise and partly on private enterprise. The NDP therefore is not a completely socialist party.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is when you chickened out.

An hon. member: What happened to the Regina manifesto?

Another hon. member: It died a natural death.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Does the member for Scarborough West agree with that?

Mr. Lewis: Did the Minister not hear me say "shame"?

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): The Liberals and Conservatives have an obsession over the Regina manifesto.

Mr. Burr: In the words of my friend, the hon. member for Lakeshore, we are all socialists. There are three socialist parties in this province—the Conservatives, who may be termed "creeping," and the Liberals who may be termed "crawling," because there is after all not very much difference, and the New Democrats who are on their feet and marching towards a better Ontario.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Let us all sing "Onward Christian Soldiers."

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Will the real socialists stand up?

Mr. Burr: I have been invited, Mr. Speaker, to join all three socialist parties as I suppose many members of this House have been. My choice was the New Democrats. I respect the choice that the other members have made, but socialism is not a dirty word.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I should like to remind all members that there is so much of the socialist in the worst of us and so much of the capitialist—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Burr: To repeat, Mr. Speaker, there is so much of the socialist in the worst of us and so much of the capitalist in the best of us, that it ill becomes any of us, 117 socialists to criticize too harshly the rest of us.

Mr. G. E. Smith (Simcoe East): Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a pleasure for me to have the opportunity to take part in the Throne debate and to endorse the government programme as outlined in the Speech from the Throne. May I congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, on your election to the illustrious office that you now hold and the important part that you play in ensuring that our deliberations in this Legislature are carried out with purpose and dignity.

May I congratulate the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) for his great and outstanding leadership on behalf of the people in the province of Ontario, and may I say, Mr. Speaker, that I am proud to be a member of his team.

The well-known author of *Sunshine Sketches of a Little Town,* the late Stephen Leacock, once asked the question, "Are you a politician or do you work for a living?" Well, I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that as a provincial member representing one of the largest rural ridings in central and southern Ontario, I seem to have found a full-time job and I know that the hon. members will concur with me when I state that to give our constituents the necessary dedicated type of representation to which they

are entitled, demands almost complete separation from other active business interests.

Right here, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that I intend to devote the bulk of my time to telling you and the hon. members something about my riding and what I propose to do, rather than give you a discourse on the political philosophy that I personally hold as well as that of my party.

I have the privilege of representing the historic riding of Simcoe East and at this time I would like to pay tribute to my predecessor, Mr. Lloyd Letherby, who represented the riding for 13 years, and who died so suddenly early in January of this year. It was particularly sad that he should have been taken so soon after his retirement from political life.

We of Simcoe county and Simcoe East have reason to be proud of our history and our traditions. Few parts of Canada are more rich in history. Our soil bore the footprints of Champlain, Brébeuf, Lalemant and other brave and noble souls whose names are enshrined forever in the pages of Canada's history. Champlain, a great man, a statesman and a true Christian, whose magnificent memorial is an impressive feature in Couchiching park at Orillia, envisages the importance of Huronia. He and his immediate successors saw the destruction of the Huron tribe in an all-out effort some 300 years ago in our area.

Simcoe county, between the years 1820 and 1850, saw its greatest influx of early settlers. They settled in groups related to religious and racial origins. There were Scots in Oro and Nottawasaga townships, French in Tiny township, northern Irish in East and West Gwillimbury, southern Irish in Adjala, German Mennonites in the northern part of Nottawasaga and Sunnidale.

Notwithstanding their widely different cultural origins, including French, these settlers and their descendants have lived and worked together in harmony these many years. They represent a cross section of the many cultures to which our Prime Minister has referred and which finds expression through the English language here in Ontario. It is my understanding they would have it no other way.

It is interesting to note that in the township of Oro there was a settlement of Negroes who had fled from slavery in the southern United States, and their original church located in the township still stands and has celebrated some 100 years of use. As a matter of fact I believe the church was originally founded and established in 1837.

In early days, Simcoe county was the scene of large military installations, and eventually Yonge Street was extended as a connecting link with the central metropolis of York, cutting through the area to Georgian Bay.

Turning to more recent times, may I point out that Simcoe county is still leaving its imprint on the pages of history. The riding of Simcoe East has given the province of Ontario two Prime Ministers and was the birthplace of a third. The late hon. E. C. Drury headed the administration here at Queen's Park from 1919 to 1923, and for more than two decades served as sheriff of Simcoe county. He took a keen interest in developing Simcoe county's reforestation programme. In fact this was the first provincial reforestation development which since has proved so successful across our entire province.

It is interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, that in the townships of Tiny, Tay, Flos and Medonte in Simcoe county, we have in excess of five million trees growing in our reforested areas. We were sorry to learn of Mr. Drury's passing, at which time, Mr. Speaker, you will recall I paid tribute to him.

From 1939 to 1943 the hon. George Drew represented Simcoe East in this Legislature, and from 1943 to 1948 he headed the administration in this House. Again, Simcoe East claims as its native son, the hon. Leslie Frost, who was born and educated in Orillia, and later in life, as the representative of Victoria riding, served as Prime Minister of this province from 1948 to 1961. Indeed, Mr. Frost has brought great honour to his birthplace, Orillia and the riding of Simcoe East.

Another well-known legislator who represented the riding of Simcoe East was the late hon. William Finlayson who served as Minister of Lands and Forests, and will be remembered by some of my senior colleagues.

Simcoe East, and more particularly the town of Orillia, is well known as the home of the famous humorist, author and lecturer, the late Stephen Leacock. We are indeed proud, Mr. Speaker, of the Stephen Leacock memorial home located in Orillia. Its complete restoration to its original condition, and the acquiring of many original manuscrips, including *Sunshine Sketches of a Little Town,* is the culmination of hard work and the sincere dedication of many interested people, both in Simcoe East and other parts of Canada. This, Mr. Speaker, is one of the

many tourist attractions in my riding, and right here may I say that we in Ontario are all too modest in "blowing our own horn" and promoting the many untapped opportunities to attract tourists and other people to our towns and municipalities.

We in Simcoe East are proud of the unique development of Fort Ste. Marie, where we see unveiled a picture of life from our history books. For the benefit of the hon. members who are not familiar with the location of Fort Ste. Marie, it is located adjacent to the martyr's shrine near the town of Midland. It tells the story of the lives of the early white settlers and missionaries who lived and worked in Huronia over 300 years ago. Last year, in excess of 124,000 people from 60 countries of the world paid admission to see the village; 41,000 of the admissions came from organized school groups and next year it is estimated that the number will be greatly increased.

I know, Mr. Speaker, that you will agree with me that this is indeed one of the outstanding educational projects of our province, and the provincial government, particularly The Department of Tourism and Information, deserves a great deal of credit for establishing and developing this project. The hon. Minister (Mr. Auld) also is to be congratulated on his vision and foresight in recognizing and developing not only Fort Ste. Marie, but the many other historic sites in our province. It is my hope that the near future will see the completion of the proposed library and resource centre which will provide complete interpretation of the village to its many visitors. I will certainly support the further development of this attraction in my riding, as I can visualize in the not too far distant future it is conceivable that 250,000 to 400,000 people would pay annual admissions and would be a normal flow during a season. Fort Ste. Marie is indeed beneficial to our tourist industry in Simcoe East, as well as the province in general.

Located adjacent to Fort Ste. Marie is Wye Lake, an ideal site for a wildlife sanctuary, where children and adults can observe wildlife in their natural habitat, in an area designed to conserve many species common to our province. With assistance from the federal government and leadership from our provincial Legislature, we could be the first in Canada to establish a sanctuary of this type where human and natural life is interpreted in its early culture and surroundings. Mr. Speaker, I intend to encourage the development of the Wye Lake sanctuary, as the first of its kind in the province of Ontario.

I would also hope that in the future we might develop other historical attractions in Simcoe East, such as the Indian village of Cahiague located near Orillia where Champlain is said to have wintered. Professor Emmerson and students of the University of Toronto are excavating this site during the summer months, and have through their researches, been able to substantiate many facts of our early Canadian, or should I say Ontario history. It is interesting to note that at the time Champlain visited this village it consisted of a population of some 8,000 people.

Big Chief Island, located offshore of Orillia in beautiful Lake Couchiching, is another location which I hope some day will be developed so that local residents and tourists alike will be able to appreciate and enjoy its natural beauty and setting.

I am pleased to note that the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond), in whose riding Big Chief Island is placed, has already made certain efforts to have this land acquired from the Rama Indians in order that it may not be exploited by commercial developers and may be kept as a natural setting for those who wish to enjoy its beauty and the many assets it as to offer to the tourist and the local people.

Simcoe East has need of a museum of local science and industry and I am pleased to report an interested group are investigating such a project in the Washago area.

We in Simcoe East have pioneered in many early manufacturing developments. Many municipalities in our riding had such industries as carriage works, foundries and mills, producing farm machinery, boots and shoes, mining machinery, brewing and distillery and many other items too numerous to mention.

As a matter of fact, in Simcoe county Mr. Speaker, the towns of Orillia, Penetang and Barrie were the centre of automobile manufacturing, and I am pleased to say that I have saved six of the Tudhope cars which were made in Orillia from the scrap yards and they would be available for such a project.

I might say here—and I am sorry that the hon. member for Grey-Bruce (Mr. Sargent) is not in his seat at the present time—that in my efforts as a collector I have acquired an early lorry or van which was used by one

of the Toronto breweries prior to prohibition days, in the early days, to transport their product from Toronto to various parts of the province, including Owen Sound. And I was thinking, Mr. Speaker, that I might make this available to park in front of his hotel as a memorial of happier days.

I advocate, Mr. Speaker, that we at Queen's Park should press for a total development of Ontario's inland waterways from Georgian Bay to the Ottawa River which would include the Trent and Rideau system.

We have some of the finest inland waterways in the world, and I am pleased to note that our water resources commission has started to implement some basic legislation to avoid the type of water pollution caused by the boating public. However, Mr. Speaker, may I suggest that water pollution on our inland lakes and streams is not only the province's responsibility but also that of all levels of municipal government, and of individuals who use and enjoy these facilities; and that applies not only to boaters but everyone.

Mr. Speaker, the county boards of health have the responsibility for insuring through proper inspection that all sewage disposal systems on inland rivers and lakes meet standards and are operating efficiently. This will be an additional assurance that our water will be kept pure for the enjoyment of all. This may necessitate the increase of staff of the inspection branch of the county health units, but it would be money well invested.

Mr. Speaker, it is the definite responsibility of all levels of government to conserve our water, one of our most precious natural resources. We in Simcoe East are proud of our provincial parks which have been developed by The Department of Lands and Forests under the direction of the Minister. If we are to attract tourists to our camp sites and parks we must have facilities second to none and, believe me, Mr. Speaker, we have just that in Little Lake park at Midland, at Bass Lake park near Orillia and also at Six Mile park, located in my riding. We also have additional parks developed by towns and villages and municipalities throughout Simcoe East. Several of them were developed this year as centennial projects. I know, Mr. Speaker, that you are familiar with Couchiching Beach park in the town of Orillia and its lovely setting.

The two provincial parks in the riding, it is interesting to note, accommodated close to a quarter of a million people during the past season.

It is my belief that future development of park sites is not the sole responsibility of The Department of Lands and Forests. I feel that all levels of government should take a serious look at all streams or lakes with a plan to develop property on road allowances adjacent to them for small community parks with access to the water.

There is indeed a need for this to be given serious consideration by the many municipalities throughout not only my riding but the ridings of the province. I might say, Mr. Speaker, there is a need for a new administration office for The Department of Lands and Forests at Coldwater and I would certainly hope that this should be provided and will be developed in the not too distant future.

I am happy to note, Mr. Speaker, that The Department of Lands and Forests recently established a snowmobile trail on Crown land in my riding, in Matchedash township west of the Severn Falls road; and there is the Horseshoe Lake trail, which follows a circular scenic wilderness route through terrain for a distance of about 18 miles.

Mr. Speaker, I would submit here to the hon. members that this shows that The Department of Lands and Forests is certainly in step with providing facilities which will be interesting and will cater to the winter tourists or the winter sportsman who is interested in availing himself of some of the winter sports which are now very prevalent throughout our province. It is a new development in providing facilities for winter recreation and public response to date has certainly been very good.

Mr. Speaker, it is my intent to encourage the extension of Highway 400 from Coldwater to the Muskokas. In addition to providing a main thoroughfare for the tremendous flow of traffic into Ontario's holiday playgrounds, it in turn would open up an entirely new area. I understand that all the Crown land in Simcoe East and south Muskoka district has been sold, and consequently this new road would develop new recreational facilities for more and more people.

We also need a new four lane highway from Toronto via the east side of Lake Simcoe to the north, and I will work for the completion of this project as it would make an additional connecting link from Toronto to Orillia and to the northern section so that weekend motorists might have a direct access

from the eastern limits of Toronto up into my area and the north.

Mr. Speaker, I trust that The Department of Highways in the near future will complete the Victoria Harbour bypass on Highway 12, which would eliminate the "eye in the needle" type of railroad bridge which I know is familiar to those who travel from Coldwater to Midland and which is such a dangerous hazard to the motoring public. There is a need for The Department of Highways to take over the county road known as the Evergreen side road, which would provide a bypass from the martyrs' shrine and Highway 12 to Highway 27, south of Midland.

Mr. Speaker, Fowler Avenue in the township of Tay, leading to Oak Ridges, a portion of the Ontario Hospital at Penetang is in deplorable condition and needs immediate attention. Approximately one and three quarter miles should be resurfaced. This has been under discussion for some time by local residents with various levels of government. I intend, Mr. Speaker, with assistance from The Department of Highways to help bring about a workable solution to this annoying problem.

There is also a need for a development road from Highway 103 in the Honey Harbour area to the Big Chute which is the location of North America's only marine railroad. It is one of the many tourist attractions; as a matter of fact it is one of the many wonders of the province and of the world. Such a road would make it fairly easy for tourists to get into see the only marine railroad in existence.

Mr. Speaker, safety on our highways is of prime importance to all of us. Many serious and fatal accidents have occurred on the Orillia bypass at the West Street intersection, and I hope that I will be successful in convincing the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Gomme) of the urgency for a cloverleaf at this location, as well as adequate illumination at existing cloverleafs and intersections in my area where highway traffic is extremely heavy.

Simcoe county is proud of its school system. In the field of higher learning Barrie is the home of Georgian college, the new provincial technical arts and science college which is so necessary in our area and which has been enthusiastically accepted. I am happy to report, Mr. Speaker, that through the efforts of a group of public minded citizens and with the assistance of the town of Orillia, county of Simcoe and township municipalities, as well as with the financial assistance from many private individuals, we have purchased 200 acres of land and have raised in excess of one million dollars towards the establishment of Simcoe college which, according to plans, will be an arts university.

Simcoe college, affiliated with Waterloo Lutheran, will provide a vital service in the field of education to the residents of Simcoe, Dufferin and Ontario counties as well as the Parry Sound and Muskoka districts. In fact, Mr. Speaker, it could be of vital assistance and fill a vital need to many students throughout the province. I know, Mr. Speaker, that as my area grows, the Orillia campus will become so popular that it will eventually become an indepedent university under The Department of University Affairs. Never in the history of this region has any project stirred so many people and received such massive support.

You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that the site was dedicated last year at which time our Lieutenant-Governor, the Honourable Earl Rowe, officiated.

It is my sincere hope, Mr. Speaker, that Simcoe college will open its doors to students of our area in 1970 or 1971.

The opening of the new driver examination centre in the town of Orillia by the hon. Minister of Transport (Mr. Haskett) just a few weeks ago provides a much needed service in our area. I have already pointed out to the hon. Minister the need for similar facilities in the Midland area, and he has assured me that it is being assessed and will be given future consideration.

Mr. Speaker, Simcoe East over the past ten years has greatly improved its industrial base. Due to the federal designation of the town of Midland, its industrial growth has been phenomenal. Unfortunately, similar growth in the remainder of my riding has been less impressive. I am happy to note that the hon. Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Randall) has seen fit to make the EIO development programme applicable to Orillia township. But may I point out to him also, that the town of Orillia, according to statistics during the past three years, has shown little or no industrial growth, no increase in employment and in fact with the announced closing of Thermax, a branch of Moffats as of July this summer, 120 people will be out of work and will have to seek new employment elsewhere. I have been and will continue to press for at least temporary designation of the town of Orillia by the provincial government under its EIO programme.

In order to revitalize our industrial economy the provincial government must take immediate action.

For many years Simcoe East has been recognized as an enterprising agricultural area. I am aware, Mr. Speaker, of the many capital grants for farm improvements as well as junior farmer loans that have been made available to the farmers of Ontario through The Department of Agriculture and Food by our hon. Minister (Mr. Stewart). These have been most helpful. However, I would like to suggest to the hon. Minister and the members of the Cabinet for future consideration the establishment of a farm loan similar to the industrial development grant, whereby a young agriculturalist who has completed his studies or apprenticeship on a farm and is ready to start out for himself, might receive the necessary assistance.

I know Mr. Speaker, you are aware, that a modern dairy farm in our area fully equipped might cost anywhere from $50,000 to $100,000. Unless prospective farmers are offered assistance similar to that provided for industry the purchase of a modern farm is in most cases out of the question. Let us continue to encourage an even broader sense the man who is willing to invest in a more effective and efficient manner or supporting the agricultural industry in this great province of ours.

I noted with interest the comments of the hon. member for Halton East (Mr. Snow) concerning the new agricultural museum to be established at the Kelso conservation authority near Milton.

I might say here, Mr. Speaker, that I have been interested in collecting and restoring antique and classic cars as well as antique agricultural equipment for amost 25 years. I am a charter member and past president of the Ontario steam and antique preservers association, as well as the first president of the historical automobile society of Canada. For personal reasons, I have made an extensive study of many agricultural and transportation museums throughout Canada and the United States. Perhaps the most outstanding example is the western development museum at Saskatoon, operated by the province of Saskatchewan. There you can see a most comprehensive display of all types of equipment which played such an important part in the development of the Canadian west. And during the annual Pioneera held during the latter part of June each year, this equipment may be seen in operation, a pageant of early agricultural equipment and agricultural methods.

A similar type of show as stated by the hon. member is held at Milton, Ontario each Labour Day weekend. As a matter of fact, several years ago while at the museum in Saskatoon to witness their show and study their display, I met the hon. Minister of Agriculture and Food, who it turns out was there for the same purpose, to acquaint himself with their ideas and to see how they might be applied to a similar type of museum if it were established in the province of Ontario.

At that time, the hon. Minister of Agriculture and Food told me something of his plans as far as an Ontario agriculture museum was concerned and he asked me if our association, of which I was president at that time, would be interested in participating with the establishment and operation of the plan. With the consent of my directors and members I assured him of our club's support.

The Ontario steam and antique preservers' association hold their annual steam era at Milton, Ontario, fair grounds each Labour Day weekend. This year will mark the eighth annual presentation of antique agricultural equipment and methods in operation. Last year over 35,000 people witnessed the three-day demonstration, which indicates the tremendous interest in this type of display.

In my mind this museum would not duplicate the efforts of Upper Canada village, the Don Valley project and the many other private or municipally operated museums throughout the province.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): The older the better; *pithecanthropus erectus*.

Mr. G. E. Smith: Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that the hon. member might learn a few lessons from the past and benefit by that experience.

An hon. member: Well said!

Mr. G. E. Smith: This would probably be a static and mobile display of agricultural equipment from the earliest types to the more recent examples. Steam threshing, engines and various types of threshing methods from the flail to the earliest ground hog type of thresher to hand fed machines through to the early combines. It might also contain early gas engines or gas tractors; types of transportation, sir, used by rural residents such as buggies, wagons, and automobiles. One might see a sawmill in operation, a shingle mill and many other items related to the early life of the Ontario farm.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, there is a vacuum that could be filled by the establishment of this type of museum at the Kelso conservation authority adjacent to Highway 401 at Milton. The bill authorizing the establishment of this museum was passed at the last session of Parliament. I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, to note that in the estimates that this has not been included in the Budget for this year.

The province should take immediate steps to put the Ontario agricultural museum in operation, as each year many items of early equipment are lost to the scrap yards. I sincerely hope the Treasury board will see fit to include this in the future because I feel that with the assistance, advice and guidance of a few of the key members of the Ontario steam and antique preservers' association on the advisory board, I would visualize the economical, sensible approach to its establishment and to its operation.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay tribute to the care and treatment that is offered to the mentally retarded and emotionally disturbed at the Ontario hospital school in Orillia under the capable direction of the hon. Minister of Health. The Orillia school is the oldest facility for the mentally retarded in Canada. And while little of the original structure remains, its new buildings and modern methods of treatment have contributed immensely to the comfort, care, and in many instances the cure, of these unfortunate citizens. During the past year the Ontario hospital school in Orillia has instituted an out-patient clinic providing a consulting and assessment service to the community. In addition, three travelling clinics cover the northern parts of the province three times a year.

The latest figure from the Orillia hospital shows that 2,089 patients are there with a staff of 1,089. These figures do not include 218 staff and 380 patients accommodated in the Muskoka unit of the Ontario hospital school. I must point out, Mr. Speaker, that in addition to providing a vital service to the province and its residents, the Ontario hospital school in Orillia contributes to the economic stability of the riding. The annual payroll is $4,567,000 and the estimated amount spent for local purchases in my riding is estimated at $282,000. As the member for Simcoe East, I will continue to work with the members of the civil service who are caring for the mentally retarded at Orillia, and to continue to champion the efforts of The Department of Health in this area.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Save some beds for your colleagues.

Mr. G. E. Smith: We have room over there for you too, Eddie.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my thanks to all those who have welcomed me here as a new member. I take the responsibility of my riding seriously and am therefore grateful to all the hon. members of this House for their assistance and for their advice.

Mr. W. Newman (Ontario South): Mr. Speaker, in contributing to my first debate in this chamber, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate you on your election as Speaker of this great Legislature. Your integrity and ability are well known to us, as are your years of solid service, not only to the people of Grenville and Dundas counties but to the people of Ontario. May I say, Mr. Speaker, that it is people like you who inspire and enthuse such newcomers as myself toward an equally meaningful participation in this forum.

Mr. Speaker, unaccustomed as I am, I am prepared to go forward tonight. I understand many of the Opposition members are not prepared, so I was brought forward tonight to make my maiden speech in the House tonight and I deem it a great honour.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): They are just trying to outmanoeuvre the hon. member.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Oh go on. We are still covering up for Tories who are not ready to speak.

Mr. W. Newman: Mr. Speaker, may I say they have a lot to learn.

May I pay tribute as well to the mover and seconder of this debate—my fellow newcomers in this Legislature, the hon. members for Hamilton Mountain (Mr. J. R. Smith) and York East (Mr. Meen). It would be my earnest hope that my own thoughts in this debate might be accorded even a small part of the general enthusiasm which has already greeted their first words.

I have the honour to represent a riding that although new in name, is not unknown in the currents of Ontario history. Ontario South is steeped in stories of earlier days and the eminent historical authority Dr. William McKay notes that the first recognition of this area came some 300 years ago.

When the early explorers mapped out their fur trading routes to the west, French-

man's Bay was one of the first areas that was identified on any map. This area, the site of one of Ontario's first villages of 300 years ago, is now noted as being one of the fastest growing communities in the province and includes the areas of Frenchman's Bay, Bay Ridges, West Shore and Fairport Beach, plus others.

The world's largest nuclear power plant, which will put power into our grid system by as early as 1970, is a great geographical landmark there. As you drive east on Highway 401, as all of you do, and leave Toronto, you can see the white towers of this great nuclear hydro power plant on the shores of Lake Ontario. As work rapidly progresses on this project to bring nuclear power generating capacity to Ontario, it is already reaching toward the halfway mark of its $528-million budget.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Another Niagara.

Mr. W. Newman: Expenditures of this magnitude are indicative of this government's appreciation of nuclear technology and its determination to meet the electrical needs of the future.

Mr. Singer: The plant does not work, though.

Mr. Sargent: $600 million lost here.

Mr. W. Newman: Mr. Speaker, in all due deference to the gentlemen across the aisle here, I would suggest they come out and visit us and see just how it is going to work.

On this site, which but a few short years ago saw cattle grazing on the beautiful bluffs overlooking Lake Ontario, we now have this vast nuclear power plant, the largest in North America, under construction.

Overlooking the new nuclear power plant on the east is the thriving town of Ajax. This well-balanced, highly productive town boasts one of the best balanced assessments in Ontario of 52 per cent residential and 48 per cent industrial-commercial. The Ajax town fathers are to be commended for their great efforts over the years in taking what was a specially built ammunition-producing community in World War II and turning it into the model community with all the modern amenities that it has become today.

Farther east along Lake Ontario, Mr. Speaker, a traveller comes to the great historical town of Whitby, which has been the county town of Ontario county for many, many years. Whitby is also another of our province's rapidly growing centres with large growing industries, a fine harbour and every facility for making an attractive community in which to live and work. Whitby town, Mr. Speaker, as you may be aware, has recently greatly enlarged its boundaries through the amalgamation of the former Whitby township with Whitby town on January 1 of this year. This new town now incorporates the historic communities of Brooklin, Ashburn, Myrtle and the vast tract of rich growing agricultural land and beautiful scenery of the north with the urban area and industrial area in the south of the township.

And adjoining Whitby, we have the township of East Whitby, which is still partly urban and partly rural, with the city of Oshawa as its southern neighbour. This township with its historical agricultural land is slowly giving way to the advancement of the urban area to the south.

When we come back west along the riding, we come to the rural area of Pickering township, with its beautiful rolling agricultural land. Mr. Speaker, this is where I live, in this lovely area. Many families have farmed the same farms in this area for well over a century.

Pickering, because of its geographical relation to Toronto, was used as a staging or stopover place for people going to and from Toronto in earlier days. Many of our old-timers still enjoy telling stories of the pubs and stagecoach days. A township museum has been built to preserve as many of our early treasures as can be located.

With that brief tour of the great riding of Ontario South, which it is my honour to represent in this House, it is plain to see that there is no more varied riding in Ontario, truly representative of all parts of this province. It makes one aware, from personal experiences, of the great range of people in our province and the varied problems which occur throughout this vast province.

In one small riding, we have industrial balanced communities, we have agricultural communities, we have suburban communities, we have dormitory municipalities. While we are generally rather pleased with the progress we have achieved, I would like to mention one of the problems facing the township of Pickering. That famous township was mentioned at great length in this House less than a year ago, as a prime example of a dormitory municipality.

The township is one of our dormitory municipalities with 87 per cent residential development as against 13 per cent industrial-commercial assessment. Through the accident of geography, industry has seen fit to establish in Oshawa and in Scarborough, both east and west, but little as yet has found its way to Pickering. This is now happening, slowly but surely, but in the meantime, the beauties of the Pickering countryside have been found ideal for raising a family and—wisely or unwisely—thousands of homes have been built without the broader base of industrial assessment to support their services at a reasonable taxation level. It is my hope that in my days in this House, I may act on this problem to assist in finding a suitable solution.

I would like to talk for a few moments on one of the other big problems we have in this vast province of ours—a problem common to every province in Canada, I might add. As you may know, Mr. Speaker, I am in the agricultural business and have had experience in many phases of agriculture. I know from personal experience that our agricultural people, in many ways, are caught in what has become known as the cost-price squeeze. Our province, of course, has been in the forefront in recognizing this cost-price squeeze on the farmer and of doing something about it.

Mr. Singer: Such as?

Mr. W. Newman: Capital grants programme.

Most recently it has instituted the capital grants programme and this has been a great deal of help to the farmers of Ontario over the past year. I know that the problems facing our agricultural people are varied ones. I realize that the price the farmer receives for his beef is lower than it was 20 years ago. However, even with advanced technology, the cost of producing beef to the farmer has increased greatly and all farmers, including myself, are very much concerned.

Mr. Sargent: Bought a tractor lately?

Mr. W. Newman: Mr. Speaker, pardon me, I did not hear him.

I realize that the Ontario milk marketing board is a great step forward in the dairy industry, but it has left some problems yet to be worked out and I am sure they will be worked out. May I emphasize this, Mr. Speaker, the farmer never did want more than a fair return for his efforts, which I think he is entitled to. Since I am engaged in both the beef and dairy business, I feel I have a fair knowledge of these problems, and I could go on at great length outlining the difficulties we face, but I know this Conservative government is aware of those problems and is doing something about them in many ways.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): The farmers do not think so.

Mr. W. Newman: I am coming to the hon. member later, Mr. Speaker. He can just wait his turn, he is coming.

Mr. Speaker, it will be a great encouragement to Ontario farmers when our federal people finally recognize the great need for a national agricultural policy for eastern Canada and the rest of Canada, which will be uniform throughout the Dominion of Canada for all people. Mr. Speaker, not long ago, the Prime Minister of this province (Mr. Robarts) stated, and I quote from the Prime Minister of our great province:

> In Ontario, agriculture remains our biggest and most important industry. We must never be allowed to forget agriculture remains the base on which our whole economic structure is built, for without adequate supplies of food, we could not have developed into the industrial society which we now have, nor can we continue to maintain a flourishing economy.

Mr. Gaunt: Whose quote?

Mr. W. Newman: As a farmer, Mr. Speaker, and a representative of a mixed urban and rural riding, I would like to assure the Prime Minister the importance which he attaches to the agriculture industry is deeply and sincerely appreciated by the farmers of this province. This acknowledgment is hardly necessary, however, since action speaks louder than words and the election results of October 17 last, proved beyond a shadow of doubt that the farmers of Ontario have the utmost confidence in the leadership of the hon. Prime Minister. Mr. Speaker, I feel the results of that election would also indicate that the Prime Minister knew what he was doing when he selected as Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. Stewart) a successful farmer in his own right.

Mr. Speaker, in preparing these remarks I thought it would be advisable to browse through *Hansard* of last year, to see what was said in the House during the debate on the estimates of The Department of Agriculture

and Food in the House. It was quite revealing. I was somewhat surprised to note that the critic of the official Opposition, who farms and is a graduate of the University of Guelph, the present member for Huron-Bruce, confined his criticism of the government to some few pages of *Hansard,* while the farm critic for the socialist party rambled on for many pages. I was even more amazed to note that the critic for the socialist party was the representative—and I am sorry he is not here—of that great rural riding of York South (Mr. MacDonald)—

An hon. member: Oh, he knows all about it.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. W. Newman: —and his vast knowledge of the agricultural field has apparently been acquired from the written word. Yet, Mr. Speaker, we find this hon. gentleman saying on page 759 of *Hansard,* and I quote from the hon. leader of the unofficial Opposition, and I am sorry he is not here to hear this:

> I would like to say, right at the outset, that if you wanted any further evidence that this Minister—

And he was referring to the Minister of Agriculture and Food:

> —is incompetent to continue to hold his position, we have it here tonight.

This was said, Mr. Speaker, by the leader of the unofficial Opposition. I suggest that the leader of the socialist party is the one who is incompetent to have any opinions on this subject. I would like to remind the hon. member for York South about these words today. And I would simply add this, Mr. Speaker, apparently I am not alone in that opinion. We now have further evidence, evidence from the farmers of this province as recorded on October 17 last at the polls. On the basis of that evidence, I suggest the incompetency of the hon. member for York South and the socialist party in the field of agriculture has been decisively illustrated.

Mr. Speaker, in referring to the tractor demonstrations of 1966—

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): We are all farmers at heart.

Mr. W. Newman: Yes, Mr. Speaker, he can learn a lot, he has a lot to learn, that hon. gentleman from wherever he is from.

Mr. Speaker, in referring to the tractor demonstration of 1966, the hon. member for York South had this to say:

> The farmers had to come year after year after year and got no action from this government. Finally in an act of desperation, as people who are not normally demonstrative people, they had to take to the highways because this was the only way.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. W. Newman: Mr. Speaker, I am certainly glad to see that the unofficial Opposition has a part in my remarks because I intend to carry on a little bit longer.

On this subject I would like to quote from an article written by the editor of the *Rejoynder,* which claims to be the official newsletter of the Ontario Young Democrats. This is what Stephen Langdon, the editor, had to say in the July, 1966, issue:

> The Ontario farmers' union revolt must be seen in the light of the above discussions. The tractors are being driven on the highways by small producers who need higher subsidies in order to make ends meet. The efficient family farms which specialize in dairy production are satisfied. It can be seen then that the goal of the Ontario farmers' union is a continuation of the inefficiency noted above. To give in to their demands, would be, I believe, short-sighted and foolish.

Mr. Lewis: We have revoked his membership.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): I bet you have, too.

Mr. W. Newman: Mr. Speaker, I am glad to see that these hon. gentlemen over here change people all the time because they do not know where they are going.

And then he goes on, Mr. Speaker—and I hope the agricultural experts on the socialist benches understand what he says—this is from the same fellow, the same man:

> Call me a Tory if you like, but in this particular instance I believe that William Stewart is correct in his refusal to act.

Mr. P. J. Yakabuski (Renfrew South): Lawlor, get out of that seat.

Mr. W. Newman: Thus, Mr. Speaker, while it is perfectly clear that the leader of the socialist party does not represent the views of our farmers, on this particular issue at least he apparently failed to reflect the views of his own party members as well.

Mr. Yakabuski: Oh, not a party at all.

Mr. W. Newman: Mr. Speaker, I learned also that the NDP critic was particularly

concerned about the alleged failure of our agricultural policies in eastern Ontario. As you well know, Mr. Speaker, eastern Ontario gave him his answer on October 17 also. Mr. Speaker, every rural seat was carried by a supporter of the government throughout the rest of rural Ontario.

Mr. Yakabuski: Where is Pilkey? Where is Pilkey?

Mr. W. Newman: The socialists received the same treatment. The result, Mr. Speaker, is that today in this House they have not got a single representative who can speak with any personal, practical knowledge of farming or the problems faced by farmers.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): I pulled some weeds once.

Mr. W. Newman: Mr. Speaker, he has been pulling weeds for many years. He has brought them all down here.

Mr. Speaker: Order. State your point. Order. State your point.

Mr. M. Makarchuk (Brantford): A point of order, Mr. Speaker. The statement made by the hon. member that we do not have anybody capable of speaking on agriculture, I think, is a bit of a slur against us, particularly in view of—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. The member is quite in order in his remarks and if those are his views he is entitled to place them before the House. I would ask the members to kindly give this new member the same courtesy that they have had earlier this session and will expect later in their maiden speech.

Mr. W. Newman: Mr. Speaker, may I say this to the hon. gentleman who just stood up: I have words of wisdom for him later.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for York South decided, and wisely I think, to select a new agriculture critic. It must have—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: They are concrete farmers.

Mr. W. Newman: —been somewhat of a problem for him. However, he found that the hon. member for Brantford had spent a couple of years on the farm beat for the Brantford *Expositor*. Mr. Speaker, we can all rejoice in this House in the knowledge that the socialists have an agriculture authority. To this instant expert and his friends on the socialist benches I would like to say this, as a farmer and a member of the government party: Please do not ask me to sit quietly through hours of criticism of this government's farm policy and charges of incompetency on the part of our hon. Minister of Agriculture and Food—

Mr. Sargent: Go home and milk the cows.

Mr. W. Newman: —when not a single one of you—

Mr. Yakabuski: Not a single one.

Mr. W. Newman: —including your agricultural critic can tell a field of barley from a field of rye without a programme.

An hon. member: A field of barley, eh? Elmer, a field of barley, eh?

Mr. W. Newman: Mr. Speaker, in conclusion on this matter of agriculture, I would like to go on to predict that in the future, for the well-being of the people of Ontario as well as the people of Canada, we must have a strong national agricultural policy, if we are to survive as a nation in the agricultural field, as a nation which is a producer of agricultural—

Mr. Yakabuski: You cannot get it out of Pearson.

Mr. W. Newman: Mr. Speaker, I am glad to see the leader of the unofficial Opposition return, because my next remarks in a few moments will be directed to him.

Being a member of that great Progressive Conservative Party under the vigorous and able leadership of the hon. Prime Minister, who believes in the free enterprise system which we have in Ontario today, may I go on from here and refer to another matter. I am referring to *Hansard*, regarding the remarks of our socialist friend regarding the ugly giants of the industrial age, who he maintains do nothing but fleece the people of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, being a member of this government which still believes in the free enterprise system—in that we must produce the wealth, we must produce the income, before we spend it—I need not go on to quote you examples of Great Britain, Sweden and other countries which have seen what it has done—

Mr. Yakabuski: Not Sweden, please; not Sweden, please! It is terrible; not any more; no more of Sweden, please.

Mr. W. Newman: Mr. Speaker, as I said before I need not quote these examples, which have seen what it has done to their country, by spending what they do not have.

Mr. Yakabuski: Sixty thousand miles of unpaved roads.

Mr. W. Newman: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Yakabuski: Terrible!

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): This debate is getting very spirited.

Mr. W. Newman: Mr. Speaker, I would like to quote from *Fortune* magazine an article on, and I quote, "The Second Battle of Britain," in the February issue, speaking of government intervention in the economy, and I quote:

> These errors were not all sins that originated with Prime Minister Harold Wilson's Labour government, yet the present government has probably exceeded any other in the ineptness of its interference, in its pre-emption of investment capacity, in its sundering of communication with the business community, and its failure to act equitably despite all its talk of equality towards business as well as labour.

Mr. MacDonald: Who said that?

Mr. W. Newman: Mr. Speaker, may I requote the article—

Mr. MacDonald: Take it as read.

Mr. W. Newman: Mr. Speaker, may I suggest to the leader of the unofficial Opposition, if he will listen, he will learn where it came from—from *Fortune* magazine. May I go on, Mr. Speaker? I am sure the hon. unofficial leader of the Opposition will get my point in a few moments. Quoting again from the same article:

> The government too often acts out of an exaggerated sense of fairness.

And I am quoting from the man who said it, Sir Anthony Reay Geddes, managing director of Dunlop Rubber.

An hon. member: A noted authority.

Mr. W. Newman: Mr. Speaker, if these people know anything about Dunlop tires I am sure they should be noted authorities. He adds, Mr. Speaker:

> It seems natural to me that Tories and socialists should disagree over the way the wealth is distributed—

Mr. Speaker, this is my point:

> —but there should be some kind of concensus of the way wealth is created, and that is what has been missing.

I refer, Mr. Speaker, to the socialist benches when I say that. Mr. Speaker, I would like today—

Mr. Yakabuski: Benches? What benches?

Mr. W. Newman: Mr. Speaker, I want to deal with the personal project of the hon. unofficial leader of the Opposition. I would like today to take up something which has long been the bane of the third party's existence, the Bell Telephone Company of Canada.

Mr. Yakabuski: Well, I am getting out.

Mr. W. Newman: Incidentally, I have no shares or financial interest in this company in any way, shape or form.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Have you a relative?

Mr. W. Newman: No, my brother-in-law is not a member either, Mr. Speaker, I might say. Except the fact that I have to pay my telephone account like other Canadians do. I pay my bills normally when I can afford to pay them, Mr. Speaker.

This company is limited to the amount of profit it can make, during the period when the prices of most goods are rising—and I say this for the unofficial leader of the unofficial Opposition, because he goes on and on and on in *Hansard* from year to year, year in and year out.

Mr. Speaker, I took it upon myself to get some facts and figures so the true facts and figures will be presented to this House, not in a peremptory way, but the facts and figures as they are presented to the Canadian people and as they should know them. During a period when the prices of most goods and services were rising shapely, this company has found many ways to resist the inflationary pressure, and at the same time to add nearly two million telephones and double its total assets. As a matter of fact, with the exception of some rather substantial long-distance rate reductions, the basic rate structure of Bell Canada has not been changed since 1958, ten years ago.

Mr. MacDonald: What about the profits?

Mr. W. Newman: Mr. Speaker, I will come to that. If they would just take their time, they will hear this.

Mr. MacDonald: What are you talking about? Their rate structure was changed in 1966.

Mr. E. A. Winkler (Grey South): It is his maiden speech.

Mr. W. Newman: Mr. Speaker, I cannot hear the official leader of the unofficial Opposition. What did he say?

An hon. member: Put "inaudible." Carry on.

Mr. MacDonald: I am just correcting your facts.

Mr. W. Newman: Mr. Speaker, if he wants to correct my facts, I would suggest he turn to the annual report of the Bell Telephone Company, which came out last week.

Mr. MacDonald: I suggest the member should look elsewhere for some of the facts.

Mr. W. Newman: Mr. Speaker, I have checked my facts and I—Mr. Speaker, I would like to say it but I will not.

Mr. Speaker, I have checked my facts and I have gone to the trouble of checking my facts. I am sick and tired of people in this House distorting facts and figures to suit their own political aims.

Mr. MacDonald: If the member says they have not changed since 1958, his facts are wrong.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. W. Newman: Mr. Speaker, if he wishes to ask me a question let him stand up and I will sit down. I cannot hear him. Does he want the facts or does he not want the facts, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Sopha: One of the first things to learn here is to take no guff from him.

Mr. W. Newman: Mr. Speaker, one of the other factors I should mention is the close relationship between Bell and its research and manufacturing associate, Northern Electric Company. This integration of research, manufacturing and service activities is a prime factor in the provision of the high quality services at a reasonable cost.

There are of course many other examples one could quote of Canadian institutions which have made and are making significant contributions to our national progress. I am not here to promote the Bell Telephone Company.

Mr. MacDonald: The member is, he does not know it but he is.

Mr. Singer: No, do not take that.

Mr. W. Newman: Mr. Speaker, if he would only sit and listen, he would be doing fine.

I repeat, I am not here to promote the Bell Telephone, I do not now, nor have I ever owned one share of stock, as I said before. However, public criticism of Bell seems to be an increasingly popular pastime these days so the occasional word of commendation should not be amiss.

This company is owned and operated by Canadians and serves some three million customers in Ontario, Quebec, Labrador and parts of the Northwest Territories. This company makes a vast contribution to the Canadian economy as an employer, taxpayer and purchaser. Let me give members a few examples from the recently released 1967 annual report, which just came out last week.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): It is controlled by AT and T, for the members' information.

Mr. W. Newman: Mr. Speaker, this just shows the incompetency of these people who do not realize the facts and figures. If you get the facts and figures you will find it is less than 7 per cent. Why do you not check them, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. MacDonald: The biggest shareholder, and they control all the little ones.

Mr. W. Newman: Mr. Speaker, may I continue with my speech?

The total capital investment of the Bell Telephone Company of Canada is over $3 billion. The total taxes paid in 1967 were over $130 million.

Mr. MacDonald: Does the member know how much they were exempt?

Mr. W. Newman: Mr. Speaker, the reason they were exempt from certain taxes is because they have a limitation on the profits they can make, which has been brought about by the federal government at Ottawa

which has no control in the province of Ontario.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. W. Newman: That is right. Now get facts and figures!

Mr. Speaker—

Mr. MacDonald: His facts and figures, Mr. Speaker!

Mr. W. Newman: No, my facts and figures, Mr. Speaker, come from the annual report.

Mr. Speaker, may I continue?

The number of employees employed by the Bell in 1967 were 38,123 employees. Of this total, 20,592 were employed in the province of Ontario. The payroll of the Bell Telephone Company in 1967 was over $236 million. Of this amount $126 million was paid to Ontario residents.

Mr. Sargent: How did they get into the act?

Mr. MacDonald: They violated the law established.

Mr. W. Newman: Mr. Speaker, around us today events are occurring and conditions coming into being which constitute a serious threat to private enterprise and its concepts; and sometimes it seems almost immoral to make a profit any more. Today, with the vanishing respect of private enterprise—in fact more than ever opinion polls show the public to be actively indifferent, seeing no great need to protect the concept—interference by government in business is advocated when any reason, however nebulous, can be advanced in support of such action. The *Globe and Mail,* in a different context but nevertheless very aptly, said, and I quote:

> Yet there are Canadians who court this situation. Some of them are those who simply rush upon whatever is regarded as reform because they like to be progressive. They do not much notice whether the progress is towards heaven or hell.

But no, we must reform.

For example, there has been severe criticism lately of the Bell Telephone and some there are who advocate various things as applied to this company among others. Over the years Canadian businessmen have demonstrated again and again that they have the resourcefulness and the energy to build top calibre industrial and financial institutions.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. W. Newamn: Mr. Speaker, if they are talking about monoply they should look to Ottawa and see the facts and figures, how they are limited on their profits. Do not talk to me about it.

Mr. Speaker, under the stimulus of private enterprise the companies have prospered and have made major contributions to the economic and social development of Canada.

An hon. member: Lots of phone calls!

Mr. MacDonald: Like Hollinger!

Mr. W. Newman: Mr. Speaker, I suggest they pay their telephone accounts.

Mr. Speaker, the Bell Telephone Company of Canada is one example of this, as a company that has so operated, as a public utility business, that Canadians have been assured of telecommunications service second to none in the world.

Contributing to the growth and development of Bell in recent years has been its firm adherence to sound financial principles, a willingness to take a justified risk and a customer-oriented approach to service. The percentage of shareholders of the Bell Telephone Company residing in Canada is 97.8 per cent.

Mr. Speaker, the percentage of the shares that are held in Canada is 94.9 per cent.

Mr. MacDonald: They certainly have the hon. member brainwashed.

Mr. W. Newman: I do not know where he got the figures from American Telephone and Telegraph Corporation—

Mr. Shulman: The control is still in the United States, by AT and T.

Mr. W. Newman: Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the hon. member for High Park check his figures rather than making statements.

Mr. Speaker, the construction expenditures of the Bell Telephone Company in 1967 exceeded $312 million. Research expenditures by Bell in 1967 were $41.5 million. Let us analyze some of these figures for a moment. Mr. Speaker, 94.9 per cent of the shareholders of Bell Telephone Company of Canada are held in Canada by Canadians.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. W. Newman: Mr. Speaker, and if I may interject here for a moment and I address my remarks to you Mr. Speaker, I hope.

All I can say is this, Mr. Speaker, that the unofficial Opposition does not dig into facts and figures because they want to come in here and they want to derogate industry I do not care what industry it is. I pick one because I am not a shareholder in this industry. Mr. Speaker, I resent their implications, because they do not have their facts and figures and because they are trying to sell us a bill of goods.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: Check with the hon. member for Wellington-Dufferin (Mr. Root), this sounds like activated sludge.

Mr. W. Newman: Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether he said activated sludge or not, I did not hear him.

Mr. Winkler: He knows the meaning of that word.

Mr. W. Newman: Mr. Speaker, because this is the way that I am built, I believe in sticking to facts and figures and telling the truth. I am a new member in this House, I have got a lot to learn. But, Mr. Speaker, if we are going to make progress in this great province of ours, then we have to look at each other and look at ourselves and learn to tell the truth in this House.

Mr. Speaker, I defy any member of any Opposition party to dispute my figures. I defy them to take my figures and deny them.

An hon. member: This is his first year, he is a mixed up kid.

Mr. W. Newman: Mr. Speaker, it is good to see so many of the unofficial Opposition and official Opposition picking on me.

We encourage Canadian participation in investments of our country and Canadians have invested vast sums with the Bell Telephone Company.

We talk about return on our investment. Socialists talk about the big giants of industry. What about the man who bought a share of Bell Telephone Company stock one year ago at approximately $50—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. W. Newman: Mr. Speaker, it is quite obvious that somebody else has read the report, I am glad to see that.

On today's market it is around $43, a loss of $7 a share. The return to that man who invested $50 in a share of stock is approximately 5 per cent and a lot less than that in many respects. And I am talking about the average individual Canadian who owns a lot of shares in the Bell Telephone Company. He also takes the risk of the stock going off or dropping. Why I can go around the corner to a local bank and get 5 per cent guaranteed interest without any risk. Can my socialist friend tell me about the big giants they referred to when they refer to Bell so often and so many times in *Hansard* I would not care to mention? I would like to show you some indication of the impact the Bell Telephone Company has on the Canadian economy. As I said before, the Bell of Canada has 38,123 employees.

Mr. Singer: That was the last page.

Mr. W. Newman: Mr. Speaker, may I go on? I am only quoting this figure again: Northern Electric, which is a wholly owned subsidiary, has 22,538 employees, and more than 5,000 Canadian businesses who sell their products to the Bell employ between 10,000 and 15,000 people. The total payroll for Bell Canada, Northern Electric and their suppliers is estimated at between $450 million and $500 million.

An hon. member: That is enough to pay for medicare.

Mr. W. Newman: Mr. Speaker, the average cost per monthly service for people in Ontario and Quebec has dropped from 4.75 hours of work to pay for a month's bill to 2.3 hours of work to pay for one month's telephone account. The former figure was in 1945 and the latter in 1967. On this basis, the Bell Telephone, taking into consideration rising costs and all other factors, has basically reduced the cost of its improved service to the customer.

I could point out—and this is a very important factor, Mr. Speaker, that I would like everybody in this House to hear—I could point out to the critics that the rate per month with 100 local calls is the cheapest in the world in Ontario and Quebec—the cheapest in the world.

An hon. member: What about that?

Mr. W. Newman: What about it, Mr. Speaker? The cheapest in the world.

Let us get our facts straight before we go sounding off about big business and what they are trying to do to people. Let us get these facts straight. Having pointed out in

some detail the tremendous number of tax dollars paid by this company—which goes back into the government's hands—how this company contributes to our economy, may I point out the Premier's words, and I quote from prior to the election campaign:

> We must first produce the wealth and then distribute it on an equitable basis to all the people of Ontario.

Mr. Sargent: Who said that?

Mr. W. Newman: Mr. Speaker, in so many words, the Prime Minister of Ontario said this. And if the hon. member would only read in the paper what goes on he would know.

I cannot emphasize too much that we must make it before we spend it, or suffer the consequences, and I refer to countries like England, Sweden and other countries. We have to make it before we spend it. Let us not forget we do not want to put our children's children into so much debt that they will not be able to carry on a normal life. Let us not forget this.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. W. Newman: Mr. Speaker, I am sure the hon. member for Grey South will look after that deficit for us very handily next year.

We have an obligation to our young people, a very strong obligation, to pay our own bills and not to put an increasingly heavy burden of debt on them. Our people, including the great body of our youth, and I include the great body of our youth because they are the—

Mr. Singer: We will not forget them.

Mr. W. Newman: Mr. Speaker, apparently they have.

They are simply asking for the opportunity to develop their God-given talents in our democratic society. They are not asking to be spoon-fed, as was mentioned earlier here by a previous speaker; they are not asking to be spoon-fed, they want incentive, they want rewards for effort.

At the same time, we fully recognize our social responsibilities towards those who, through no fault of their own, are not able to look after themselves, but we favour the individualistic approach, not the universal compulsory approach of the socialists. Our citizens are proud of Ontario, not only as a place to stand, but a place to grow and mature.

Mr. Speaker, let us not lose sight of our free enterprise system and the right of the individual to work and think for himself. Let us not take away the few freedoms we have left. If we are going to be the great province of the great nation which will one day lead the world, let us not make the mistake of choosing the wrong path on which to walk.

Mr. Speaker, under the leadership of this government, which will celebrate a quarter century of continuous service to Ontario this year, we have progressed to become the biggest and wealthiest province in Canada. These things do not just happen. They have to be planned. Sometimes it is necessary to take an unpopular stand for the long-range good of the province. This takes—

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Economic planning!

Mr. W. Newman: All kinds of planning. Mr. Speaker, this takes intestinal fortitude and this is something this party has. It does not play on the emotions of the moment for personal gain. But this party stands strongly for the interests—

Mr. Singer: Stands four square for right and justice, motherhood and senior citizens.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: There are enough squares over there now.

Mr. W. Newman: Mr. Speaker, I would say they sit four score tall instead of four square tall, as my friend from the official Opposition said.

But this party stands strongly for the interests of well-being of all the people of Ontario and Canada, all the people. I am proud to be part of this great Conservative Party, which has and which will continue to mould a great future for our province and our nation. Thank you.

Mr. R. G. Hodgson (Victoria-Haliburton) moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we will resume this debate.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 10:50 o'clock, p.m.

ERRATUM

Thursday, March 7, 1968, Afternoon session

Page	*Column*	*Line*	*Correction*
545	1	26	Change to read: **An hon. member:** What about the medical school?

Legislature of Ontario Debates

No. 23



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

First Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Wednesday, March 13, 1968

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1968

5

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Wednesday, March 13, 1968

Welcoming "Timmy" for 1968, Mr. Dymond, Mr. Nixon, Mr. MacDonald 725

Question to Mr. Grossman re the Don jail, Mr. Sargent 726

Question to Mr. Grossman re paroles, Mr. Shulman 726

Questions to Mr. Grossman re bail, Mr. Sargent 726

Questions to Mr. Welch re the LCBO and LLBO, Mr. Ben 727

Questions to Mr. Wishart re bail, Mr. Deans 727

Question to Mr. Wishart re the death of Arthur Louis Cuccia, Mr. De Monte 728

Question to Mr. Robarts re the select committee on electoral reform, Mr. Lawlor 728

Questions to Mr. Bales re the workmen's compensation board, Mr. Lawlor 728

Question to Mr. Haskett re the recall of automobiles for repair, Mr. Young 729

Question to Mr. Davis re school boards, Mr. Paterson 729

Question to Mr. Simonett re flood relief, Mr. Paterson 729

Question to Mr. Davis re the student award programme, Mr. T. P. Reid 729

Questions to Mr. Gomme re the Pickerel River bridge, Mr. Martel 730

Question to Mr. Welch re translation services, Mr. Peacock 730

Questions to Mr. Stewart re the committee on farm income, Mr. Sargent 731

Question to Mr. Gomme re highways, Mr. Sargent 731

Question to Mr. Davis re community colleges, Mr. Sargent 731

Question to Mr. Gomme re Highway 401, Mr. Innes 732

Questions to Mr. Simonett re Douglas Point plant, Mr. Sargent 733

Questions to Mr. Wishart re the late Harold E. Rider, Mr. Shulman 734

Resumption of the debate on the Speech from the Throne, Mr. MacKenzie, Mr. Makarchuk, Mr. W. Hodgson, Mr. T. P. Reid, Mr. Stokes 737

Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Stokes, agreed to 758

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Dymond, agreed to 758

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 13, 1968

The House met at 2:30 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are always pleased to have visitors to the Legislature and today we welcome as guests, students from the following schools: In the east gallery, the Prindale Gardens public school of Scarborough, Huron-Bruce district high school from Wingham; in the west gallery the Lord Lansdowne public school, Toronto; and in both galleries the Richard W. Scott Catholic school, Toronto and under the Speaker's gallery, West Waterloo-Lutheran Progressive Conservative club.

And at 3:15 p.m. we will be joined in the west gallery by pupils from Park Street collegiate institute in Orillia; and at 3:30 p.m. perhaps by students from another school.

I am sure we welcome these young people.

Mr. G. Ben (Humber): Mr. Speaker, it may interest the pupils from the Richard W. Scott school to know that the picture of the man after whom their school is named, who was a Speaker of this House, hangs in the west lounge right by the door. Perhaps they may want to take a look at his photograph.

Mr. Speaker: Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

Before the orders of the day I would like to direct to the House, and particularly to the member for Humber some remarks with respect to a question raised by him by way of a point of order last week, with respect to questions directed to one Minister and answered by another. I would say the questions for the notice paper are customarily directed to the Ministry as a whole and while private notice questions before the orders of the day are usually directed to a specific Minister, it is obvious that the Cabinet as a whole is responsible for the proper furnishing of information, and the Minister who is responsible for the subject matter of the question is obviously the one to answer.

In the recent instance where this point was raised by the member for Humber it is apparent that part of the question which had been asked is the responsibility of the Minister of Reform Institutions (Mr. Grossman), not the Attorney General (Mr. Wishart), and should have been so directed.

The Minister of Reform Institutions therefore, was quite proper in answering the question which was the responsibility of his department.

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, I would like to have the privilege of introducing to you, and through you to the hon. members of this House, a visitor who comes to see us once every year. His name is Kevin Lahn and he is the Timmy of 1968.

Mr. Speaker, Timmy this year hails from Hanover. He has already been properly met by his member, the hon. member for Grey South (Mr. Winkler) and I am afraid he probably got a little indoctrination, at least I hope he did.

He is a very bright young fellow and I know he is being started out in the right way.

He has a far more important function this year, sir. He is in grade 3 and is just nine years old. He is very interested in model building, in drawing, and in carpentry. He has been a cub scout and was a member of the Fifth Maple Leaf troop in Toronto. He is a great hockey enthusiast and I do not think it amiss to say, sir, that his team is the Boston Bruins. I do not think that anybody in Toronto will deny him that this year anyway.

Of course his hero is Eddie Shack, and I think a good hero indeed.

Timmy wants to be a policeman and he is aiming, I think, in the footsteps of his dad, who was in that profession for a time. Unfortunately, two years ago, Timmy had a misfortune and had to lose a leg, but he is overcoming that, and I think in this way alone is a tremendous stimulus to all of us here who are much more richly blessed.

Mr. Speaker, as you know, Timmy represents the crippled children of Ontario, but more he symbolizes the hope all of them have

of being helped to achieve their full potential, no matter how great or how limited their physical resources may be.

We can help them attain that hope by all of us pitching in and doing our share to make successful the Easter seal campaign, which Timmy will officially kick off tomorrow.

I am quite sure, sir, that you, with all of us, welcome Timmy to this august House and we will with you follow his career, which we know will end in success only.

He is accompanied by Mr. Clark, the representative of the Ontario society for crippled children, which is doing such tremendous work on behalf of these children in our province.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, so that Kevin can have the advantage of influences from both sides, I would certainly like to welcome him on behalf of the official Opposition, and those of us here are great admirers of the work of the association for the assistance of the crippled young people in this province, and we wish them the greatest success in their present campaign.

We know that the people of the province will turn out generously in support of the type of assistance that is so desperately needed by so many young people in Ontario.

On behalf of our group here, I send the best wishes to a handsome visitor and wish him the best.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, just in case Kevin has not learned up in Hanover that there is a push and pull that goes three ways, not just two ways in Ontario politics, I would like to join with the hon. Minister and the leader of the Opposition in adding my words of congratulation.

I must say, Mr. Speaker, there are few occasions in the activities of this House which move me more than the annual visit of Timmy, because we have a magnificent example of a young person taking on a task which I suspect most of us—if we look back at the tender age of nine, for example—would have been absolutely terrified by. I am amazed at the aplomb and the efficiency with which they carry out their task on behalf of all other crippled children.

I, too, want to join the hon. Minister and the leader of the Opposition in expressing my congratulations and best wishes for Kevin's work.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): Now, Mr. Speaker, on a note quite not as cheerful, in answer to the question asked of the hon. member for Grey-Bruce (Mr. Sargent) the other day of the hon. Attorney General, with reference to the length of time those inmates for whom bail had not been set had been held in the Metropolitan Toronto jail, I offered at that time to get the information for the hon. member and I have it here.

The first group on remand with no bail set: one week—14 males and two females; two weeks—ten males and two females; three weeks—five males; four weeks—seven males; five weeks—two males; six weeks—one male.

Now the second group, that is for sentence with no bail set: seven weeks—one male and two females; eight weeks—one male; 12 weeks—one male; 14 weeks—one male. And finally, from the high court: no bail set—37 males and no females.

All of these figures are as of Thursday, March 7, the day the hon. member asked the question. I suppose, Mr. Speaker, it is in order then to move for the discharge of question 31 from the order paper.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for High Park on Monday last asked a supplementary question and I promised to get it answered. I quote the question:

> Will the Minister inform me, and I am sure he will not be able to today, how many paroles were granted in the past year where there were other charges pending?

Mr. Speaker, I have been advised by the parole board that in starting to go through the files this morning they have already found three such cases. However, they also advised me that it will be necessary to examine approximately 1,000 individual files for this information, that is for the past year. In view of this, I wonder whether the hon. member still wishes me to proceed with this examination, which will entail a great deal of work on the part of an already overworked staff. If the answer is in the affirmative, I am afraid I will have to ask the hon. member to place this question on the order paper so that my staff will be able to examine these voluminous files when time permits.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): Mr. Speaker, through you to the Minister. I just wanted to be sure that there had been such cases and I am quite satisfied, thank you.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Mr. Speaker, through you to the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions: Will he assure the House that people who have been held up to six weeks without bail have had access to an ombudsman, or legal aid insofar as their rights are concerned?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, they all have access to legal aid. I mentioned this the other day. They are advised of this; a notice to this effect is posted in all of the institutions across the province.

Mr. Sargent: Will the Minister advise, Mr. Speaker, how this young lady could be held seven days without charge?

Mr. Speaker: Order, this is not supplementary to the original question, and if the member wishes to ask that question I will be glad to have him place it tomorrow. The member for Humber has the floor.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the hon. Provincial Secretary, notice of which has been given. In view of the number of newspaper reports in this connection, is the LCBO giving consideration to permitting cocktail lounges to serve draft beer; and if so, when will this come into effect?

Hon. R. S. Welch (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, the liquor licence board of the province has lifted restrictions as to the place for the sale of draft beer; this is already done and was done as of February 22 last.

Mr. Ben: Will the Minister accept a supplementary question?

Since the liquor control board is permitting the serving and the sale of draft beer in cocktail lounges, will any consideration be given to implementing the reverse process, that is permitting the sale of liquor in beer parlours so that people can have a drink at a reasonable cost, without having to go into a fashionable cocktail lounge?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Well Mr. Speaker, there are several ways in which one who owns an establishment in this province can have the privilege of serving liquor by the glass, and we have certain classifications of establishments which are licensed for this purpose, and if a person who has a public house licence also has accommodation that would qualify, they should apply to the liquor licence board for a review of the accommodation to see whether or not, by virtue of the regulations as they are now printed, he can have this privilege.

I do not know further what I can do. We have what is called a cocktail lounge, Mr. Speaker, and we have a dining lounge and we have club licences and these are the classifications and the regulations are spelled out as to the licensing of these facilities.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Attorney General.

Is he aware that Mr. Louis McIntosh, of Hamilton, spent 136 days in jail, unable to raise bail of $1,000, and then the charge was withdrawn by the Crown?

Will the Attorney General immediately implement the recommendations made by the McRuer commission about bail, by having rules promulgated pursuant to section 424 of the criminal code for the courts having jurisdiction in criminal matters in the province of Ontario?

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I am aware of the facts of this matter and I think that in order to answer the questions properly I should relate them briefly to the House.

I am advised that Mr. Louis McIntosh, aged 39, was first arrested on October 30 on a charge of contributing to juvenile delinquency. Bail was set at $2,000 and one surety. The case was remanded to November 14 and on this date bail was reduced to $1,000 and one surety. On November 23, the charge of carnal knowledge was laid—the nature of which I do not feel that I should go into, in fairness to McIntosh.

I mention that because it relates to the matter of bail and to the release of a person charged with such an offence.

On December 1, McIntosh was committed for trial by a magistrate and bail was continued in the amount of $1,000 and one surety. The accused then brought an application for a writ of *habeas corpus* which was dismissed on February 23 of this year. On March 11, 1968, McIntosh was acquitted of the charge after the court had heard the testimony of the witnesses.

Mr. Speaker, I comment here briefly to say that because of the nature of the charge, the requirement as to bail and surety was reasonable. I submit that it is very essential that there be precautions taken with respect to the release of this man and I do not wish to detail the circumstances of that very serious charge.

With respect to the rules which are set out in section 424 of the criminal code, they do

not refer to rules of a substantive nature; that section itself refers to procedural rules with respect to forms and applications and that sort of thing which may be made by the judges of the court relating to various matters, one of which is bail. I am further advised that McIntosh had counsel at all times and that at no time throughout this matter was any application made to have the bail reduced.

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent): Mr. Speaker, I have a question before the orders of the day to ask of the hon. Minister of Agriculture and Food, of which I have already given notice.

Will the Minister advise if his department has made any progress to continue the operation of the sugar refinery in the city of Chatham?

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): Mr. Speaker, I wish I could tell the hon. member that the matter has been resolved satisfactorily. I cannot at this moment, but I can tell him that the whole matter is under very active consideration and I hope to have a positive announcement one way or the other very shortly.

Mr. Spence: Mr. Speaker, I have a question to ask of the Minister of Lands and Forests, of which I have already given notice.

Will the Minister advise the House if his department has enforced the eight-inch size limit in the harvesting of perch in Lake Erie during 1967?

Hon. R. Brunelle (Minister of Lands and Forests): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. member for Kent if I could take this as notice? This morning we were kept quite busy, along with our personnel of the game and fish committee, but tomorrow I will have an answer.

Mr. D. M. De Monte (Dovercourt): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the hon. Attorney General, notice of which has already been given.

Is it the intention of the Attorney General to order an inquest into the death of Arthur Louis Cuccia?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, this matter has not been referred to me for any decision and I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that you recognize that criminal charges have been laid in this matter and any inquest would ordinarily await the determination of those charges. There are three other persons who survived the incident and are now charged before the courts with break and enter, intent while armed, and also possession of burglar tools—quite serious criminal charges.

It is our usual procedure that where a death occurs in relation to a matter where criminal charges follow, it is felt the criminal trial—the trial on those criminal charges —with bring out, very fully, all the facts relating to that whole matter. If it were felt after that trial was concluded, that an inquest were necessary, then we would consider the matter, but in the meantime it will await the disposition of the criminal charges.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Mr. Speaker, a question to the Prime Minister.

Does the Prime Minister intend to reappoint the select committee on electoral reform?

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether we will reappoint it because there has been some change in personnel since that committee functioned in the last Parliament, but it is the intention of the government to continue our review of the election laws of the province.

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Labour.

Will the Minister instruct the workmen's compensation board of Ontario to abide by the law as it now is, as set out by Mr. Justice Hart in January of this year, in the case of Stanley Kuzyk and the workmen's compensation board—namely, that all medical reports be made available to a claimant or his representative, in order to enable them to fully and properly prepare a case before the board?

Hon. D. Bales (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, as Minister of Labour I report to this Legislature for the workmen's compensation board. I am advised by the officials of the board that the decision of Mr. Justice Hart in the case of Stanley Kuzyk versus the workmen's compensation board was appealed to the court of appeal and consequently this matter is *sub judice* at this time.

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Speaker, may I ask a supplementary question?

Does the Minister not agree that my question as phrased, "the law as it now is," ought to be abided by, by that board?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the hon. member appreciates the matter is before the court of appeal at this time. It will be heard, I understand, very shortly.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the hon. Minister of Transport.

Is the present American Motors recall campaign also being conducted in Ontario? If so, what steps are being taken to ensure that all defective cars are in effect being recalled and repaired at the earliest possible moment?

Hon. I. Haskett (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, the American Motors Corporation in the United States has recalled a total of 22,304 vehicles as follows:

1. The quality control department found that the material used by one supplier in manufacturing the oil strainer gaskets in one type of automatic transmission, was not up to American Motors Corporation specifications. The part which costs 1.5 cents is not faulty, but its quality is in question. 15,456 vehicles are affected.

2. The owners of 3,338 sedans and station wagons have been asked to return their vehicles to dealers for adjustments to mechanisms controlling the reclining seats. 3,510 station wagons have been called back for replacement of the door latches on one of the four doors in each vehicle.

American Motors Canada Limited is conducting an investigation to determine whether or not the defects apply to its products manufactured in Canada and expects to make an announcement next week. Approximately 2,000 of the vehicles manufactured by the parent company in the United States have been imported into Canada. The owners of these vehicles are being asked by the Canadian company to take their cars to the dealers concerned in Canada so that the necessary adjustments can be made.

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests.

How many pounds of Ontario fish acquired under the federal price support programme for 1967, are still in storage? Second, what will the price support be for 1968? Third, will any new controls be introduced in 1968 that will affect commercial fishermen in Ontario regarding size of mesh or pounds of catch allowable per day?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Speaker, could I ask the hon. member if I can take his question as notice and tomorrow I will have the answers.

Mr. Paterson: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Education, notice of which was given.

With the proposed changes in school board administration, which will allow county school boards to submit taxes to ratepayers: (1) what authority will school boards have should the property owner be in arrears in his school taxes; (2) will the county school boards have the power to sell a ratepayer's property for failure to pay his school tax; (3) what is the legal position of ratepayers who pay their municipal taxes but do not pay their school tax?

Hon. W. G. Davis (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, I think as the hon. member is aware the proposal and the basic philosophy are to identify clearly, for the ratepayer, the amounts being spent for educational service and the amounts being spent for municipal service. These will be outlined very clearly on the tax bill but we do not wish to see any duplication of service, so that in respect to the questions asked by the hon. member, we anticipate that the municipal clerk-treasurer will continue to follow the same existing procedures with respect to the arrears problem—and this would answer part three of his question—and that the same remedies will continue. And, of course, with this procedure the county school board will not have the power to sell, if there are arrears. This would be governed by existing procedures with respect to the municipalities.

Mr. Paterson: Mr. Speaker, I have a further question of the Minister of Energy and Resources Management.

Will the Minister advise if he has made a request to the federal government for assistance in providing relief to the people of southwestern Ontario who suffered severe flood damage in the early part of April—early part of February it should be.

Hon. J. R. Simonett: (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Mr. Speaker, I believe the hon. member is referring to the flood in February, not last April. The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs has writttn to the Prime Minister of Canada inquiring if the federal government could assist the people who have been hard hit by the recent flooding of southwestern Ontario. The Prime Minister of Canada has replied indicating that no financial assistance in the form of direct relief will be available from the federal government, but has indicated that flood control measures may be eligible for a federal grant and this aspect is being explored by officials of my department.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): I have a question for the hon. Minister of Education, notice of which has been given.

The second instalment of the Canadian students plan loan has not yet been paid at Lakehead University this term. This situation has forced needy students to borrow money from banks and credit unions. Can the Minister advise what immediate steps he will take to ameliorate this situation?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I think perhaps the hon. member is under some misunderstanding. Actually, the second instalment under the Ontario student award programme relates to the grant portion of the award. The Canada student loan portion is made available in the fall of the year. Our understanding is that, as of the moment, some —I believe it is 831—cheques have already been sent to the students at the Lakehead. To the best of our knowledge there are some 15 students who have not received the second instalment, and while I cannot specify all the reasons for the hon. member this afternoon, they relate generally to the answers that I have given to this question before. That is that the student was a late applicant, or secondly, there was some error in his application form, or thirdly—and this has happened in some institutions—the institution has failed to file the necessary form stating that the student was still in attendance. The vast majority of students at the Lakehead have received their second instalments and we think that there are some 15 out of some 700 or 800 who have not, probably for the three reasons that I mentioned.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): I have a question for the Minister of Highways.

Can the Minister advise the House why the repairs to the Pickerel River bridge on Highway 69 south, 45 miles south of Sudbury, have been delayed? Second, what has been the cost to the public so far for keeping the bridge guarded?

Hon. G. E. Gomme (Minister of Highways): Mr. Speaker, the original design of the bridge was rather complicated, bringing about difficult problems in the design of the repairs. These have been completed, and the work will be shortly undertaken. The answer to the second question, as to the cost of repairs and all other costs in connection with them, including keeping the bridge guarded, will be charged to the insurance company of the equipment which caused the damage.

Mr. Speaker, I also have the answer to the question which the same member asked on March 11, 1968. The question was:

> When will the work be started to rectify the fog conditions which have been responsible for 168 accidents and 11 deaths in the past seven years on Highway 17 west between Sudbury and Copper Cliff?

The answer is that in late 1965 work was completed, resulting in this section of highway being reconstructed to four lanes and a median. Also included in this work was illumination. The above corrective measures have greatly improved conditions, as indicated by the following statistics. For the years 1964 to 1967 inclusive, the accident rate based on million vehicle miles of travel, decreased from 5.3 in 1964 to 1.8 in 1967. The frequency of accidents has been cut in half during the same period, and the same applies to the number of persons injured. In 1967, four rear-end collisions were reported as against 15 in 1964 and 23 in 1965.

In respect to the 11 deaths mentioned, I would point out that our figures indicated that there were evidences of drinking in six of the seven accidents. In all, 12 persons lost their lives in the seven fatal accidents reported. Seven of the 12 died in a two head-on collision, both involving drinking drivers. It is obvious that the reconstruction of this area has done a great deal to reduce the number of accidents to the point where the frequency compares favourably with that experienced on fully controlled access freeways.

Mr. Martel: A supplementary question for the Minister? The question that I asked was with regard to the fog. It is still there.

An hon. member: Well, what do you expect us to do?

Mr. Martel: Clear it up; it is man-made.

Mr. H. Peacock (Windsor West): I have a question for the Provincial Secretary and Minister of Citizenship. Would the Minister consider negotiation with the province of Quebec of a reciprocal agreement by which translation services would be available to businesses and citizens of one province wishing to carry out business in the other, who now find that they are impeded because government documents are not available in English and French?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, if I have understood this question correctly, I really do not see the necessity of providing such a service mainly for the commercial undertakings in one province dealing with the governments in another because there are private services available for those people to be retained as part of the operation of their business. I might say that I do not know of

any difficulty being experienced by our people in this province in dealings with this government in either of these two languages.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, a question to the hon. Minister of Agriculture and Food.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Sargent: Where did the hon. member see it? Who are the members of the commission of the $500,000 income study for agriculture announced last fall in the election. And two—

Mr. Speaker: Would the member ask his question in the terms in which it has been submitted to the Speaker? He is not doing so. Will you start again, please?

Mr. Sargent: Who are the members of the commission of the $500,000 income study announced last fall for agriculture; the salaries of these commissioners; at what point is the study now, and when will it be completed; and what are its terms of reference?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, I feel that this question should be more properly put on the order paper but I happen to have the answers for the hon. member.

First the members of the committee are as follows: Mrs. K. E. MacIntosh, of Kitchener, representing the Conservative association of Canada. Mr. Malcolm Davidson, of Brucefield, a farmer. Mr. John Phillips of Toronto, a farm journalist with the editorial staff of *Farm and Country* magazine. Mr. Gordon Hill of Varna, a farmer. Mr. George MacLaughlin, of Beaverton, a farmer, and chairman of the Ontario milk marketing board. Mr. Tom Robson, a farmer, of Leamington. And the chairman of the committee is Mr. Everett Biggs, Deputy Minister of Agriculture and Food.

The hon. member refers to a commission. There is no such thing as a commission. This is a committee that was appointed at the Vineland conference, on farm income, in the fall, October, of 1966—and has been continuing its studies since that time. At the Kemptville conference, they were requested by the farm organizations present to ask the government of Ontario to provide $500,000 to continue the study, which was not at that time in a conclusive stage. I promised to relay this request to the Prime Minister and the government of Ontario, which I did, and which they have accepted. The Prime Minister made the announcement of the $500,000 availability to the farm income committee in August of last year, following the Kemptville conference.

I have no knowledge as to what is being paid Hedlin, Menzies as individuals carrying out the survey. As far as the members of the farm income committee are concerned, they receive $25 per day plus expenses for any day in which they are involved either in attending committee meetings or other work in connection with the committee. This, of course, excludes the chairman of the committee, who is a civil servant.

The final report of the committee is expected next fall, and I would hope to have it before that, but certainly next fall.

The terms of reference of the committee are about as broad as they could possibly be made. They are intended to give the committee direction in studying ways and means of improving the level of farm income in the province of Ontario.

Mr. Sargent: Will the Minister accept a supplementary question?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: No.

Mr. Speaker: It is declined so the member will put his next question.

Mr. Sargent: What is he being paid for? This is a very important thing to agriculture.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: The member already has access to it if he wants to look it up. The answers are all there.

Mr. Sargent: The Minister does not even know how much they are paying them.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I certainly do.

Mr. Sargent: Well he should know.

A question to the Minister of Highways. Will the Minister advise what plans his department has for a major highway serving Walkerton, Owen Sound and the Bruce peninsula?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: This portion of the province is being subjected to an area study to establish the roads needs, and the information requested by the member for Grey-Bruce will be based on the results of this study which should be completed in 1969.

Mr. Sargent: When?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: 1969.

Mr. Sargent: I have a question for the Minister of Education, but it is more proper

that it should have gone to the Prime Minister. It is in regard to the planned school land consolidation programme for education. And I say in view of the planned consolidation of school boards—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. In view of the fact that the Minister was in and had to leave and the member had not reached his his question—

Some hon. members: He is in now.

Mr. Speaker: Is he? I was going to allow him to ask the question and we would pass it along. But now the Minister is back.

Mr. Sargent: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

In view of the planned consolidation of local school boards to a county basis by January 1, 1969, to give equality of opportunity, will the Minister advise why Grey and Bruce counties cannot have a community college?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I really came prepared to answer this question two or three days ago. I think, as the hon. member well knows, it is not a case of Grey and Bruce counties not being able to have a community college. The hon. member I am sure is well aware that both of those areas constitute regions of the community college programme in the province of Ontario and that they will in fact have access to a community college.

The decision as to the geographic location of these institutions is determined by the boards of governors of these institutions, and as I recall, there is representation from those two geographic areas mentioned by the hon. member on the college board. I would assume that they will make a decision that will be in the best interests of the total community.

Mr. Sargent: When?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that this question might be more properly directed to the board of governors, or to Georgian College.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Speaker, I have the answer to a question that was asked me by the hon. member for Oxford (Mr. Innes):

> What construction company was engaged to construct the uneven and bumpy section of the $17-million-a-mile portion of Highway 401 from Highway 27 to Avenue Road? Is the condition due to faulty construction or the type of material specified by the department? Was this section covered by a bond sufficient to cover rectifying this section? If it is the material will the department check into specifications for future projects?

There is, of course, an error in the question, where reference is made to this section costing $17 million per mile. As a matter of fact the cost is approximately $6 million per mile for that portion of Highway 401 from Highway 27 to Avenue Road.

Six contracts were called for the reconstruction of Highway 401 between Highway 27 and Avenue Road, as follows:

1. Contract 63-329—Dufferin Materials and Construction Limited, Avenue Road to the CNR.

2. Contract 64-108—Majestic Perini Limited, CNR to Jane Street, including the basket weave and Keele Street interchange.

3. Contract 63-216—C. A. Pitts, General Contractor Limited, Highway 400 interchange and Wendell Avenue.

4. Contract 65-55—Dufferin Materials and Construction Limited, Wendell Avenue to Humber River, including the Weston Road interchange.

5. Contract 65-263—Perini Limited, Humber River to Bellfield Road.

6. Contract 66-296—C. A. Pitts General Contractor Limited, Bellfield Road to Dixon Road.

Question 2: No, the roughness is a winter condition which is common to concrete pavements in the northern part of North America. It is primarily caused by the warping of the concrete slabs as a result of the thermal gradient between the top and bottom of the slabs. The concrete slabs expand and contract in linear relationship to the temperature. In cold weather, because the top of the slab is at a lower temperature than the bottom of the slab, the top contracts more than the bottom. This condition develops a light warping which disappears when the top and bottom of the slab are at the same temperature. This condition is relatively common in areas of North America where high frost penetrations are prevalent. The Department of Highways have dealt with the Portland Cement Association regarding this matter, who have assisted us and other highway authorities in endeavouring to counteract this situation.

3. The answer is no.

4. The material is not the cause of unevenness. The department has changed its specifications for concrete pavement for future

work. These new specifications require shorter slabs than it has been customary to use in the past, and it is hoped that this change will greatly minimize the warping of the slabs.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, a question to the vice-chairman of Hydro.

Mr. Speaker: May I request the member address it to the member? I think he was advised that—

Mr. Sargent: The hon. member for Muskoka.

How much has the Douglas Point power plant cost to date? Is it in production yet? And if not, when it will be in production?

Mr. R. J. Boyer (Muskoka): Mr. Speaker, these questions were sent to me a couple of days ago. The question has not been asked in the form in which submitted, but I suggest it is appropriate that the Minister of Energy and Resources Management answer these questions.

Mr. Sargent: Go ahead.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I am on?

Mr. Speaker, as the plant at Douglas Point was built by Atomic Energy of Canada Limited, I would suggest to the member that he should direct that question to them.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, we have had this department sitting with perhaps millions of dollars and he cannot answer the question. It is ridiculous.

Mr. Speaker: Order! The member may wish to rephrase the question and direct it to the Minister with respect to matters which fall within the Minister's department. I will be glad to receive such questions tomorrow.

Mr. Sargent: What is wrong with now? Can I get it now, Mr. Speaker? Will you accept the question now, sir?

How much has Douglas Point power plant cost to date? Is it in production yet, and if not when will it be in production?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Speaker, I just said that this plant was not built by Hydro, it was built by Atomic Energy of Canada Limited. I think the member, if he wants to get the exact cost of that plant, should direct his question to them. I understand it has cost in the vicinity of $85 million, but it was not built by Hydro, so we would not have the exact figures. I am also advised that the plant is in full production, delivering 200,000 kilowatts per day since last December.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, will the Minister advise who in this House is responsible for this spending project?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: No one. It is a federal project under AECL jurisdiction.

Mr. Speaker: Order! Order, please.

The Minister has answered the question I think very well; and he has also advised the member to whom he should apply—

Mr. Sargent: A bunch of stick handling there someplace.

Mr. Speaker: —for such information as the Minister has not.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, may I just comment here? I did not realize that it was going to get into this spot.

Ontario Hydro, the provincial government and Atomic Energy of Canada combined to build certain atomic power developments. It is the same partnership that is building at Pickering, and for the member's information there is a certain amount of experimentation in this work and that is why it was undertaken by the three separate authorities. If he is really interested in what Ontario's participation in this total programme is, we would be quite prepared to give him the information.

Perhaps with what I have been able to give him here, he could rephrase the question, because as far as the government is concerned, it is a very interesting experiment indeed, and one of which we are very proud. We are developing uses for uranium for power purposes, which are of great importance to the mining industry in this province. Some years ago this whole matter was discussed here in the House, but we of the government undertook to underwrite some of the finances of this. Hydro undertook to underwrite it, and it is quite a complicated agreement. But if he wants the full story of this put before the House, we would be delighted to put it before the House.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Speaker, maybe I should clear up a point. I think the question—

Mr. Speaker: Order, order!

The leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Nixon: The question was a very important one and I would say that the hon. Minister who undertook to answer it, after having it given to him by the member for Muskoka, was at least in some measure misleading the House because our involvement in this certainly can be measured in dollars. I would question the fact whether it has been up to 100 per cent output since last December. I do not believe that is a fact.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Speaker, in order to clear up a point, we did not, nor did Hydro, finance any part of Douglas Point. It was built by Atomic Energy of Canada Limited, and Hydro buys power output only. There was no money involved in that plant as far as Hydro was concerned. The cost of the one at Pickering is being shared by the federal government, the provincial government and Hydro.

Mr. Nixon: What is our share, provincial and Hydro?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: We have no share in the Douglas Point plant.

Mr. Nixon: Then .why is the Premier so proud of it?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I think that perhaps he misunderstood the question.

Mr. Sargent: I want to thank the Prime Minister for his offer to reveal the situation, but we want to have a full-scale examination of this in the estimates.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order!

There is ample opportunity either in the deliberations of the appropriate standing committees of this House to deal with this matter, or in the estimates, or for the member to place a question tomorrow asking exactly what he wants to know that is within the purview of the government, as has been explained by the Prime Minister and the Minister.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, on March 8 the hon. member for High Park asked two questions, at which time I took them as notice and undertook to answer. I would like to answer today.

The questions were: (1.) Is the Attorney General aware of what happened to Harold E. Rider? and (2.) When will The Attorney General's Department exhume the body buried under the name of Harold E. Rider?

I would answer, Mr. Speaker, that these questions and, more importantly, the innuendos raised by them may be answered only by an accurate recital of the facts as they relate to the case of Harold E. Rider.

The late Mr. Rider lived in room 221 of the Keystone Hotel, 335 Jarvis Street, Toronto, and had done so for several months prior to September 15, 1967. He was last seen alive by Mr. Carmen Sacco between four and five o'clock on the afternoon of September 15, 1967, when Mr. Rider passed the front desk of the hotel.

Mr. Sacco, who is the night clerk at the hotel, received complaints about the loud volume of the radio in room 221 in the early morning of September 19. He stated to the investigating detective that upon checking the room and knocking upon the door without result, he opened the door with his pass key and found the body on the bed.

Mr. Sacco, who stated that he had known Mr. Rider for three years, identified the body to the detective as being that of Harold E. Rider. The body was further identified as that of Harold E. Rider by two taxi drivers, Harold Robert Johnson and Lloyd Elmer McGraw, each of whom had known the deceased for several years, as they had all worked as taxi drivers.

Photographs were taken, the coroner made his investigations at the room and the body was then removed to the morgue where the autopsy was commenced at 5 o'clock in the morning.

At the morgue, the body was once again identified by Mr. Sacco to the morgue attendant in the presence of the detective, who made the identification a few moments later to the pathologist.

I will not burden the House with the lurid technical description of the body as given by the pathologist, nor will I produce the 15 pictures which were taken as a necessary part of this portion of the investigation. The body was, however, badly decomposed and in a state of degeneration.

The hon. momber has already acknowledged that the pathologist who did this autopsy is a most capable and experienced physician. The pathologist has indicated that the physical evidence to which the hon. member has referred such as height, weight, scars and circumcision were all materially affected by the advanced degree of decomposition, which had a marked effect on the skin and on the tissues. The colour of the hair was a matter of opinion upon which there was obviously some difference in view—no great difference, really, in description. The written notes of the pathologist indicate that the

appendix was present—the typed report was incorrect on that point.

In view of the continuing concern of Mrs. Rider, the supervising coroner, his executive assistant and three detectives met on October 20 with Mrs. Rider and her son-in-law, Ernest Tatryn. The hon. member, in his early remarks on March 6 suggested that Mrs. Rider was interviewed "in the presence of two men whom she was led to believe were detectives". He seems to suggest that there was some attempt at deception. I do not understand him for there were, indeed, three detectives present, one of whom was a sergeant of detectives, for the police and the coroner were taking the matter most seriously and were going to every length to accommodate and satisfy Mrs. Rider.

At this meeting the photographs of the deceased man were produced for the son-in-law, who identified the body to Mrs. Rider as her late husband because of the hair line, the features, the general contours of the body and because the shoes on the body were a gift by him to his late father-in-law. The son-in-law agreed that the pictures of the deceased were of such a nature that Mrs. Rider should not be called upon to look at them. The only reason they were not shown to her was because of the concern for her own sensitiveness, as supported by the son-in-law.

I would say, Mr. Speaker, that if the hon. member would care to see the pictures which I would be glad to show him, I am sure he would agree that that was a reasonable, a compassionate and a sensible thing to do.

The supervising coroner and his associates were under the impression that Mrs. Rider and her son-in-law were quite satisfied that everything humanly possible had been done in procuring the best identification available for the authorities, for they were thanked for their efforts and they heard nothing further until the matter was raised by the hon. member.

Mr. Speaker, I would now say to the hon. member for High Park that firstly, insofar as it is humanly possible, we have made ourselves aware of what happened to the late Harold E. Rider and secondly, we do not intend to direct the exhumation of the remains identified as those of Harold E. Rider.

I do not intend, Mr. Speaker, to deal further with the innuendos raised in those questions.

Mr. Speaker, on the 5th, I believe of March, following questions asked by the hon. member for Scarborough West (Mr. Lewis), I undertook to furnish to the House certain factual information with respect to the matter of the trial and acquittal of the Rev. Russell Horsburgh. There has been a good deal of publicity attendant upon the acquittal and as a result of that publicity there have been comments on the administration of justice, law enforcement and my own integrity, which I feel warrants a reply.

It is not my intention to express any opinions, but rather to establish certain undisputed facts which I believe indicate the perspective in which critical comments should be reviewed.

First, Mr. Speaker, I wish to refer to the affidavit of certain witnesses and the suggestion that the Crown in some way was delinquent in the attention given to that material. One of the two affidavits was sworn on June 27, 1965 and was, on that date, in the possession of counsel for the accused. It was delivered to the counsel for the Crown by counsel for the accused together with the other affidavits of September 17, 1965.

The appeal was set to be argued on September 21, 1965. In other words, the Crown had the material four days before the appeal —that is the affidavit material, although one affidavit, at least, had been available to the defence and in the possession of defence counsel for almost three months before that date, before the date it was shown to counsel for the Crown.

However, immediately upon receipt of that material, the case was taken off the list for hearing and a senior inspector of the criminal investigation branch of the Ontario Provincial Police was instructed to investigate the matters raised in the affidavit. This officer had no previous connection with the case and this was by deliberate instruction and design so that there would be no previous connection to colour his judgment.

On September 29, 1965, this inspector made his report to the Crown and to counsel for the accused, who was present by express arrangement made by officials of The Department of the Attorney General, so that he would have exactly the same information as Crown counsel. Defence counsel perused the reports in detail and they were all fully discussed in the presence of both counsel, for the Crown and for the accused.

The appeal came on for hearing on October 25, 1965, and the Crown had both witnesses, that is the witnesses who took the affidavits, available for the court should it wish to pursue the matter of the affidavits. Defence counsel sought leave of the court to file the affidavits. The application was not opposed

by Crown counsel but was refused by the court which declined to hear the witnesses. The appeal by the accused was dismissed.

When the matter came before the Supreme Court of Canada, the Crown again offered to make these witnesses available but the Supreme Court of Canada indicated that this would not be necessary. The witnesses were not called at the second trial because the charges in which they were involved were not proceeded with due to the inavailability of the witnesses who had become scattered and removed for a variety of reasons upon which I may not enlarge. To suggest that the Crown did not co-operate in every way with the defence, when these affidavits were revealed to us, is a gross and mischievous misstatement that is not consistent with the true facts.

Next, Mr. Speaker, I wish to point out that the matter was not a miscarriage of justice in any sense but was rather an example of the exhaustive way, exhaustive care, that is taken in our jurisdiction to provide a system of review of every judicial decision affecting the rights of an individual.

The original conviction, which incidentally was made by a judge brought in from another county for a singularly localized case, was appealed firstly to a judge of the Supreme Court of Ontario, secondly to the court of appeal for Ontario, and thirdly to the Supreme Court of Canada, where the appeal was ultimately allowed, although a new trial was ordered. The new trial was then held before another judge, brought in from still another county, and the prosecution was conducted by a Crown attorney who had hitherto had no association with the case.

I sincerely believe, Mr. Speaker, that all of this indicates not only that the department did everything possible to insure a fair and objective hearing in every court, but that the system of justice functions to provide all possible remedies to the person charged.

Mr. Speaker, while people may, with comparative immunity, attack the integrity of persons who serve the province, I do not feel that I may close without repudiating these aspersions which this man cast upon myself and upon the administration of justice. The facts which I have related will, I believe, demonstrate that far from supressing the affidavit material, we did in fact co-operate in every way with this man's counsel. This, I am confident, I may say, his counsel would confirm. Any decision respecting the affidavit was properly rendered by the courts. And I should point out here that the affidavits were not used, not permitted to be used by the courts in any of the trials, or in any of the appeals. The affidavits played no part in the matter.

Mr. Horsburgh has stated that I told a deliberate lie respecting the nature of the affidavits which were produced four days before the date fixed for the appeal. This unwarranted allegation, Mr. Speaker, I submit, is a scurrilous thing; the whole purpose in having the affidavit material investigated by the police was to ascertain the position of the witnesses, and as a result of that investigation I made my comments, which I do not now retract. The deponents were attempting to vary the effect of their evidence while maintaining that their evidence at the first trial was accurate. I cannot elaborate further on this allegation for the material never formed part of the case before the court.

In answer to the question of the hon. member for Scarborough West (Mr. Lewis), I would say further that there is no authority under which a payment could be made to Mr. Horsburgh, even if it was felt that the case warranted that consideration. In some jurisdictions, special legislation might be enacted to authorize such a payment. I do not, at the moment at least, contemplate such action in this case.

Mr. Shulman: Will the Minister accept a supplementary question in relation to Mr. Rider? Am I to understand that the two-inch growth in height is considered to be a post-mortem change?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, I am not sure that I have the details before me to enable me to answer that question. I would like to suggest to the hon. member that he might see some of the material which I did not attempt to detail, as I said, to this House, and I think he would be satisfied beyond all doubt—

Mr. Shulman: May I see the material?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Yes, he may see this. I think it should be helpful in putting his doubts at rest.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The first order, resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the amendment to the motion for an address in reply to the Speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor at the opening of the session.

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

Mr. H. MacKenzie (Ottawa Centre): Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a few moments of the time of this House to make a few comments regarding some problems in this province, and to bring before you approaches to them which could have been implemented some time ago to alleviate the conditions, and apparently, so far as I can determine from the Speech from the Throne and other available information, are not yet underway with truly significant force.

But first of all, Mr. Speaker, may I congratulate you on your appointment to your high office. From what I have seen in the short time I have been here, I believe that you have approached your duties with a fair and firm hand and have blessed this House with dignity. I believe this House is most fortunate in having one, of your high ideals, available for the high office you have, and once again may I congratulate you, sir, on your appointment.

As one who came to this province 17 years ago to seek a livelihood and a fortune, I have really not too much to complain about so far as my own welfare is concerned. I have had the good luck of making an acceptable living—the fortune I will have to leave to others to discuss—and in most ways my family is probably as well off and secure as the average in any part of the world. In many ways, I believe my present welfare is due in large measure either directly or indirectly to the good legislation brought forward in past years by the Conservative government in this House; legislation which has this wealthy province progressing at an ever-increasing rate; legislation which was surely improved and more carefully detailed due to the criticism of the official Opposition.

And particularly so, if what I have heard from our very capable, careful, and knowledgeable leader and a few of our members in the short time I have been here, is representative of what has gone on in this House in the past years.

I look at Ontario today, the great wealthy province it is, with its large productive farming areas, the productive capacity of the hundreds of manufacturing plants, the broad expanse of the resources industry, the developing recreation industry, and above all the broad knowledge and capability of the people of Ontario. I look and it is a picture which among other things leaves one with my background in some state of awe—and to have the privilege of being a member in this House with those who determine the course and direct the affairs of this great province, is an honour of the highest order, and doubly so to be here under our hon. leader (Mr. Nixon). A leader, who in my humble opinion has no equal in this House, a leader who knows and understands this province, a leader who realizes the greatness of this province and its people, and one who at the same time is acutely aware of the absolute necessity for long-term planning—planning of a detailed, proper, and adequate nature if this province is to continue to progress, and eradicate problems causing hardship. The picture in our province today, as I said, and it cannot help but leave one in a state of awe when first looking long and hard at all aspects of the economy. The productive capacity, the resources, the wealth and average welfare of our citizens, but no one can look too long without seeing large areas of present difficulties and without seeing large areas where difficulties are occurring and will become severe if positive leadership is not provided by those in responsible positions.

Housing and the lack of it, of all our immediate problems, is probably the most severe, and is causing real hardship to some of our people. Continually letters are arriving from constituents on low, fixed incomes reporting rent increases of as much as $35 per month on one bedroom units and $50 on two bedroom units.

If these reported increases are in fact occurring, Mr. Speaker, and I believe they are, you can imagine the very real hardship and disastrous effect this can have on senior citizens on low, fixed incomes—confronted with either paying the increase or the high cost of moving if they can find a suitable location. I am at a loss to understand why, Mr. Speaker, with all the statistics and information available on students commencing and graduating school, marriages, births, employment, housing unit starts, and so on, it was not possible to predict the housing units required and to get the HOME programme and other necessary programmes underway soon enough to head off this extremely severe problem which is causing hardship.

Where is the breakdown in government planning and programme for the future? Does it in fact exist? Why is it that even now, when we are well into the crisis, the price of lots on the government sponsored subdivisions is beyond the average wage earners in this province? No attempt is apparently being made to simplify the procedures and thereby decrease the time required to process plans for registered subdivisions. There is

no indication of firm leadership in simplifying and standardizing codes and regulations relating to housing in order to simplify and speed up construction and get costs down. Why is it that the hon. member for Lakeshore (Mr. Lawlor) reports 135 acres of suitable housing land in his riding available at low cost, and apparently no firm action has yet been taken to develop it? The crisis today in housing shortage, which is creating hardship for many of our people, is one which long-term planning could have offset, if not completely, surely in part.

Under these circumstances I suggest there is an obligation on the part of this government to find some way to protect those of our citizens who are suffering hardship due to the lack of planning and leadership by the government. If the province of Quebec, where the spirit of free enterprise is as strong as it is in this province, can move in this direction, and they have, and so protect their citizens from hardships, surely we can also in this province. And Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that this is not necessarily a policy endorsed by our caucus but I would hope so.

But, then, considering the future, Mr. Speaker, both the immediate and long term future, with regard to housing, it seems to me that right now detailed planning should be under way to meet the needs of at least the next ten years, and broad general plans should be underway for the needs of this province to at least the end of this century. The Premier (Mr. Robarts) has suggested in the past that the answer to our growth, urban sprawl, over-running of recreation areas, and transportation may be the development of satellite cities, where all phases are properly planned and integrated. This same thought has been voiced strongly by others and has adequate merit for serious study.

The high cost of sewer replacement for higher density, the urban sprawl and high cost of transportation in the way of road construction and land acquisition; the over-running of recreation areas and resultant downgrading of total welfare and living conditions must be stopped. It is past the time when serious and far-reaching studies must be commenced to attempt to relate housing density, employment, education, rapid transportation and all those things which make up a city. We must plan ahead, and plan well; the alternative is one crisis after another, prohibitive costs of rebuilding and relocating and the continued erosion of the sense of security and home to the people living in those ever changing areas and all that means with regard to stability and responsibility on their part.

The housing crisis, municipal sprawl, and the related difficulties could never have occurred with the intensity they have if long-term detailed planning and leadership had been provided.

Pollution of our streams, lakes, land and air is still another problem which has already reached crisis proportions in some areas and is rapidly approaching it in others, and yet look and ask as I may, I find no indication that long-term, detailed planning for the control of all types of pollution is underway.

There is a great tendency on the part of all of us, I believe, to some extent, to accept pollution as an evil to be accepted and learned to live with, and this results I suppose from the great growth in this province. In the long run, this acceptance is eventually going to have a very adverse and severe effect on our welfare. With regard to air pollution, already over the city of Toronto it is possible to see the smog of the city on a clear day for many, many miles distant, and without question it is thick and heavy and unquestionably very detrimental to health. And for one from outside the city who brings a car here and leaves it parked for a day or two, and then looks at the large accumulation of dust and dirt and realizes that this is what he is breathing every minute while here, it is then that one begins to realize how serious the problem here is.

There are other areas in this province of which some hon. members have already spoken with regard to severe air pollution which is destroying crops at a very rapid rate, not to mention those other places where the high sulphur content is killing off all vegetation in the surrounding areas. And even recently, Mr. Speaker, we read in the Toronto newspapers where certain people are seeking permits to erect very high smoke stacks for a proposed central heating plant.

While it is true that a 700 foot stack may get the fumes high enough up, that they will not affect the immediate area, on many, many days, when winds and drafts are unfavourable, the pollutants will be forced to the ground and will do severe damage in other areas. I have also received an Ontario Hydro notice which indicates they are planning to build an extremely large power generation station in the 2,000 megawatt range near the town of Port Hope, and that as yet they have not decided whether to build a nuclear plant or a fossil-fuel plant.

Here again, Mr. Speaker, as with the housing crisis, it seems to me that a group should be brought together to do some long-term study and planning and to lay plans for not less than ten years in the future, and I would think, broad general plans for the remainder of this century. In many of the published articles I read, I find that nuclear plants are very rapidly developing to that stage where they are competitive with fossil-fuel plants and hydro plants. May I read you one small section from a past issue of *Fortune* Magazine, which relates to a station very close to being the same as this 2,000 megawatt station which the Hydro plans to build out close to Port Hope, and I quote:

> As a result of the decline in costs, electricity generated by nuclear fission has become cheaper in many areas than power produced by burning coal and oil. This was nowhere more clearly demonstrated than in a decision by the Tennessee valley authority to order a $250 million atomic power station from General Electric. The 2,150 megawatt TVA project will be constructed in the heart of the coal country, where the costs of fossil-fuel power are about the lowest in the nation. TVA estimates that its nuclear plants will have at least an 18 per cent generating cost advantage over the most economical coal-fired power stations.

Mr. Speaker, the article goes on and outlines many aspects of nuclear generation, too long to read into this record, but there it is. As I say it is a year old and there have been many advances since that time.

If research and development goes well it may be that in the very near future we will have nuclear plants which generate power at costs about one-third to one-half the cost of hydro and fossil-fuel stations. Only recently an article was published regarding the intense work being done by five different concerns in the United States on nuclear stations employing the principles of fast breeder reactors whereby additional nuclear fuel is created as the plant operates.

It was reported in the article I read that the complete breakthrough and utilization of this type of plant should commence in not more than five years time. Why then, if these developments are going on so rapidly, and if we will have cheap nuclear power in five years, is consideration being given now to building additional fossil-fueled plants which will only add more pollution to our air?

Why is it that we do not now have a group studying and planning this whole problem of supplying power and heat? I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that it may be possible eventually to supply most of our major needs from these nuclear stations and that we should right now be planning for the displacement of existing fossil-fuel fired plants in all those areas where air pollution is a problem and that great care should be exercised in issuing permits for any future plants which are going to add to the air pollution existing.

As a temporary expedient, may I bring to your attention, Mr. Speaker, that in Trail, B.C., if my memory serves me correctly, the people rebelled against Cominco for the pollution their smelting operations were adding to the air and thereby killing off plant life. Cominco, as I understand it, went at the problem with vigour and a strong will. The end result, as I recall it, was that Cominco were able to develop a method of removing the pollutants from the air and developed a profitable sulphur industry in the process.

I appreciate, Mr. Speaker, that the automobile is also a real source of air pollution which at the present time is difficult to eliminate. But here again I believe that a group should be studying this problem with a view to eliminating it as soon as possible and to ensure that pollution of our air does not continue until that time when deaths amongst our people start occurring because of it.

But pollution in our air is only one of the problems. We do not have to look far to find that our streams, lakes, and even the land is polluted or contaminated in the highly settled areas and even in some not so highly settled. Each year we continue to add thousands of gallons of compounds to our lakes and streams and to our land, without knowing with certainty the extent of the long term effect on the health of our people. What we do know is that the effects of these compounds are detrimental in one way or another to the health of our people in both the long term and the short term.

Only last week, Mr. Speaker, a very extensive article was published in one of the Ottawa newspapers regarding the work being done by one of our scientists on the effects of insecticides such as DDT and other compounds and points out that these compounds eventually find their way into the bodies of our people where they are continually being stored up and will eventually have their effect. In his words, and I quote: "we are hellbent on our destruction probably, and don't even know it."

He further points out that there are some compounds on the market that are so dangerous that they are not even used in his laboratory.

Not only is the pollution of our lakes, streams and land in the long run detrimental to the health of our people, but already it has also had very adverse effects on such things as commercial fishing, recreational fishing, tourism and so on.

Here again, Mr. Speaker, as with housing, and urban sprawl and confusion, if a research study and planning group had earlier been created to study pollution in all its aspects and effects, it is quite possible that even now we would know the full dimensions of the problems, the steps and controls necessary to deal effectively with the problems, and could probably have got corrective measures underway in time to offset crisis conditions now existing in some areas.

From the *Research Index*, Ontario 1967, I note that studies are being undertaken to try to find acceptable fish species which will thrive in our polluted waters. This is a very worthy undertaking, but consider how much better the results would be if we could eliminate the pollution or at least bring it down to acceptable limits.

These two areas, Mr. Speaker, housing and the associated problem of urban sprawl, and pollution of air, lakes, streams and land, are surely two areas where the problem could have been greatly eased and possibly offset to acceptable limits if they had been looked at in detail some time ago, then long range plans formulated and implemented as required. I find it hard to believe that problems should occur and a crisis be reached before a will to deal with them occurs, and yet they do.

But to some extent I suppose it can be argued that housing shortages, urban sprawl and pollution are problem areas of which the government had insufficient warning, having regard to the lead time required and the costs involved to study, plan ahead and apply corrective measures.

The same arguments cannot be applied to education where all the facts and figures are before the responsible people continually; where the facilities and requirements are known well ahead of time and with a high degree of exactitude.

The planning in this area is in many respects apparently lagging behind with the planning in other problem areas. I think back to 1958, when as a candidate for the public school board in Ottawa, one of the things I suggested continually at that time was the implementation of teaching the French language in the very early grades of public school. It was very apparent even at that time that equal accommodation for our French-speaking population was not being provided, nor was equal opportunity being provided for our English-speaking, in that they were unable to gain facility in the usage of the other official language of our country by the approach to teaching then in use. I am happy to see, Mr. Speaker, that these inequalities are being dealt with in an effective way and consider it most unfortunate that near-crisis conditions must occur before leadership is provided.

All of this leads me to wonder about other aspects of educational requirements as to what extent long term planning has been detailed. How far into the future has it been planned and detailed, or alternatively, are the changes we see proposed now only short term and due to change at great expense in the not too distant future?

When, Mr. Speaker, you stop to consider that a very large technical school recently built at great expense on the fringe of Ottawa just a short time ago, had its name changed to a college, and, I understand that prefabricated steel temporary buildings are now being erected for use on some of the proposed new college campuses, it leaves one wondering if the technical school programme was wrong or if the proposed new college programme is held in some doubt. In any case, it is only possible to conclude that firm planning has not existed and that uncertainty has or does.

It is quite possible that in some respects, requirements in education are changing at an ever accelerating rate, making it most difficult to provide as needed, plant, facilities, and educators of the type and in the location required.

The hon. Minister's proposal on the reorganization of school jurisdiction seems a firm step which I believe could only have been made after a careful look at the problems confronting education and I hope it is the right one. It is quite possible the hon. Minister, in the short time that he has had, considering the magnitude of the problem and the rapid changes taking place, is only now charting his course with any certainty of direction. I sincerely hope he will pursue it with great vigour and will extend it beyond high school to include a college under each

board of education and, into the future, even a university when the need arises.

I might recommend to the Minister that he apply serious and studied consideration to attaching to each unit, plant, equipment, and staff as may be required in terms of efficiency to operate and keep together a research and development group for the express purpose of assisting our industry to solve problems and permit our industry to move into the forefront with their products.

I do not believe there is any cheaper way of assisting our industry, particularly our Canadian-owned industry, in moving to the forefront with their products and at the same time, providing a large reservoir of people educated to the proper level, and trained in the methods of research and development. Anyone who looks at the strong capability of the leading countries in this world quickly becomes aware that their industry strength in large measure arises from their ability to keep their products of industry in the forefront, in both quality and cost.

The position of a good segment of our industry in Ontario today is one of excellence only because of being owned and controlled by outside interests, or else being associated with companies outside of Canada to whom they pay money for being permitted to use design and improvements resulting from research and development; and I do use the word "development" since without it research as such has very little meaning or effect on the welfare of our people. The end result is that many of our industries are restricted in the world markets or in one way or another, controlled to the disadvantage and welfare of our people. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that we are only now getting started with education and we have a long way to go to provide people finished in all aspects of education and training who will eventually be able to push our own industries to the forefront, and I use the word "own" in the full sense of ownership. The time is here to plan ahead, and plan ahead well, and plan into the future, that this province may move into the forefront.

Education for the sake of education is not sufficient, education as such must have a purpose and that purpose must be toward the improved welfare of our people and the improved strength and welfare of our province and all that means.

On matters of economic development, regional development, and so on, it appears the opportunities to plan ahead and strengthen and improve the position of many of our areas is unlimited. The hon. member for Sudbury (Mr. Sopha) recommended a short time ago in the House that consideration be given to manufacturing in Ontario, those products which are eventually manufactured from our resources, with particular reference to minerals.

This may sound difficult and probably would have been a few years back when it was so necessary to get to where heat and power were readily available as well as certain types of know-how. But with nuclear stations to generate heat and power; with the colleges and universities developing to provide the people with an ever expanding labour force—if there is one type of economic development for the north worthy of consideration and which should capture the imagination of anyone looking into future development for the north, it would be hard to believe they could not realize the significance of this recommendation by the hon. member for Sudbury.

It is to be hoped that this recommendation will be pursued, developed and planned to the point where the results will be real and tangible. Surely leadership is required on this and similar proposals if the development of our great northland is ever to become something more than a dream or a vision. There is little doubt that some Ministers of this government are visionary in this matter and realize full well the rewards which can result from planning and development.

The plans for developing transportation systems to resources and for developing municipal airplane landing strips, as indicated in the Speech from the Throne, are quite indicative of those who are planning ahead. Whether or not the plans and the expenditures will be sufficient to make a real impression will become clear as time goes by. But it would be my belief that the Minister should be free to develop suitable landing strips at all small and large towns and cities in the north where distances preclude the close liaison by automobiles of developers, purchasers, promoters and salesmen.

When you consider that a good landing strip is not much more than the equivalent of one mile of two-lane paved highway, the cost to the province will not be significant compared to the cost of our highways, and the benefits to tourism, development and business which could occur, could well be beyond our fondest hopes.

Anyone who looks at the growth of general aviation in the United States and Canada in the past few years—years when the number of private pilots in the United States has increased to over 300,000, and the number in

Canada to over 25,000—and notes the increase in Canada last year was better than 5,000, or anyone who has made the time-consuming trip of driving the long distances by auto to the northern towns and compares it with the time saved by general aviation planes, will quickly realize the benefits to be derived from properly fitted, low-cost landing strips, properly maintained by the government, and located close to the respective village or town.

I note the present planning calls for assistance to municipalities with regard to landing strips. It is to be hoped that the Minister of Transport (Mr. Haskett) will be given a reasonable freedom to proceed with long-term planning and financing, a freedom to ensure that the necessary and desirable landing strips are in fact constructed.

Mr. Speaker, I have attempted to bring before you problem areas which may have occurred due to lack of long-term detailed planning. I have attempted to show the great necessity for planning, and preparing well into the future. There is little doubt that the Premier and others in his Cabinet are more than aware of the requirement for planning.

When I refer to the Premier's notes on the debate on the Speech from the Throne—the challenge of government on page 8—it reads as follows, and I quote:

> —to accomplish this objective we need a careful set of plans for each of the ten economic regions of the province, so that all our governmental activity and expenditures are coordinated.

And again on the same page, and I quote:

> —this means that as never before, we must accept the full implication of planning.

And again on page 11 of the same debate, I read:

> —regional development tax reform and provincial government planning add up to one set of decisions born of many minds, and even more considerations.

When I read these remarks by the Premier, I am impressed by his awareness of the great necessity for planning. I am also impressed by the notes of the Premier during the same debate with the title of "The Conservative Quarter Century" and the two sets of notes must be related to our present problem of housing and pollution, and development, and education, and other requirements, and we must then decide if we should have full confidence in the extent to which planning has and is being done.

Mr. Speaker, may I respectfully suggest to the House that the planning in the past has been inadequate, and may I suggest too, that sometimes the will to plan ahead gets a little weak as the years go by, and the tendency is to accept the status quo until a crisis arises. It would be my belief that more initiative must be developed toward planning, even if that means appointing assistants to the Ministers among the younger members. Or else, as has been suggested by our able leader, bring these matters on planning before the Opposition, meeting in committee so that real vigour and will can be applied to them and experts can be brought before the committee.

Mr. M. Makarchuk (Brantford): Mr. Speaker, it is with a little trepidation that I rise to speak today, particularly when I found out yesterday afternoon that God was on the Tory side. But I wonder if God knows about this.

Nevertheless it is a pleasure to speak here representing my riding, Brantford, which I would like to point out to some of the members opposite is about six-sevenths rural and about one-seventh urban in area. It was a supposedly impregnable Liberal stronghold. In the election before last the NDP polled about 2,000 votes in Brantford; in this particular election we had 10,500.

Brantford went the way many other ruban ridings in Ontario went, that is they voted NDP.

As the trend to urban development and living continues, I feel very optimistic, Mr. Speaker, about the future of the NDP. For it is in the urban areas that the revolution of rising expectations is having its greatest impact. It is in these areas that the people are starting to see the possibilities that are open to human beings for a better and more fulfilling life. It is here that they are starting to realize that the impersonal forces that control and affect our lives are not guided by gods and deities but by politicians, and as a result there has, and will be, a greater scrutiny by the electorate as to whom they elect as their representatives, and particularly in whose interest the representatives act.

As I sit here, on the longest back bench in the House, and listen to the remarks from the other side as they pat themselves on their respective backs, about what great things they have done, and the great things that they are going to do, I notice that somehow, sir, they particularly forgot to give credit, for what has been accomplished in this province, to the few individuals who have tried to keep Ontario in the twentieth century. Here I would like to quote from an article written last year by Pierre Berton, a knowledgeable Canadian—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Makarchuk: A wonderful man, a wonderful man. And I quote—

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): He got this from an unimpeachable source.

Mr. Makarchuk: An unimpeachable person. Quoting:

> For all my years in Ontario, and they are now approaching 21, there has been but one party in power, the Conservatives. And for all those years, there has been only one effective Opposition—

For the benefit of the Liberals, I will read that again:

> And for all of those years there has been only one effective Opposition, the CCF-NDP.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): He printed that for the member's campaign garbage.

Mr. Makarchuk: It licked your man there, did it not? Quoting again:

> Looking at my province in this centennial year, I can find precious little cause for celebration, but I shudder to think what it would be like had it not been for the vigilance of Donald MacDonald and his dedicated band of progressives.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): God is on the member's side now, eh?

Mr. Makarchuk: Always has been.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Makarchuk: Well, that particular group, Mr. Speaker, has grown and will continue to grow. Here I want to point out that the only time the established order in this province, the Tories, have moved was when they were under pressure. And the movement has been brought about because of controversy, public debate and new ideas which have originated from our leader and other members of the NDP.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Talk about a smug minority!

Mr. Makarchuk: Listening to some of the speeches by the members from the other side, I cannot help but conclude that what we have is a political party that is married to the past, afraid of change, and trying to apply remedies that have never worked, to modern problems. The social philosophy that permeates the Tory party is something they have acquired in their formative years, 50 years ago, and then have comfortably closed their ears to the intellectual clamour which now transpires through our society. Instead of devising new concepts to deal with the requirements of this age, they bandy about the meaningless rallying cry of the North American "boob-oisie" — private enterprise. Solutions suggested by this side, Mr. Speaker, are immediately labelled "socialism," and this immediately precludes that particular solution from our economic and social affairs.

Mr. G. A. Kerr (Halton West): What would Berton do without those sponsors?

Mr. Makarchuk: As an aside, I find it interesting the number of times my colleagues and I have been called "socialists" in this House in the general run of the debate. I find the term is rather meaningless but I can understand the members opposite using it as an epithet. Being Tories in Ontario, in the province they see no evil, they hear no evil, nor speak no evil. So, they are limited to what they can talk about, as the self-inflating statements are not only boring but also unrelated to the outside world.

Mr. Kerr: The member has not been listening to the Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Randall).

Mr. Makarchuk: I will get to him yet. So I have come to the conclusion that to relieve their frustrated psyche they yell "socialists," since four-letter words will not be in keeping with the dignity of the House.

Mr. Speaker, there is a great debate going on across this land as to what kind of society we are trying to build here. It appears to me we have a choice—either we are going to be a younger carbon copy of the sick society that has developed to the south of us, or are we as Canadians going to develop our own good society? For the benefit of some of the members opposite, who will not see what is happening in the United States, I will read part of an editorial from the *Globe and Mail*, and I quote:

> If Canadians sometimes wonder what real differences exist between Canadian and United States societies, they will find some answers in the report of the President's commission on law enforcement and administration of justice. It is a sombre and terrifying, and in some ways almost a hopeless report. The commissioners found crime much more pervasive than they had anticipated. One American boy in six is referred to juvenile court. Some 40 per cent of all male children now living in the United States are likely to be arrested for a non-traffic offence during their lives. One

> survey showed that 91 per cent of the sample admitted acts that could have sent them to jail.
>
> Confidence in the machinery of law and order is singularly low. One third of a representative sample of all Americans said it was unsafe to walk alone at night in their neighbourhoods. Slightly more than one third said they kept firearms in the house for protection against criminals. The machinery of law and order itself, from police, through courts, to prisons, and probations, and parole services, was in general inadequate, understaffed, under-trained, and overburdened. But most distressing of all, perhaps, was the portrait of a society designed not for order but for disorder, not for justice but for injustice, not to conquer crime but to breed crime.

To this, Mr. Speaker, we can add that it is a society for violence, and viciousness is a way of life. It is a society that can murder its civil rights workers and its President and allow the murderers to go free. It is a society that can barbecue a child in Vietnam and solemnly say that it is done to protect a "democratic way of life." It is also a society that is considered affluent. And above all, its philosophy is private enterprise, and this we should never question.

The sad part about it is, Mr. Speaker, instead of encouraging the development of our own economy and consequently political independence, we have people who are prepared and willing to give away what we have left, and that is not very much. And in the process of handling over our resources we also hand over our political independence and so we, too, eventually can have the same sick society and we, too, can become party to that grisly barbecue. I noticed that when the hon. Minister of Economics and Development was in Los Angeles, there was a little item in the *Globe and Mail*. I will quote the item:

> Alco Standard Corporation of Philadelphia will acquire control of Bartaco Industries Limited of Orillia, subject to approval of the United States government which has recently adopted foreign investment regulations.

If I may be so bold, Mr. Speaker, I would like to suggest that if the Minister spent more time scratching around home, we may not only be able to preserve some of our existing industries but also help in the development of new ones. Of course, this may not all be private enterprise and the Minister may not be prepared to act. Then it would be advisable to remove the Minister. And if the government is not prepared to do it, we will arrange for it four years hence.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Makarchuk: I would like to add here—if you were following what I was reading—that the purchaser had to ask the United States government for permission to buy the particular industry. Our own governments—the governments of Ontario and of Canada—were silent.

For those of you who say that we cannot live without United States financial support, I would like to quote again from the *Globe and Mail* an article referring to the case: if Canada cannot live without American support or financial help:

> If that be so, then how is it that Sweden with less than half our population, only a tiny fraction of our natural resources and at least as unfavourable a geographic position, not to speak of not having the same access to the fruits of United States research and development, is continually running neck and neck with us for the honour of having the world's second highest standard of living?

To this I might add that the United Nations authorities say that Sweden is ahead of Canada in the standard of living.

Mr. Speaker, the society to the south of us is not the kind of society that we want in Canada. Unless we make a concerted effort to organize and plan our society on a wide basis, not the *ad hoc* piecemeal approaches, we will become more similar and act accordingly to the society in the United States.

Somewhere, this government and the Liberals should start realizing once and for all that the market mechanism—or your so-called private enterprise system—will not provide us with an environment where a man can advance spiritually, culturally and intellectually. We must admit that although many enterprises can and should be left to the private market mechanisms of our society, we must also start working and seriously using the techniques of government intervention and planning to provide for us our own society of free and equal men, a society that promotes human excellence.

Before you can do this, you will have to dispose of your conventional wisdoms into the garbage heap of time and if you are not prepared to do it, the people in the elections to come will ensure that you are not around.

As they say, Mr. Speaker, the "natives are getting restless," and after yesterday's Bud-

get, they are more restless. They are getting tired of hollow rhetoric about free enterprise, individualism, supply and demand, risk taking, inventiveness and the social virtue of making money.

What they want, Mr. Speaker, is reasonable housing, because it not only provides for them a place to stand, but also a place to sit down and lie down. It contributes to better education, to better communities and healthier people, and it provides homes where children can grow.

Last year, in my riding, the Brant county children's aid society had to take care of more than 100 children because their parents could not find places to live. Next year the figure will be higher. In Toronto the figure runs into thousands; in other places it is just as bad as Brantford, and probably worse because we have one of the best community welfare services in Ontario.

It is very hard for us to assess the intangibles—the damage done to children's personalities. However, these children will come to haunt our society, a society that failed them in a time of need. Then we will reap the consequences in the form of criminal offences, unemployables, welfare and other actions that in no way contribute to the well-being of society, and we will also provide housing for them in jails and in mental institutions.

There are other things that people want; they want job assurance. They do not want to be left at the mercy of a corporation that has the social responsibility of an alley cat.

Currently, in Brantford, a local union is negotiating a new contract with Massey-Ferguson. Despite the fact that the company profits are up, the company is trying to blackmail the union to agree to their terms, or otherwise they will pull up their stakes and move. Here you have an example of a corporation that is prepared to uproot the lives of more than 10,000 people, creating serious problems not only in their lives, but also in the community. And the Ontario government, Mr. Speaker, is not only silent, but its representative on the recent conciliation board became the spokesman for the company endorsing their stand.

There are many other things the people in this province want changed. They are getting tired of taxes they cannot afford. To this particular end, I suggest that the government take a serious look at the available sources of revenue as outlined in the Carter report and for some of you who argue that it will impinge on mining or will frighten away mining, I would like to point out this particular article in the *Globe and Mail*, the heading of which reads:

> BIG YUKON DEAL POSITIVE REACTION TO CARTER REPORT
>
> Recommendations of the Carter commission on taxation serve as a positive rather than a negative factor, in the decision by Anvil Mining Corporation of Los Angeles to undertake a $56 million open pit lead-zinc silver mine in the Yukon territory.

Further on it says:

> R. B. Markham, Anvil vice-president, said the known availability to 1974 of the present three years' tax exemption for new mines was not an influencing factor in the company's decision to go ahead with the project. The idea has always been to get into production as quickly as possible.
>
> We made a study of the effects of the Carter commission recommendations on taxation. In the short term we found that if enacted, they reduce our profit, but in the long term, we found that they would not make any difference.

So I suggest that there are many sources of revenue outside of gasoline tax, cigarettes and other taxes.

The people, Mr. Speaker, want medicare—not a messed-up hash of expensive plans that you have in Ontario. In general, Mr. Speaker, the people are just tired of being the victims of the casual and accidental policies of governments and corporations.

They want the government and the corporations to act in their interests. They want a government that will eliminate crowded living conditions, anxiety about employment, pollution and noise.

Seeing as I mentioned pollution at this point, I would like to introduce, Mr. Speaker, the Makarchuk plan for water pollution control. It could be considered as my post-centennial project. To bring this about I would like to invoke a rather recent development in our social scene, by this I mean the development of sit-ins, teach-ins and so on. I notice the Legislature opened on February 14, but we did not really have a love-in in here. What I propose as a solution, Mr. Speaker, is that we hold a drink-in.

This would consist of the Cabinet gathering at the river, it has a very nice ecclesiastical sound, like at the mouth of the Don or perhaps we could use the Grand River in Brantford. We could gather at the spot just

below where the effluent from the glue factory is discharged in its raw state into the river. It could be an annual affair, or if we are really anxious, we could make it a biannual event. Some noted personality—we could give him an official title, but he does not necessarily have to be a Cabinet Minister, we will call him lord high chief ablutioner—would perform the ceremony. This would consist of drawing the water in the stainless steel mug from the river and serving it to members of the Cabinet.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, it would be a—you can't lose type of proposition. We will get immediate reaction, one kind or another and then we will get a Cabinet that is willing to do something about the water pollution problems.

Mr. MacDonald: They would have to drink some of their own medicine.

Mr. Makarchuk: Mr. Speaker, the people of Ontario want a government that will involve itself in changes that are beneficial to man. It will have to come to terms with developing problems of automation and strive to end the drudgery, sweat and frustrating nature of work.

Mr. Kerr: That is why we are here.

Mr. Makarchuk: The particulars—

An hon. member: Oh, who is the hon. member kidding?

Another hon. member: Does he mean he is sitting here because he is too lazy to work?

Mr. Makarchuk: The particular ethos that commands a man to eat his bread in the sweat of his face is no good when human intelligence has invented ploughs that pull themselves.

All I have mentioned, Mr. Speaker, is not wishful thinking, or as my compatriot said, the dreamer arrives. It is, Mr. Speaker, in the realm of human possibility. All we require is the desire and the willingness on the part of the government to seek solutions to the problems I mentioned. But, before it can start, it must have a dedication to the needs of people—not a corporate elite.

This, of course, requires a philosophical change, and I have not seen any indication that the government is prepared to switch from their hollow philosophy of personal avarice to a philosophy of public responsibility.

You may be, and I repeat, you may be capable administrators, but what we need, Mr. Speaker, is not only administrators but also innovators.

Technology is creating change whether you like it or not. It is being forced upon you and to cope with it, we need new ideas, not a repetition from the Little Abner school of economics.

You talk about individualism, but you forget that only the free men can be individualists. Freedom comes, Mr. Speaker, when a man does not have to worry where his next job is going to be or where he is going to raise his family or how he is going to pay his taxes. Freedom comes through proper education to each according to his ability, not his or their parents' pocket book. Freedom also comes, Mr. Speaker, when a man can take a publicly subsidized transportation system, to a publicly subsidized concert hall, to hear a publicly subsidzed symphony orchestra play a piece of music composed by an artist subsidized by the state.

This freedom, Mr. Speaker, has no relation to your corporate society, a collective bureaucracy, that control supply and demand, administrator's price and controls the market place with its sole criterion being profit.

We, too, want the collective society, Mr. Speaker, but its criterion is the creation of an environment that will permit man to develop to his maximum potentialities.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I wish to say that I feel very optimistic about the future. As Victor Hugo has said, there is one thing stronger than all the armies in the world, and that is an idea whose time has come. I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that time is on our side and our ideas and our actions will dominate this House.

Mr. W. Hodgson (North York): Mr. Speaker, it is a great honour for me to be able to take part in the Throne debate on behalf of the people of York North riding.

First of all I would like to join with the other members, sir, in congratulating you on your election as the twenty-seventh Speaker of this legislative assembly. With already a remarkable career in public service behind you, I am certain that your experience and your knowledge of this House will not only be of great assistance to us who are sitting here for the first time, but equally important will be your ability and sense of fairness, which assure us that this assembly will have a full opportunity to discuss the important problems facing us today, and to make the difficult decisions that can only mean a continuation of progress and stability in the province.

Mr. Speaker, the riding of York North that I represent today is far different from

the York North riding prior to the October 17 election. Through redistribution in 1965, the riding boundaries have considerably changed and thus has the population makeup of the riding changed also. Nonetheless, it should be pointed out that our riding has been represented on the government side of the House since 1945. If we assume another election will not come until, say the year 1971, this will mean a total of 26 continuous years in the Progressive Conservative camp.

Much of this incredible record is the responsibility of one man—my predecessor, Major A. A. (Lex) Mackenzie, M.C., V.D. Major Mackenzie first came to this House in the general election of 1945, winning by 3,042 votes. He won easily the next five elections, and in the 1963 campaign his majority of 6,233 votes was by far the largest vote of confidence ever given to a member from York North. I recall being told in 1963 after the Liberal Party nomination of that year, that one Liberal delegate said, and I quote:

> I don't know what they're arguing about in there. They all intend to go out on election day and vote for Lex Mackenzie anyway.

This, I think, reflects more than anything else, Lex's popularity throughout the riding during his 22 years as our representative. I can only say that it will be my goal to carry on with the tremendous contribution that Lex and the Progressive Conservative Party have made to the people of York North.

The new riding of York North consists of three municipalities—King township, East Gwillimbury and Whitchurch—and two towns —Newmarket, the county seat, and Aurora— and one village, Stouffville. The total population of the riding is approximately 57,000, growing at a rate of about 6 per cent a year. King township lends itself to agriculture, estate farms and homes, and also contains the finest vegetable garden in Canada—the Holland marsh. This most productive marshland also extends into East Gwillimbury. The remainder of this township consists of very productive mixed farms and urban homes.

Whitchurch is also a very fine mixed farming area with a number of estates and estate homes, together with some 3,000 acres of county forest which is supervised by The Department of Lands and Forests. Newmarket is a historic town with a population of about 11,000 and contains commercial, industrial and residential property. Aurora is similar in size to Newmarket but is proud of the fact that in 1959, Sterling Drugs Company Limited moved its entire plant and headquarters to this town from the city of Windsor. The residents of Aurora are also proud of the fact that the present Prime Minister of Canada, the hon. Lester B. Pearson, attended school in the town, while his father was minister of one of the local churches.

Stouffville, while still of village status, has a population of 4,500 and is growing rapidly. It is a very lovely and attractive residential area within easy commuting range of Metropolitan Toronto.

Mr. Speaker, one of the interesting side notes about the riding of York North is the fact that we have as residents, two members of the NDP who sit in this Legislature—the member for Scarborough West (Mr. Lewis) and the member for Beaches-Woodbine (Mr. Brown)—who, it appears, believe it is of more benefit to them to live in York North riding, many, many miles away from their own, than to take up residence, or at least live close to the people they represent. However, that is their choice, and under the Progressive Conservative government, unlike socialist regimes in some countries, people in this province can live where they want.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say that the government is to be congratulated in its recent move whereby the province assumes the full cost of the administration of justice. To us in York county this has meant a reduction of 1.04 mills. This is particularly encouraging when government at all levels seem to have a phobia of spending more and more.

Of course not only governments are responsible for this; Opposition parties in this Legislature are perhaps the worst offenders of wanting to spend increasingly huge amounts of the peoples' income. I recall the leader of the official Opposition (Mr. Nixon) just a few days ago whining about the few campaign promises made by our party, but it has been calculated that the Liberal Party in the last election promised new programmes which amounted to more than $700 million. The NDP election promises come to about $1 billion, and I might mention that the $1 billion that the NDP promised to spend is probably on the low side, since it would be difficult to assess the overall cost of the 40 or more new government departments, Crown corporations and agencies, commissions and committees, they are asking for.

As I say, the reduction in the mill rate, because of government action, is welcome, particularly at a time of the big spenders in the Opposition.

Mr. Speaker, one of the great concerns in my riding, and quite frankly a good number of other ridings in the province, is some of the recommendations of the Smith committee on taxation. I can only say without hesitation, that the people in York North are not too happy with the idea proposed by the Smith report for regional government. We believe that any form of regional government should be organized along existing county boundaries. I think the idea of the city-state type of regional government proposed by the Smith committee leaves much to be desired.

The Smith committee proposal would, in my view, create a wide breach between the rural and urban areas in this province, and I think the government should give very serious consideration to the views of the association of Ontario counties, as outlined in its blueprint for local government reorganization. One of the key recommendations of the association of Ontario counties states, and I quote from page 20 of the blueprint:

> (a) That to assure a minimum dislocation of municipal government functions during the establishment of the new county, there be no alteration in the boundaries of either the counties or their member municipalities.
>
> (b) That to provide for alterations of boundaries as required, a review of the boundaries of the counties and their constituent local municipalities be made within every ten-year period.
>
> (c) That the county or any one of its member municipalities should have the right to request such a review.

Generally the position of the association of Ontario counties and the Smith committee are very much alike. That is, until we reach the section on boundaries. In a paper given on January 13, Mr. Carl Bateman, first vice-president of the regional government committee of the association of Ontario counties, sums up the difference very clearly. He has this to say, and I quote:

> We believe in a two-tier system of local government and that the two critical values of our system of government must be access and service. We further agree that a governmental region should possess an adequate tax and revenue base in order for it to have the capacity to provide the necessary services through its own tax resources. These functions or services must also be performed with some degree of efficiency. Finally, we agree that regions should be so drawn and their governments so organized that the discharge of any function or service can easily and readily become part of their overall responsibility.
>
> It probably goes without saying that we also basically agree on the services that a regional government should provide. Such things as assessment, planning, taxation, education, parks and recreation, arterial roads, public health, welfare and capital borrowing, are all services that must be provided by the region and I doubt that any can or will argue against them.
>
> However, having listed the foregoing criteria, which of course is simply basic to good government, the similarity between the two briefs ends. The Smith committee report follows the pattern set by the ones before – Jones, Mayo and Plunkett – and under the cloak of efficiency, abolishes a century of experience and tradition and proposes a system of government that is foreign and untried.

It is very difficult for one to disassociate himself from views such as this, and as I said earlier in my remarks, I hope the government will give more than a reasonable glance at the association of Ontario counties blueprint because I think it is more in tune with what the people want, than what the Smith committee recommended.

Mr. Speaker, I understand that the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Gomme), will be presented with a petition signed by some 1,400 people from the "GO north committee." I must say this speech was made up a couple of days ago and in the last few days there has been another 400 added, for a total of 1,800 today. It urges a northern expansion of the government of Ontario transit service. I just want to add my support to this petition and to point out that this idea was a very large part of my own election campaign last October.

Mr. Speaker, during the past couple of weeks, certainly in the course of the Throne debate, we have heard an enormous number of demands made by individual members upon the government. There is, in my view, nothing wrong with this. After all, we were all sent here to do a job for our constituents. But there is, in a sense, a parting of the way in this regard between members who sit on the Opposition benches and those on the government benches.

The Opposition members, after making appeals for more services in their own ridings, go on and cry gloom and doom. They

try to project the false proposition that every thing in this province is wrong. Yet I would say to them that nowhere else in Canada, or even in the United States, are progress and prosperity more evident than here in the province of Ontario. One does not build a strong house for the future by tearing down the foundation of the present. We have in Ontario, a good government. We need only to compare it to the circus that we accept as the administration in Ottawa, to understand and to realize just how good a government we have in this province.

It is very difficult, I imagine, to be a Liberal today, and I suppose it is quite understandable why the official Opposition spends more time in this House being a federal apologist than putting forth any meaningful or constructive ideas in the area of provincial politics. As far as our socialist friends over there are concerned—well, we have seen how they operate a government. They had their chance in Saskatchewan for 20 years. Never has there been a more mass exodus of people from a province than between 1943 and 1964 when 250,000 young people fled Saskatchewan, fled from socialism, most of them coming to the province of Ontario.

They come here happy to partake in the opportunity, prosperity and individual freedom that has been made available by Progressive Conservative governments in this province. Perhaps the greatest indictment of socialism in Saskatchewan was the fact that the people of that province would take anybody else—including Ross Thatcher. So we only say to the Opposition members: Look at Ottawa under Liberalism; and look at Saskatchewan when it was under socialism; then maybe you will understand and appreciate good, sound government in Ontario. Thank you.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): Mr. Speaker, may I add my voice to that rising chorus that is congratulating you on your recent appointment as Speaker of the House. Let me say, sir, that I have noticed that you seem to possess those two qualities that are going to stand you in good stead in your job—those of patience, and a sense of humour—both of which, I suggest, in the last few days have been stretched perhaps to the breaking point.

Mr. Speaker, I have the honour and the pleasure to represent the great and beautiful riding of Rainy River district in northwestern Ontario. Many of the members of this chamber who have been here before will recall the hon. member who preceded me, Bill Noden, who represented our riding faithfully and well for 17 years. I am sure that all hon. members in the House and you, Mr. Speaker, will join with me in wishing Mr. Noden good health and happiness in his retirement.

As I said, Mr. Speaker, it has been some 17 years that Mr. Noden represented our riding, and now it has been returned to the Liberal-Labour Party. In Canada, the Liberal-Labour Party is on the rise. We now have a member in the Senate, the hon. William Benidickson; we have a member in the federal House, the hon. John Reid, Kenora-Rainy River, and now I am here from the riding of Rainy River.

Usually, Mr. Speaker, when I announce that I am a Liberal-Labour member I get a great reaction from my friends on the far left. As a matter of fact, I was speaking at Lakehead University last Thursday, and I announced I was Liberal-Labour and some of the young and ardent socialists jumped up and said, "What do you mean, you're Liberal-Labour? What is all this Liberal-Labour business? What do you mean? You are Labour." I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that I think it is because they are so particularly sensitive, and the fact that they have not been able to get all the labour behind them and form the government that they are so very sensitive. I come from a very labour-heavy riding, sir, and I might suggest that we have not had a CCF or an NDP member in some time, and will not have in the future.

Mr. Speaker, I would brifly describe for you, as I know of your interest in the far north, just a part of my riding, starting on the west with the small town of Rainy River. It has been said that it has one of the most beautiful names in Canada, that of Rainy River. The adjacent area of Morson is on the beautiful Lake of the Woods, and a beautiful and hospitable vacation land to which all members are invited at any time.

From there we drive, sir, east from Rainy River to the beautiful town of Fort Frances, passing through the rolling hills and valleys of some of the richest agricultural land in the world, as far as hay production goes. We reach Fort Frances, Mr. Speaker, where the main industry is the pulp and paper industry. The town of Fort Frances is situated on the beautiful Rainy Lake. From there we can drive farther east—getting a little nearer towards the riding of my friend from Fort William (Mr. Jessiman)—to Atikokan, which is world famous for its Steep Rock iron mines, and now it has also associated there Caland Ore Mines. You will recall, Mr. Speaker,

that a few years ago, the lake at Steep Rock was completely pumped out by the largest dredgers in the world, and this I think is something we should be justly proud of in our riding.

Recently, in the last revision of the ridings, we were fortunate in my area to have added on some northern territory around the town of Dryden—Barclay township—the towns of Wabigoon and Ignace, beautiful wild lands, beautiful vacation lands, and we are very happy in Rainy River riding to now have them associated with us. I might say that, talking about the Wabigoon and Ignace and Barclay areas of my riding, it is necessary for me to travel through either the riding of Thunder Bay or the riding of Kenora to get into the rest of my riding. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that perhaps something can be done about this, and perhaps we can have a road built between 11 and 17 to ameliorate the situation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not want to make a long speech. I realize we are trying to get through with the Speech from the Throne, so we can get on with the other business of the House, but I would just like, for the benefit of the gentlemen opposite, to outline a few of the problems that we face in northwestern Ontario and in my riding in particular.

One of these main problems that we have in our riding, as in northwestern Ontario, is the problem of roads and the condition that these roads are kept in. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that if the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Gomme) drove over a 20-mile section of road from Atikotan to Niobe Lake, he himself would be willing to get out and start commencing to fix this road up. It is a disgrace—because we are such a large tourist area, and we are trying to promote tourism in our area—to have people put up with conditions like this. It is an abomination.

I have already mentioned the highway between 11 and 17. This would open a beautiful untouched reservoir of vacation land and wild land for the hunter, the fisherman and the naturalist. I am quite sure the Minister of Highways already has this under consideration.

Another problem that we face in my area is in the agricultural field. As I said we have a fair amount of agricultural land in the western part of the district, but we face a large problem with drainage. We have a programme now which admits that some drainage can be done but there is no comprehensive scheme, which I suggest this government should have come up with long ago. As it stands now, the individual farmer can dig a ditch or a trench along his farm, but this is bound to cause flooding on his neighbour's farm or into a neighbouring municipality. What we need in this area, Mr. Speaker, is a comprehensive plan which is going to provide for a complete drainage system of the western agricultural land of the Rainy River district.

Another thing we need vitally is a home for the mentally retarded—an adult residence in northwestern Ontario. As it is now we have to send our people down to eastern Ontario and they lose complete contact with their families. Of course it is an added expense and burden on the people involved.

Mr. Speaker, there are two other points I would just like to bring up before I proceed and one is the problem of transportation. We have fantastic areas to cover in northwestern Ontario. My friend from Fort William has spoken about the transportation problem, especially in my area. Apparently everything is all right in his area because he spent most of his speech talking about Rainy River district, which saves me a great deal of trouble.

And, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Fort William, whom I am going to miss come the next election, berated the federal Liberals for taking away or shutting down the Canadian National Railways line in northwestern Ontario. It is common knowledge, even to my friend from Fort William, that regional economic development and regional development generally is a provincial responsibility. The reason they have to shut these trains down is the fact that there are no people to use them. If the government had, 25 years ago, begun doing something for the economic situation of northwestern Ontario, there would be sufficient people now in our area to use these facilities and the trains would be maintained and still be operating today.

Mr. Speaker, before I get on to my philosophy, one more problem is the recommendations of the Smith report, which has not —especially in regards to taxation—yet been made legislation. Apparently there is no provision this year, but I am afraid that these resolutions of the Smith report might become law and are seriously going to affect every mining community in northwestern Ontario. Now I have asked, Mr. Speaker, in the last two weeks whether the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. MacNaughton) and whether

the hon. Minister of Mines (Mr. A. F. Lawrence), who has been recently appointed, would go up to northwestern Ontario and see what these problems are. You can not administrate our vast area sitting in Toronto, when you have not even seen it or met the people and the problems involved. Now, Mr. Speaker, during that somewhat tedious monologue of the Premier (Mr. Robarts) telling us about our quarter century of Conservative rule, he suggested that the reason the Opposition parties did not do quite so well in the previous election was that they did not work from a wide enough basis. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that those in the benches opposite, especially in the front row, get off their very wide bases and get up to northwestern Ontario and see what is going on.

Mr. Speaker, the present government and I are both celebrating our 25th birthday this year. I hope that my 29th or 30th will be celebrated on the other side of the House. At the time of the election, Mr. Speaker, I was only 24 years old. I say this only for the benefit of the press who seem to be absent because they seem to think that I am anywhere from 18 to 35, so I thought I would clear that up. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that because of my particular age at this time, a quarter of a century of Pat Reid, which I will not go into as lengthily as did the Premier, I would suggest that this is an appropriate and opportune time for both myself and the government offices because we have both been around for 25 years to review our philosophy and our attitudes to both life and to government.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the people of my area are quite well aware of the way I feel about the people and government or I would not be here. However, it might be in order if I could just review them briefly so that perhaps the contradiction with the government opposite might be more clearly defined. They realize, Mr. Speaker, the citizens of Rainy River district, that I am basically interested in people, and people as individuals. I believe the government should provide a framework for the individual providing those services which the individual cannot provide for himself, and providing only those essential services that will leave him free to pursue his life and ideals. Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, I want to give the individual a choice as to how and where he will live his life insofar as it is possible in this complex world.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I am a Canadian and I strongly and sincerely believe that it should be Canadians first and Canadians who have the first opportunities to partake of the riches of this our country and which our province has to offer.

Mr. Speaker, what is the attitude, the philosophy, and what has been the attitude and philosophy, of this government that has been in power for some 25 years? I suggest, Mr. Speaker, it is one of neglect. There has been a great lack of communication and I was hoping that perhaps my hon. friend from Fort William could add to the communication breakdown, but apparently he is only fostering it. I would like to read, Mr. Speaker, from a speech on January 30, 1967. It is in relation to a book on the development of northwestern Ontario:

> We read how the local citizens, the half breeds, the trappers and the guides eat the crumbs from the table of those powerful men from the east. To many in my area this makes for very unpleasant reading today. For many of them feel that to a certain extent they are still eating the crumbs from the tables of the east. I think it is possible to find some support for these views by statistics, etc.

Mr. Speaker, that is from the speech of the hon. member for Kenora (Mr. Bernier), his maiden speech last year, in January, 1967. I suggest that there has been some breakdown of communication, perhaps between the member for Kenora, the government, and the hon. member for Fort William.

Mr. Speaker, the member for Kenora refers in his speech to the fact that we are eating the crumbs from the tables of the east—it recalls to mind a picture in *Oliver Twist*. You will recall, Mr. Speaker, the beadle, and I would not want to refer to anyone on the opposite side but there are some that you can conjure up in your mind that remind you of the beadle in *Oliver Twist*, standing there by the soup pot and pouring. Oliver, very skinny, very thin, very ragged, comes up with his bowl and he asks, "More". Mr. Speaker, we in northwestern Ontario do not want more, we want some. That is all we want. We do not want handouts, we want a little help, that is all.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): They are entitled to justice.

Mr. T. P. Reid: We see ourselves, you know—going on with Oliver Twist—as having our pockets picked by Mr. Fagan and his gang over there. Picking our pockets—we provide the raw material for the industry of the south and what do we get in return? Very little.

Now, Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend from Fort William said that we do not like to be

thought of as have nots. Well, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that we never thought of ourselves as have nots. We have great potential, great assets, both in people and in natural resources in northwestern Ontario, but what we want is a chance to develop them. Now I think, Mr. Speaker, that it is very symptomatic of this government, the attitude that they took during the campaign, and I draw to your attention one particular instance and that is the programme, the much touted programme of the equality of industrial opportunity.

Now, Mr. Speaker, a number of points about this. First of all this was not made part of the Premier's pork barrel until he had made a tour through three or four northwestern Ontario ridings and he, being a very astute man, I will give him that, had smelled the political wind and realized that if he did not come out with some programme for northwestern Ontario he would lose all of northwestern Ontario and northern Ontario instead of just maybe one or two Cabinet Ministers here or there.

Mr. Nixon: He tried to save his bacon with the old pork barrel.

Mr. T. P. Reid: But, Mr. Speaker, the most cynical thing about this was that the Premier was reported two days later in eastern Ontario as telling the people that this plan was tailor-made for eastern Ontario, when two days ago he told us it was tailor-made for northwestern Ontario. Now, Mr. Speaker, the latest effort of the government is the new five year study. Five years, Mr. Speaker—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. T. P. Reid: I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that we have a number of small towns and communities in northwestern and northern Ontario, where the economic situation is so dire and drastic, that within not five years, but within one year or two years at the most, unless something is done now, the towns will become complete ghost towns. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that these people, who live and work in northwestern Ontario, want to remain and live and work in northwestern Ontario, but they have no choice. They cannot move even from one community to another in northwestern Ontario. They must come down to the Golden Horseshoe, where all the money seems to be being spent.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what we want in northwestern Ontario is not reaction, but action, and this is what we have been getting for the last 25 years. Whenever the political wind smells bad, we have the government, opposite, proposing some kind of little crumb that will keep us happy until the next year or until the next election.

I would remind you, Mr. Speaker, at this time, that the Liberal Party under Mr. Robert Nixon proposed, during the last election, a department of northern affairs to administer, to help and to aid the north and northwestern Ontario and realizing the full potential that exists in that area—

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. T. P. Reid: I come now to the government's attitude to the northwestern businessman and citizen and it is something that I think is shocking. First of all, Mr. Speaker, there seem to be two laws existing in this country, one for those who are not Canadians and one for those who are. Let me give you a number of examples:

A tourist operator in northwestern Ontario has to comply with certain rules and regulations of The Department of Tourism and The Department of Lands and Forests, but those operating from the other side of the border do not always have to comply with these rules and regulations. They are not stopped, they are not harassed and they are not fined if they do not conform to the safety rules, for instance. Now this to me makes no sense. Those people are using Canadian resources, taking advantage of our fish and game and wildlife and yet they do not have to comply to Canadian laws.

Now let me give you a particular example, Mr. Speaker. There is an airline—Bohman airways—operating out of International Falls on the United States side of the border. Now this airway has been operating somewhat illegally over a number of years. So finally, after a great deal of public protest, he was finally picked up—for spotting moose, I believe it was—and his licence was suspended for three months—for a lousy three months. Pardon the expression, but that is the only one that occurs to me. And when did this suspension occur, Mr. Speaker? During freeze-up, at the very lowest peak of the business tide.

Now this would never have happened, I suggest, if there had been a Canadian involved.

Another thing, Mr. Speaker, that illustrates this government's attitude is gun licences. A year or two ago the department came out and said that everyone over 16 who had not procured a licence before that time would have to take a test. There was no such provision made that I know of—and perhaps the Minister can correct me if I am wrong—there was no such provision made for our

friends coming from south of the border. Now why this should be, I do not really know.

I give you another recent example of the government's attitude. In *Hansard* of March 6, 1968, the hon. member for Essex South (Mr. Paterson) asked:

> Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Energy and Resources Management. Will the government of Ontario allow in 1968 visits into the Canadian waters of the Great Lakes or inland Ontario waters, by yachts, or vessels registered in other jurisdictions that comply with the sanitary regulations of their base port, and do not meet the requirements or sanitary conditions as laid down by your department?

The answer from the hon. Minister was:

> Mr. Speaker, the answer is yes.

So we have to comply with Canadian regulations, but our visitors do not. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that this situation does not pertain when we go south of the border.

Now there is one other problem or aspect of this whole problem that makes us, especially in my area, feel somewhat like secondary citizens and that is the fact of the way the law is administered. This, of course, would be a case probably for The Department of the Attorney General and I give you one example, Mr. Speaker. If an American or a non-resident of Ontario wishes to hunt moose in Ontario, he has to procure a non-resident moose licence which costs $101. But I have never seen in any of the local papers in my area where, when they have been caught, the fine has ever been more than $100. So it is worthwhile to take a chance. You buy a licence and it costs you $101. If you get caught it costs you only $100 and the gamble is worth it.

There is one other aspect of this problem also, and that is as the rules and regulations apply to hunting and fishing. The non-resident can fly into Canada and once he checks into this country, he does not have to report back out and this, Mr. Speaker, has the effect of almost encouraging poaching and taking of excess limits of fish. Fishermen can fly into a lake, fill up their pontoons with fish, and fly back to the United States without stopping and checking out. The same applies to moose hunting. At a recent meeting I attended with the Fort Frances sportsmen's club, there was an American there who suggested that he knew a number of people who flew into Canada, shot their moose without buying a licence and flew back to the United States. He said they figured that they would be caught about once in every five times. So what they were doing was saving $500, in effect.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that our laws, if they allow these situations, should be tightened up and that anybody caught pulling this kind of practice should lose his licence and not be permitted to fly a plane into Canada. But the immediate result should be that The Department of Lands and Forests should make it a regulation that any fisherman or hunter flying into Canada must necessarily stop and check out of Canada with a conservation officer before he leaves.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. T. P. Reid: Mr. Speaker, the foregoing means that we have two results really that come from all this. One is that the Americans themselves, and the Canadians, have little or no respect for our game laws any more, because in part they are not enforced and when they are enforced, the fines are measly and there is no cancellation of gun licence, and so on and so on.

Citizens of both countries tend to lose all respect for our conservation officers and for our laws in general, and when the people in my area see these practices being carried out with little or nothing being done to stop them, they feel as though they have become second class citizens in their own country.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we come to one of the points that bothers me the most and this is in the recent announcement by the department that they are going to impose a resident fishing licence on the residents of Ontario. Now this in itself does not bother anybody overly much. We were told this morning by the Minister that the economic quantity of game and fish in this country came to something like $500 million, I believe was the figure he used—and the idea of these fishing licences is that we are going to raise revenue. I suggest that this is fine. Nobody quarrels with that and I am sure that the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests is having a great number of letters and newspaper clippings from my area on this.

The problem, Mr. Speaker, and the thing that bothers us most about this, is the fact that there has been no provision—none at all—to raise the non-resident's fishing licence. This is the part that really bothers us.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. T. P. Reid: I am sorry. It has been?

Hon. R. Brunelle (Minister of Lands and Forests): It will soon be announced.

Mr. T. P. Reid: It will soon be announced? Well, I am sorry. The hon. Minister spoiled half my speech. I was just getting warmed up.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. T. P. Reid: I would suggest to the hon. Minister that even though he suggests $2, this is still very little and is only a token to again pat the poor Ontario resident on the head and say: "Well, you see we are doing it to them, but we are going to do it to you."

I have a copy of the Quebec sport fishing regulations "Règlement de la Pêche Sportif" —in French, if you like—and their non-resident season fishing licence fee is $15.50. Now I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that the people who can afford to come up to Canada, and some of them spend very little money, can afford to pay more than $8.50 for a fishing licence. I suggest that a very serious study be made by The Department of Lands and Forests to see just exactly where the cutoff line would be.

I think I would suggest that a $15.00 licence would be a very fair one because after all, Mr. Speaker, we have a resource, we have a product here that we are offering, and I think we should at least be getting our money's worth from it if we are going to continue to sell ourselves down the river.

Mr. Speaker, I have been shocked and ashamed at some of the actions and some of the words of some of the members of this House. Let me assure you, and those opposite, and particularly the Minister of Lands and Forests of whose department I am a critic, that my criticisms or attack on the department or on the government will be on government policy, and not a personal attack on any one of the members of the government, full of innuendo or insinuation.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Mr. Speaker, as I rise to take part in this debate, I would like to echo the sentiment of previous speakers in congratulating you upon your election to the office that you are holding at present, and to thank you for the consideration that you have given to the new members, of which I am one. And I would also thank the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Brunelle) for his hospitality a few weeks ago, in making it possible for new members to meet his department officials. This is just another example of northern congeniality and that northern hospitality shining through.

Mr. Speaker, the riding of Thunder Bay which I am honoured and privileged to represent, covers an area of 150,000 square miles, with one voter for every 7.8 square miles. It runs from White River on the east to English River on the west, from Lake Superior and the state of Minnesota on the south, to the shores of Hudson Bay on the north. I travelled some 16,500 miles during the recent election campaign, and, in order to get from the southeastern portion of my riding to the mid-western portion of my riding, I had to go through the ridings of Port Arthur, Fort William, Rainy River, Kenora, and then on up into Pickle Lake. So that when you hear me talking about the problems that are confronting the people that I happen to represent, they are as vast and they are as varied as the geographic entity that I happen to represent. Now this vast area holds the key to the future prosperity of our entire province.

Within the boundaries of Thunder Bay, we have some of the greatest stands of timber on the face of the earth. We have the potential to become one of the most prosperous areas in Canada if we develop our mining industry in an orderly and a businesslike manner. In this entire area of 150,000 square miles, we have only five producing mines. One of them is a gold mine at Geraldton—it is now on a salvage basis. Another is only a 100-ton-a-day operation—Zenmac at Schreiber —and still another is an amethyst mine. The only operation of any significance is at Manitouwadge where Wilroy and Geco are located. We have hundreds of millions of tons of iron ore on the Anaconda and Canfer properties, a reasonable distance from Geraldton, while this town will lose it only mine and only industry in the near future.

Geraldton, with a population of 3,500, is in the heart of the most richly endowed areas of our province, and yet the community is doomed unless we can attract new industry. Private enterprise is not willing to invest capital in this area so it is clearly the responsibility of government to get something going.

What could this government do to encourage development in the north? First, it could give top priority to a complete survey and inventory of our forests to determine what type of plant or mill would thrive and be profitable. Loans to interested companies, along with the assurance that an ample supply of timber within economic distance to their base of operation would be available, must be given. I have had some discussions with the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests with regard to the town of Nipigon, which lost its only industry just recently with the closing of Norply. It means the closing of their only plant and represents the laying off of 130 people or one-third of the labour force. There are two towns in my riding that are losing their economic and their industrial base, just within the last year.

Second, it could establish a Crown-owned corporation such as Soquem, in Quebec,

which would carry out exploration and development in the mining field. Soquem, in its first year of operation, entered into agreements with more than 25 mining companies and will use profits accruing to undertake future development. As Mr. John Deutsch, former chairman of the economic council said recently, "Canada has had a habit of letting the other countries solve its development problems." But in this case—the north that is—Canadians will have to make more than their customary effort to solve their own problems.

Mr. Speaker, this government has abdicated its responsibilities to its northern people for far too long and a necessary first step would be the establishment of a northern research centre. This could be accomplished by relocating research personnel of The Department of Mines, and The Department of Lands and Forests in a place like Geraldton, where on-the-spot research and exploration could be carried out. A number of research stations have been established in northern Canada. These research stations have assisted northern development by providing a field base for research workers, by increasing our knowledge of the northern environment, and by assessing and co-ordination of scattered research efforts.

Most of the research in these stations has been the physical and biological sciences, and very little in the social sciences. The research workers have tended to have little contact with local people. In northern Ontario we need personnel and we need capital in order to exploit the full potential of the north.

Now the problems of northern development are seen increasingly as human problems. How traditional peoples can become accustomed to modern, urbanized, industrialized society, and how southern Canadians can adapt to a new physical and social environment—social sciences will provide some indication of how to solve these problems. The community development process can be seen as the introduction of ways and means of bringing about a social and economic change in a humane manner as quickly as possible. It needs a co-ordination of effort and research and action.

The north offers a number of advantages for experimentation. There is a need to accelerate living conditions quickly in our harsh physical environment. The situation is a cross-cultural one, with Indians and whites living close to each other. A high level of science and technology has to be introduced to exercise control in an area of long distances between settled places, in a climatically severe environment where populations are small.

If operational errors are made in these areas because of lack of adequate information or knowledge, then they are reflected in monetary terms or in terms of human stress and strain. Northern Ontario therefore can be seen as an area with possibilities for learning and experimenting. Successful projects can be accelerated; those in trouble can be analyzed and the bugs removed. In the north an interaction occurs that can be studied, between the land and the sea, and the Indians and the whites, between mining and forest operations, between primary industry and agriculture, between English and French Canadians.

Geraldton could therefore serve as a focus, as a field base to study a number of physical environments, and a number of social problems and all present development possibilities. The main aim would have to be to make the same data on the area available to those who have operational responsibilities in the area, and at the same time, ensure a flow of accurate, up-to-date relevant information from Toronto to our area.

The flow from Geraldton to Toronto would be of statistical information; the reversed flow could be details of new programmes, new ideas, new experiences in Ontario and the rest of Canada that were relevant to northern Ontario.

Mr. Speaker, we have been accused of being separatists and having separatist tendencies by the hon. member for Fort William (Mr. Jessiman). Does this plan which I have tried to enunciate sound like the irresponsible babbling of a sectionalist or segregationist? Mr. Speaker, I would think not. I would suggest that the hon. member for Fort William who is identified with the smug minority, open his eyes and see things as they really are in northern Ontario.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Port Arthur (Mr. Knight), the day before yesterday, made reference to an editorial that appeared in the Port Arthur *News-Chronicle*, and it took particular exception to statements that the hon. member for Fort William had made in his Throne debate speech. It is kind of ironic that he would make the kind of statements that he as for the simple reason that he along with the hon. members for Port Arthur, Rainy River (Mr. T. P. Reid), Kenora (Mr. Bernier) and myself, hosted a

delegation that came down from northwestern Ontario—the associated chambers of commerce. They presented some 25 briefs to various Ministers of government, and I think he worked as diligently as any one of us, in order to bring the message from northwestern Ontario down to government of the lack of many of the amenities in the north that you people enjoy here in the south. How he can say one thing in this House and enunciate an entirely different policy when he is with the people who are trying to get something done for the north, is completely beyond me. He knows just as well as I do what is needed in the north. I have invited him, along with other members from the north, to join with me in bringing the message down here of the inequity, the inequality that exists between southern Ontario and northern Ontario and he has done the same thing when he is back home on the hustings.

For his own very good reasons, he wants to join with the crowd over here, patting one another on the back. It is completely out of character for a northern member, because even the former Minister of Mines, I think, in his own way, tried to bring the message down here. He was not altogether successful, and I think this is reflected in the fact that previous to the last election seven of the 12 members who represented northern Ontario sat on the government benches and four of them were Cabinet Minitsers. Two of them are not with us today, so I think it is very obvious that the people in the north have done something about their frustrations and will continue to do so.

I would like to get on to another subject, Mr. Speaker. A brewery uses the slogan, "It is great to be a northerner," in its advertising. Its purpose is to present attractively, a number of attributes which people who live in northern Ontario believe or would like to believe belong to them. These attributes are openness, friendliness, self-reliance, exuberance and a quality best described as outdoorsy. Since the brewery commercials are designed for the market area of northern Ontario, there is a rather embarrasing element of self-congratulation about them. I refer to the "It is great to be a northerner" theme because it may drive home the paradox to some of my listeners.

Many of you may have gathered from the wails and cries of those of us who represent the north of this province that it is tough to be a northerner, or even that most northerners are anxious to be southerners. Frankly, our problems are more complicated than many of us have been prepared to concede. I want to begin my analysis of them with the assurance that I know, and my colleagues know, that policies for our problems require more than a response of a tossed bone or two from the government.

The realities for northern Ontario begin with political power. It rests with the Ministry, which stems from the members in this assembly chosen by the people. Draw a line from north of the Soo to Sudbury and North Bay; the overwhelming part of Ontario's land mass lies north of that line; the overwhelming number of Ontario people live south of it. Representation in this Legislature is related to population. It is an overly simple point, but one you need to begin with and never forget. Northern Ontario has relatively few members of Parliament and these men in the main represent huge areas of square miles with scattered population.

In the past ten years, a number of realizations about their own political and economic position have come home to the people of Northern Ontario. Population trends are not with us—they are against us; against us in terms of acquiring a greater and greater population base and more and more political representation and so more and more political power of the most crude kind.

Our young people emigrate overwhelmingly and we are in danger of developing a Maritime mentality. We know now, and perhaps should have known since the depression, that northern Ontario is unlikely to have a really strong agricultural base. We know now, and should have known since the days of the Kennedy commission on forestry, that the nature of our forests—slow growing, small in individual tree size and distributed unevenly over hundreds of thousands of square miles—precludes intensive management.

The most marvellous silviculture and most enlightened management is not going to convert northern Ontario into any British Columbia, or Sweden, in terms of a concentrated logging, milling and pulp and paper industry. Good management and planning and wise husbandry can give a higher production in a few more mills, but the lesson in forest exploitation of the past decade is that excessive forestry requires excessive capital investment in machinery, and more skilled workers, but fewer and fewer of them.

A crude and shocking figure exists, to convert this trend into problems of people and communities and power and growth. About one third of the labour force of 1950 is required in 1968 to bring out the pulp crop in

northern Ontario as a whole and that crop is almost double the one in 1950. I make these points about forestry, not in a spirit of pessimism, but to argue that we and no one else should any longer deceive ourselves that there is an enormous growth potential, especially in terms of people and communities, from northern Ontario forests as exploited for wood for conversion into wood products.

The optimism of the north exemplified in the brewery slogan was based on the belief of a generation of pioneers who went into the northern frontier, especially after Cobalt's boom at the turn of the century. What had been fur trade country, then an over-roomy corridor for railway transport lines that went to the prairies, and an occasionally exciting frame for thrilling mine lodes, like Silver Islet in the 1870s or Michipicoten copper of the 1880s, was to become the new farm and forestry development mecca.

Cochrane and Dryden were to be agricultural centres. Every railway divisional point was a potential mill site, every railway siding a potential sawmill site. And there was the added glamour and prospect of tourist income from the trout of the Nipigon and the pickerel of Gogama Lake and the muskellunge of Eagle Lake and the Wabigoon River. There was something very fine about that optimism, the kind of belief in the future that set Backus a-building at Fort Frances and developed an iron and steel complex at the Soo, and which for its originators made millions, and made James Dunn a millionaire. Only, then World War II came along.

For 30 years men tried and went broke and tried again to develop the ores of the Sudbury basin before metallurgical advance and huge corporations began to pry out and accelerate the riches. Meanwhile, through northern Ontario, the three transcontinental railroads provided a skeleton for local development and discoveries in mining and forestry. To a degree, contrary to the understanding of those in southern Ontario, northern Ontario is built around the communities founded by the railway—Kenora, Fort William, Port Arthur, Capreol, Cochrane, Sioux Lookout, North Bay, and my own home town of Schreiber.

Here again, trends of the postwar years have brought home the tenuous nature of growth in northern Ontario. Railways are moving much more freight with fewer men on the trains, in the stations, and along the tracks. The railway labour force in northern Ontario is down to almost half of what it was in the early fifties, with prospects for a slow continuation of this receding trend. Again, I stress this in a spirit of realism not pessimism.

Highways have followed, complemented, gone further than, in many cases pre-empted the traffic and services of the railways. Again, highway transport has been distinguished, like forestry, with extensive operation, big equipment, and relatively small numbers of employees. Northern Ontario is comparatively young but the death of the Porcupine gold camp, which we have been watching and hearing about in the last few years, is a reminder that ore bodies peter out and that mining developments bring jobs and towns but their permanence is nothing to be taken for granted.

The locale and development of new ore bodies is not an even or determinable matter, and only on the rare occasions, say with Texas Gulf, do you get discoveries at perfect locations to meet community and employment needs. And again it is worth noting that developments in mining technology have led to amazing tonnages with amazingly few turning the ores out. In other words, mining, like forestry and transport, is peculiarly open to technological change with mechanized equipment replacing men. Who would have thought that 20 years ago the Steep Rock iron range would be producing millions of tons of iron ore annually at its nearby town, Atikokan, would hardly be bigger that it was during Steep Rock's first development phase?

The only labour intensive development in recent times that is linked to our natural resources is tourism. And until population pressures from the cities to the south get much stronger, tourism is a welcome—but a seasonal, and so a limited—opportunity for investment and jobs and people.

In quick summation, whether it is transport, forestry, mining, tourism, or if you want to stretch the past into the future, farming or the fur trade, there is not going to be any blinding, quick success to change the prospects of northern Ontario. Anything we get, anything we develop, anything we are encouraged to do must begin with these realizations. Therefore, every development in mining, every prospect of an economic development in forestry, all the myriad and mostly small development prospects in tourism should be planned and apportioned and encouraged and supported by intelligent government support at the three levels of government, but especially at the provincial level.

This seems rather obvious as an approach but there lingers in the mood, the political philosophy of this province, the idea that the

market is the best determinate of all developments. Sometimes the market philosophy can be very stupid. Remember the Nakina situation a few years ago when the Canadian National Railways, using its own economic yardsticks, decided to close down its divisional point operations at Nakina. A spontaneous rail strike put this off and in the aftermath a lot of people realized that good market philosophy for the CNR in dollars and cents was stupid in terms of the investment in social and community capital that persons and government, especially the provincial government, had put into Nakina.

Whether an industry establishes in Cooksville or Brantford or Fergus is maybe much less important to the well-being of Ontario, and in terms of the market principle less determinant, than whether a new industry goes into Rainy River or Fort Frances. My point is that the basis is narrower in northern Ontario and the need is greater if we are to retain the vigour of some of our young people.

This kind of idealism about northern development which I am expressing is nothing strange in northern Ontario. You find it common from Timiskaming through to the Manitoba border, but northern Ontario, for all its similarity in main industrial lines and topography is not one coherent region or population. At its simplest it is seven or eight regions, most of them more tributary to Toronto by far than we are to each other. For example, the community of Kapuskasing and the community of Kenora have much more likelihood of crossing each other's tracks, rare as that might be, in Toronto rather than in the north. Thus you get the tendency for those of us who represent northern constituencies to have the same general problems but to work individually, and unfortunately more and more as individual supplicants to the powers in Toronto.

The lines of communication—by airlines, by letter, for education, municipal and business matters—tend to be centred in Toronto from the regional centre in northern Ontario, be it Kenora, Dryden, the Lakehead, Geraldton, Manitouwadge, Nipigon, Hearst, Kapuskasing, Timmins, Kirkland Lake, Sault Ste. Marie, Sudbury and North Bay. If there is anything I would like to bring into this Legislature and to all my colleagues from the north, whatever their party, it is the thesis that we tend to compete with each other without knowing it. Compete for the attention and the expertise and the funds of governments and my belief is that we are not strong enough for such competition, that we must establish among us a sense of co-operation and common purpose and sense of shared development.

Obviously a number of Ministers in the government are more important to the north than others. Lands and Forests, Mines (Mr. A. F. Lawrence), and Economics and Development (Mr. Randall) are examples; and of course the Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) himself. Some people still shy away from the connotations of the word and concept "plan". Mr. Speaker, we need an overall plan for northern Ontario based on a realistic view of what we have and where we might go. Who is to make the plan? It will not spring forth in a season like a buck's antlers, that is certain. Each of us has ideas, hobby horses, enthusiasms, villains and enemies in relationship to the north as we see it. My tentative idea regarding a plan for northern Ontario has these features at this time. I am not dogmatic about them and I hope to learn from others.

For example, I believe that (a) there must be an acceptance by the government of the principle that northern Ontario requires greater funds for investment from or backed by the government than it has previously considered possible, in either theory or practice; (b) some greater decentralization in government apparatus from Toronto to at least three different and quite separate centres in northern Ontario is sensible.

For example, Sudbury, the Lakehead and Kapuskasing. A priority should be given to placing schools and colleges and training facilities in which the government is directly involved in northern Ontario.

Mr. Speaker, I see that it is 6 o'clock. I would like to adjourn this debate.

Mr. Stokes moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, before moving the adjournment of the House I would advise that tomorrow we will continue this debate.

Hon. Mr. Dymond moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 6:00 o'clock p.m.

No. 24

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

First Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Thursday, March 14, 1968

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1968

5

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Thursday, March 14, 1968

Sixth report, standing committee on private bills, Mr. Carton 761

The Lord's Day (Ontario) Act, 1960-1961, bill to amend, Mr. Wishart, first reading 761

Professional Engineers Act, 1968, bill intituled, Mr. Wishart, first reading 761

Evidence Act, bill to amend, Mr. Wishart, first reading 762

Statement re the housing authority of Toronto, Mr. Randall 763

Statement re Harold C. Banks, Mr. Wishart 768

Statement re the closing of the Canada and Dominion Sugar Company plant at Chatham, Mr. Stewart 770

Questions to Mr. Randall re Mr. and Mrs. David Lumsden, Mr. Nixon 772

Questions to Mr. Grossman re drug trafficking in provincial reformatories, Mr. Nixon 773

Questions to Mr. Bales and Mr. Wishart re strike at Canada Sandpapers Limited, Mr. Nixon 773

Questions to Mr. Davis re provincially-assisted universities, Mr. Nixon 774

Question to Mr. Gomme re location of proposed highway, Mr. Nixon 775

Question to Mr. Welch re beer prices, Mr. Sopha 775

Question to Mr. Auld re Dundurn castle, Mr. J. R. Smith 775

Question to Mr. Simonett re the Hydro Electric Power Commission, Mr. Edighoffer 776

Question to Mr. Yaremko re OHSC and OMSIP premiums, Mr. Braithwaite 777

Question to Mr. McKeough re the shelter grant, Mr. Burr 778

Questions to Mr. Wishart re legal aid, Mr. Sargent 778

Questions to Mr. Grossman re Mr. Frank Ellis and Mr. Thomas Tracy, Mr. Sargent 779

Questions to Mr. Brunelle re commercial fishing, Mr. Spence 780

Question to Mr. Randall re the Ontario development corporation, Mr. Sargent 781

Resumption of the debate on the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Stokes, Mr. Belanger, Mr. Haggerty, Mr. Pitman 781

Recess, 6 o'clock 797

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, MARCH 14, 1968

The House met at 2:30 p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: Once again today we have students in our galleries: in the east gallery, Fairview public school, Cooksville, and Lakeshore school, Toronto; and in the west gallery, the Richard W. Scott separate school, Toronto. At 3:15 this afternoon, we will be joined in the east gallery by pupils from Eastview public school, Scarborough, and in the west gallery by pupils from Park Street collegiate, Orillia. I am sure that we welcome these young people here today.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Mr. G. R. Carton from the standing committee on private bills, presented the committee's sixth report which was read as follows and adopted:

Your committee begs to report the following bill without amendment:

Bill Pr13, An Act respecting the city of Peterborough (2).

Your committee begs to report the following bills with certain amendments:

Bill Pr11, An Act respecting the city of Peterborough (1);

Bill Pr12, An Act respecting the community foundation of Ottawa and district.

Mr. Speaker: Presenting reports.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

THE LORD'S DAY (ONTARIO) ACT, 1960-1961

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Lord's Day (Ontario) Act, 1960-1961.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, a brief word of explanation on the purpose of the bill. It is to permit the operation of agricultural, horticultural or trade exhibitions or shows after the hour of 1:30 in the afternoon on Sundays upon adoption of a municipal bylaw.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, could I ask the Minister if that would include the Canadian National Exhibition, for example?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: That is the intention of the Act, to totally encompass the CNE, plus the sportsmen's show, and other similar exhibitions.

Mr. Nixon: The Minister said totally encompass. That would be all parts of the CNE?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: The provision for the municipal jurisdiction comes into play. In the passing of the bylaw, the municipality may specify the activities which may or may not be permitted.

Mr. Nixon: They could still exclude the midway?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Not necessarily. It would be up to the municipality.

Mr. Nixon: They could?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: They could, yes.

THE PROFESSIONAL ENGINEERS ACT, 1968

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves first reading of bill intituled, The Professional Engineers Act, 1968.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, the note which I should like to read to the House with respect to this bill, explains that this is the first comprehensive revision of this Act, which was first passed in 1922. Changes made are designed to facilitate the association of professional engineers of this province in the administration of its affairs and to bring the Act up to date in form and substance.

It is to be noted that the public continues to be protected, as all the bylaws of the association must be approved by the Lieutenant-Governor in council, and the members of the profession, sir, continue to be protected, as all bylaws must be approved by a majority vote of the membership of the association.

I should like to add that the bill, substantially in the form in which it is now introduced, was presented to The Department of the Attorney General last year, and we reviewed the legislation then to a very considerable extent. The proposals which are formulated here into legislation were put forward, of course, as might be expected, by the professional engineers. We worked with them in reviewing those proposals and in the sifting and the drafting of the legislation.

Last year there were still some differences which I might describe as internal differences within the profession. These have been clarified and disposed of and, therefore, I bring the Act forward now. But I want to say further, that in reading the report of the hon. Mr. McRuer, in which are found comments and recommendations with regard to legislation which affects professions, he makes one recommendation which I think, is a very meritorious one.

I say that with respect. It is recommended that professions—where they have special Acts—should have represented on their governing bodies, lay members—members who represent the public. The principle, as carried forward in that recommendation, being that if a profession is given a special Act, the primary consideration should be the protection of the public.

There are, certainly, definite provisions in this Act which go to the protection of the public in the review by the Lieutenant-Governor in council, but I am not rejecting, certainly would not want to suggest, that while there is no lay representation on the council as now proposed in this bill—which has been ready for some weeks actually—I would think that it would be proper to present the bill as it now appears. With respect to this recommendation, I think, in any case, it would be fair and reasonable to expect a profession such as the engineers, who are very large in numbers in this province, to have the opportunity to examine the recommendations of Mr. McRuer in the report and to bring forward their submission.

Now it is probable or possible that the bill could be reviewed in that respect as it moves through the various stages in this House, or it could be possible that further time might be allowed and an amendment could be made to it later, perhaps, after the engineers themselves have had a chance to study the recommendations which have been made by Mr. McRuer.

I did not wish to present the bill, in its present form, without making those introductory remarks.

THE EVIDENCE ACT

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Evidence Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, last year there was adopted in the rules of procedure, provisions for the production of business records upon notice, before they were tendered as evidence in an action and likewise, provisions for the production of medical records, upon notice before being tendered as evidence in an action.

The courts have held that such rules could not be effective; that they were outside the authority of the rules committee and should be in legislation if they were to be effective. The purpose of this amending Act is to bring those provisions into the legislation.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Mr. McRuer is against this because you deprive the right of cross-examination to the litigant.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Oh, no!

Mr. Sopha: The Minister is against the ideal of the McRuer report.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Oh, no. The hon. member may debate that in the House.

Mr. Sopha: I will not ask the Minister when I may debate it!

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): Mr. Speaker, may I ask a question of the hon. Attorney General on this bill?

Will this particular bill affect the type of case that was discussed in the House yesterday where the workmen's compensation board has refused to reveal medical reports?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I would not think so, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. S. J. Randall (Minister of Economics and Development): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day—

Mr. Speaker: Order, the Minister has a statement.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Speaker, I have a statement with reference to the housing authority of Toronto, which I would like to put before the members today. I think they will certainly be interested in what I have to say about this matter and perhaps it will save a lot of future discussion.

From time to time over the past two years, views have been expressed concerning the possible takeover by the Ontario housing corporation of the housing authority of Toronto, most of which have been misleading. These have been reported in the press with the inevitable result that both the staff and tenants of the housing authority have become extremely disturbed. In view of this, and in the interest of accuracy, I feel it is incumbent upon me to report fully on this matter.

In April 1966, the housing authority of Toronto submitted a brief to the federal Minister responsible for central mortgage and housing corporation with whom they had subsequently met. The purpose was to request central mortgage and housing corporation to enter into an agreement with the housing authority of Toronto to meet 50 per cent of the annual operating losses sustained and borne wholly by the city in Regent Park north, and to waive the requirement for a replacement reserve fund to be maintained in respect of the projects financed under section 16 of The National Housing Act. This is because of the annual deficits which these projects were incurring.

With respect to the first request, the federal Minister intimated that, subject to the express consent and approval of the province of Ontario, and subject to the introduction by the housing authority of Toronto of the rent-geared-to-income scale jointly adopted by central mortgage and housing corporation, central mortgage and housing corporation could contribute up to 50 per cent of the annual operating deficit.

With regard to the waiving of the replacement reserve fund contributions, the Minister pointed out that under The National Housing Act this was not permissible. He suggested as an alternative that consideration could be given to a request for an increase in the rental scales to offset the deficit.

During the early part of 1966, I was asked to meet with Controller Margaret Campbell and senior officials of the city of Toronto. The controller requested the meeting with a view to inviting the province to participate in the operating losses which were being met in full by the city. I pointed out that the provincial government had already extended considerable financial assistance to the city in respect of the projects under discussion by way of capital grants amounting to $1,000 per suite for the 1,397 units in Regent Park north and the 903 units in Moss Park, for a total of $2,300,000.

Subsequently the board of control formally requested that a conference be convened to clarify the respective positions of the city of Toronto and the Ontario housing corporation in the provision of housing for the city of Toronto. A preliminary meeting was held on July 4, 1966, attended by myself, the board of control, the chairman and officials of the Ontario housing corporation and officials of the city of Toronto and the housing authority of Toronto.

Among matters discussed, the question of the Ontario housing corporation assuming the responsibilities of the housing authority of Toronto and the city of Toronto limited dividend housing corporation limited was raised by board of control. I suggested that such an arrangement could be considered but that in order to qualify for federal assistance in respect of operating losses it would be necessary for the province to acquire ownership of these properties. One way in which this could be effected would be for the city to lease its equity in the developments to the Ontario housing corporation for a nominal sum and for the corporation to assume the outstanding indebtedness. On this basis, at the end of an agreed period of time ownership of the properties would revert to the city.

A further meeting took place shortly thereafter under the chairmanship of the late Mr. K. D. Soble. This meeting was also attended by Controller Margaret Campbell and officials of the city of Toronto, the chairman of the Toronto housing authority, Mr. David Archer, officials of the authority and officials of the Ontario housing corporation. During this meeting Controller Campbell inquired of Mr. Soble what advantage the Ontario housing corporation feels there is in it taking over the city's existing housing stock.

Mr. Soble answered that the Ontario housing corporation had not said that it wanted to take over the Toronto housing authority and that the current study was being made as a result of an inquiry by Controller William Archer as to whether the Ontario housing corporation would be interested in assuming the operations of the Toronto housing authority. Mr. Soble stated that he did not know of any benefit that would accrue to the Ontario

housing corporation if it took over the operations of the housing authority, and furthermore if it is found there is no distinct advantage to the city in the Ontario housing corporation assuming this operation, then there would be no point in proceeding in this direction.

At the request of the city I met again with board of control in July, 1967. At this time the city indicated it wished the provincial government to give consideration to the proposed acquisition of the city-owned properties. It was agreed that Mr. W. M. Campbell, finance commissioner, Mr. W. F. Manthorpe, development commissioner, and Mr. W. R. Callow, city solicitor, would provide the Ontario housing corporation with financial and other details of the city's public housing operation in order that the province might give further consideration to the proposal. This information was subsequently provided and I was able to determine approximately what the cost to the province would be in the event that it concurred in the city's proposal.

A meeting with the board of control was arranged for March 8, 1968, and the day before, March 7, I wrote the following letter to Mayor William Dennison:

During the early part of 1966 I met with Controller Margaret Campbell and senior officials of the city of Toronto at the controller's request. Controller Campbell advised me of the operating losses which were being met in full by the city of Toronto in its rental developments and asked whether the province would be prepared to participate in these losses.

I pointed out that the government of Ontario had already extended considerable financial assistance to the city in respect of the projects under discussion by way of capital grants of $1,000 per suite totalling $2,300,000. Any further contributions by the province toward the operating deficits could not, in my opinion, be anticipated where the province exercised no jurisdiction or control over the operation and administration of the units and the rental rates charged.

Subsequently I was requested to meet with board of control to clarify the respective positions of the city of Toronto and the Ontario housing corporation in the provision of housing in the city. A preliminary meeting was held on July 4, 1966, and a further meeting took place shortly thereafter.

Among matters discussed, the question of the Ontario housing corporation assuming the responsibilities of the housing authority of Toronto and the city of Toronto limited dividend housing corporation limited was raised. I suggested that such an arrangement might be considered and that in order to qualify for operating subsidies at both federal and provincial levels, OHC should lease the lands on which the dwellings are located for a nominal sum of $1 per annum.

The municipal equity in the developments to date would be represented by the value of the lands at the time of acquisition by OHC, this value being determined as the amount of indebtedness which had been liquidated at the date of acquisition. OHC would then assume responsibility for retiring the debenture debt service or would assume the existing mortgage or mortgages as the case may be.

The terms of the lease on the land would be for a period of not less than 10 years beyond the date or dates on which the outstanding debt will be fully amortized. At the termination of the lease periods, ownership of each development would wholly vest in the municipality.

In July, 1967, I met again with yourself and board of control, at which time it was agreed that representatives of OHC would meet with Messrs. W. M. Campbell, W. F. Manthorpe and W. R. Callow of the city of Toronto to obtain certain specific information concerning the city's developments in order that the province might give further consideration to the proposed acquisition.

Over the ensuing months the necessary information has been provided to OHC, and this has permitted an approximate determination of the financial and other considerations involved. Approval in principle has been received at both the federal and provincial levels to enter into the proposed arrangements, and the Metro chairman, Mr. Wm. R. Allen, Q.C., has informally indicated that the Metropolitan corporation would be prepared to bear 7.5 per cent of any operating losses which may be involved.

Having regard to the foregoing, I now feel the following steps are necessary in order to obtain the formal approval of all parties concerned:

(a) A resolution should be passed by the city of Toronto requesting OHC to acquire certain real property currently administered and operated by the housing authority of Toronto and the city of Toronto limited dividend housing corporation limited. (Attached to this letter is a schedule of the properties involved.);

(b) It will be necessary for the city of Toronto to give an undertaking that it will offer alternative employment to all employees of the housing authority of Toronto and the city of Toronto limited dividend housing corporation limited. (All positions available under the new management structure to be created by OHC will be open in the first instance to all administrative employees of the two bodies referred to above. These persons will be hired under the terms of The Public Service Act of Ontario, but the normal probationary period will be waived.);

(c) It will be necessary for the city to offer alternative employment to those employees of the two bodies referred to above employed under the terms of collective agreements with locals 43-767 CUPE and district council No. 46 brotherhood of painters and paperhangers. (OHC will undertake to hire all personnel required to fill the maintenance positions created under the new management arrangement from previous employees of these two bodies, and will do so through discussions with local 767 of CUPE.);

(d) There must be a clear understanding on the part of the city that it has relinquished all interest in the properties previously under its jurisdiction, and that these properties will now form part of OHC's total Metro portfolio, to be operated on the same terms and conditions regarding rentals, eligibility of tenants, etc.;

(e) Upon receipt of the necessary resolution from the city of Toronto a formal application will be made to central mortgage and housing corporation to participate in the financing of these developments, and agreeing that all developments will be operated on the basis of the national rental scale with CMHC bearing 50 per cent of any operating losses which may result. Application will also be made to the corporation of the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto to bear 7.5 per cent of any operating losses which may be incurred in these developments;

(f) The provincial grants previously made in respect of the Regent Park north and Moss Park developments will be capitalized and form part of the total indebtedness of these developments, such indebtedness to be recovered by the province over a period not exceeding the term of the lease on the land.

It is not proposed that OHC take over certain properties acquired by the city of Toronto for emergency purposes. It is felt these would be better administered under the Metro emergency housing programme.

In order to ensure a smooth transition, it is suggested that a joint committee be set up for the purpose of implementing the acquisition. On the part of OHC, this would comprise Messrs. P. E. H. Brady, deputy managing director, development; E. J. Whaley, deputy managing director, property management; E. Weiss, deputy managing director, finance; A. A. Hermant, corporate secretary and chief counsel; and G. Fulford, personnel manager. It is suggested that the contemporaries of these persons at the city level constitute the city's representation on the committee. The committee should be given a specific time limit within which to fully implement the transfer of responsibility.

Concurrently with a formal application to central mortgage and housing corporation in connection with those properties now owned by or on behalf of the city of Toronto, CMHC will be requested to concur in an amendment to the No. 2 agreement for south Regent Park, permitting the payment of a grant in lieu of taxes equal to full normal taxes and this will save the city another $100,000 per year.

That is the end of my letter to the mayor.

The meeting on March 8 has been referred to as a "secret meeting with board of control." I was not aware of any secrecy attendant upon this meeting, nor was my letter to the maylor in any way confidential. The meeting was attended by all members of the board of control with the exception of controller Allan Lamport. The Metropolitan chairman, Mr. W. R. Allen, Q.C., was also there. The question of attendance by directors of the housing authority of Toronto was, of course, a matter for the city of Toronto to determine.

As you will appreciate from my letter, I was extremely concerned that the welfare of the staff of the housing authority should be foremost in our minds. It was for this reason that I considered it absolutely necessary for the city of Toronto to guarantee employment for all administrative and maintenance employees who could not be absorbed into the new management structure.

I was concerned that, at the earliest possible moment, the staff members should be advised of what was taking place and what arrangements were proposed on their behalf and this was agreed upon at the meeting. However, at no time was I in a position to go directly to the housing authority and, for that matter, until such time as a specific request is received from the city for the Ontario government to take over its public housing operation, it would be neither right nor proper for me to do so.

Throughout the discussions, my sole concern has been to work with the city as closely as possible in finding a solution to the financial problem in which it has found itself as a result of its public housing operation. By absorbing the city's public housing stock into the overall property management programme of OHC, the taxpayers of the city of Toronto will, on the basis of figures provided to us by the city, be relieved of an annual operating loss in excess of $900,000 in addition to the $100,000 I mentioned a few minutes ago.

However, it must be realized that if the Ontario housing corporation were to merely assume the existing administrative structure of the housing authority, there would be duplication of positions with no saving in administrative overhead. I have made it abundantly clear to the city that if the Ontario housing corporation is to take over these developments, it will administer them as part of its overall Metropolitan Toronto portfolio and at a minimum cost to the taxpayer at large.

However, having regard to the fact that certain positions in the Toronto housing authority will become redundant, I have indicated to the city that I will assist them in every way possible to relocate the persons now occupying these positions.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I had some questions on this matter, some of which will not be necessary since the Minister has given us his statement. But can he tell us what the effective date of the transition of that responsibility might be?

Hon. Mr. Randall: No, as I said in the letter, we have to receive a resolution now from the city of Toronto for us to take over, and then we will proceed to work with the city of Toronto and CMHC to close the deal.

Mr. Nixon: Any predictions?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Oh, I would think in the next 60 days it could be done, I do not foresee any delays.

Mr. Nixon: Then, a question of which I did give the Minister notice. Did the Ontario housing corporation decide that Robert Bradley, executive director of the Toronto housing authority, would not be useful to the Ontario housing corporation, for as the Minister just said, be redundant, and therefore would not be employed by the Ontario housing corporation after the takeover?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I do not think that I received that. Wait a minute, yes I have it right here. The answer to the first question is that the government of Ontario has not yet been asked by the city of Toronto to take over the responsibilities of the housing authority which I have just outlined. The question of employment by OHC of the members of the Toronto housing authority has not been specifically dealt with at this time.

However, it is not a question of a person's usefulness. It is a question of the duplication and unnecessary costs. In the event that the city does ask the government of Ontario to take over its housing responsibilities, a staff structure will be set up to manage the units.

This will have regard for the existing management of OHC, and will be designed to ensure that there will be no duplication of positions or unnecessary overhead.

The hon. member mentioned one gentleman in particular. I have already talked to him by telephone and I have made it quite clear to the city officials that I felt that he had done a job for the city and that they should make sure that his interests were protected. On the other hand, I suggested to Mr. Bradley in the phone conversation when he called me, that I would do my best to see that he would be relocated.

Mr. Nixon: In the Ontario housing corporation?

Hon. Mr. Randall: No, not in Ontario housing, I do not have a position of that type in the Ontario housing corporation for him.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, the Minister said that he thought that some of those positions would be redundant, and that there would be no duplication. Does he feel that the director of the Toronto housing would be redundant?

Hon. Mr. Randall: At the moment, yes; I do not have a position of that magnitude available. I have all the executives in the Ontario housing corporation that I require for that position, I do not have a position open for him.

Mr. Nixon: If the Minister would permit a supplementary question based on the questions that I submitted, how would he explain the fact that Toronto has indicated to Mr. Bradley that if this goes through, he will be, and I quote, "out on his ear."

Hon. Mr. Randall: I do not know what Toronto has said to Mr. Bradley. I think the leader of the Opposition is reading a lot of reports that may be accurate, they may be inaccurate; and I think that what Mr. Bradley would be wise to do, would be to wait and see what does take place.

Mr. Nixon: Then can the Minister assure us that neither he, nor the chairman of the Ontario housing authority, nor any of the members of the staff, have indicated that his usefulness will not be a matter of any importance as far as the Ontario housing authority is concerned.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Yes. I told Mr. Bradley that I did not have a position at the present time for him in the Ontario housing corporation. What the city told him, I do not know. I also told Mr. Bradley that there are other positions, perhaps, in the government where I could recommend his services.

Mr. Nixon: I think that the Minister needs him.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Well, that is the leader of the Opposition's opinion, I do not think so.

Mr. Speaker: Order! The member for Windsor West has a question along the same lines, which I think that he might put now.

Mr. H. Peacock (Windsor West): Mr. Speaker, I had a number of questions which were answered in good part by the Minister's statement. I have one separate supplementary question if he will answer it. It is, would the Minister agree to fixing an effective date for the takeover, not earlier than the date that he is assured that arrangements have been made for continuation of employment of Toronto housing authority employees, either with the city of Toronto, or with the Ontario housing corporation?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I think that I can answer this. As I said earlier, we are looking after every employee on the payroll to see if they can be absorbed into the operation. Now, we have already discussed this with the union leaders in those locals. So, we have entered into a discussion with them to ensure that these employees are taken care of as soon as we possibly can.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Mr. Speaker, would the Minister answer a question on that statement? If the final ownership of this whole package is finally invested in the province, does he know what the net cost to the province will be?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I think that the hon. member did not understand me. All we are doing is renting the real estate, until the balance of the mortgage is paid off, and then it reverts back to the city. The province never becomes the owner of the property.

Mr. Sargent: Then would you tell me, if you plan to have any more packages like this across the province, where to bail out other housing plans? Are you setting a precedent for the rest of the province now?

Hon. Mr. Randall: No, this is, to my knowledge, the only housing authority in the province of Ontario. All the rest were authorities appointed by the province. The last one was the Metro housing authority which we took over several years ago. This was one set up by the city of Toronto and which they would like to get out of at the cost of roughly $1 million a year, and we are trying to oblige them.

Mr. Sargent: Again, sir, one more supplementary, if you would answer this. In effect, we are talking about a $1 million subsidy in this package here. What other cities of Ontario then have received capital grants to say $1,000 per unit from the government?

Mr. Speaker: I do not think that this is a matter which arises as supplementary to this—

Mr. Sargent: It is part of his statement, sir.

Mr. Speaker: —and I think if the member wishes to have that information, it requires a certain amount of research and if he will either place it on the order paper or deliver it to me tomorrow morning to my office, it will be dealt with. The Attorney General has a statement he wishes to make.

Mr. L. A. Braithwaite (Etobicoke): Mr. Speaker, I have an additional question for the Minister if he will answer a supplementary to what he said.

He made reference, Mr. Speaker, to rents geared to income. Now, as the Minister no doubt knows, there are, throughout Metropolitan Toronto, many cases where individual tenants have received an increase in pay. Immediately they are in trouble because their rent has been geared to income, and because it has been calculated on the gross pay instead of on the net pay. It appears that this problem is going to be compounded by the government takeover of low rental housing in Toronto.

I would like to know, Mr. Speaker, if the Minister can tell us if he has made, or if his department has made, any steps toward changing the basis of calculation of rent from the gross pay to the net pay.

I am sure that the Minister is familiar with the problem.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Speaker, all I can tell the hon. member is that as far back as last May, I think it was, a new rent scale was put into effect which did materially lower the rents in many areas. The lowest rent now is around $32 a month. The question of a man's income or gross family income going up and his paying a net increased percentage has been discussed with the Minister responsible for housing in Ottawa who set this rent scale. It is not set by the Ontario housing corporation. They set the rent scale and we had suggested to them that perhaps there is an inequity in the basis of applying.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Substantial inequity!

Hon. Mr. Randall: Applying this extra increase.

Mr. Sopha: Gross injustice I would say!

Hon. Mr. Randall: All right; gross injustice of applying this charge against the man's added income.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Randall: By the same token—

Mr. Sopha: He always blames Ottawa for his own shortcomings.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

Hon. Mr. Randall: If the member would just sit there with his bare face hanging out and listen for a minute, perhaps he would get the answer.

Mr. Sopha: A typical Rotary club statement.

Hon. Mr. Randall: That is right. I am trying to answer the gentleman behind the member.

I suggest to you, sir, that there are cases also where we have people who are earning far in excess of the amount that permits them to live in public housing; but there was nowhere else for them to go so we did not force them to vacate. There are problems on both sides; those who earn too much and want to stay there because they cannot find another place to go, and those who, of course, are trying to improve their income. They are not rewarded for improving their income.

We have discussed this, as I said, with the Minister of Housing in Ottawa and suggested he change The National Housing Act. Perhaps this could be negotiated. I appreciate the problem, but it is not within my jurisdiction at the moment to change it.

Mr. Braithwaite: Mr. Speaker, if I could ask just one more question. Inasmuch as many of these individuals in my particular riding have been forced to go on to welfare because of receipt of an increase in pay, it appears to me that the government would save money if they took it upon themselves to reduce the rent.

Mr. Speaker: If the member will content himself with asking a supplementary question and not making a statement—

Mr. Braithwaite: Does the Minister have any intention of making some sort of provision with reference to the amount of rents that Ontario housing itself is responsible for, in order to assist these cases? I am certain the Minister knows of many important cases.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

The member has placed his question; he will now be seated while the Minister answers him.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Speaker, I will just say I will take the hon. member's suggestions into consideration. I do not have the answer today. I thought I had explained my position as far as I could go. I recognize some of the difficulties that are created when family incomes are improved, but again I say, this is a matter for negotiation with our federal partner. They have to stand 50 per cent of the losses, therefore they want to be consulted when we make any changes.

Mr. Singer: That is a little different, quite different.

Mr. Braithwaite: Mr. Speaker, this is an important matter.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order!

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, I wish to advise the House that I have now been notified by the counsel who have been acting for Ontario in the extradition proceedings against Harold C. Banks that the Secretary of State for the United States has advised that Banks will not be extradited by that country.

I have not yet received the full details of the decision which is being forwarded to me by mail. However, Mr. Speaker, the decision has been arrived at after a full and complete hearing before both the extradition commissioner in New York and the Secretary of State at Washington. Ontario has made every submission possible and has taken every step available in the judicial and treaty process between our two countries.

The decision that has been made is within the discretion of the United States and has, I am sure, been exercised with full consideration for all submissions. As we have now exhausted the avenues available for the return of this man, I do not, for Ontario's part, intend pursuing the matter further.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, a few moments before the House went into session I heard the hon. Attorney General on radio commenting on this. He indicated at that time he felt that there were some undue pressures exerted on the American Secretary of State. I wonder if he would comment further on that matter.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: No, Mr. Speaker, I made no suggestion of any undue pressures. I indicated to the press that it was the usual procedure in extradition proceedings that the commissioner's decision, after the hearing, is accepted as a matter of course generally by the Secretary of State. You have to go a long way back in time to find it otherwise. I felt that there were strong pressures or urgent submissions made to him because he held a hearing in this case following the commissioner's judgment, which was in favour of extradition.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Nixon: What were the sources of these pressures at that hearing?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I would not know.

Mr. Nixon: The Minister does not know who appeared at the hearing?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: No.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Attorney General if it is his intention to protest—

Mr. Speaker: If he will accept a question.

Mr. MacDonald: —and I use the word "protest" for want of a better one at the moment.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I said in my statement, Mr. Speaker, that for Ontario's part we do not intend pursuing the matter further. I believe that extradition, being a treaty matter, perhaps there are avenues open—perhaps on the level of Secretaries of State. But I think

Ontario has done its full duty and has pursued the matter to the fullest extent that we wish to do now.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, may I ask, can the Attorney General make representations to Ottawa to pursue the matter? They presumably have been acting on your behalf up until now. Or do you at this point give up?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, Ottawa has not been acting on our behalf. The full case, all the submissions in this matter before the commissioner, was made by Ontario. We carried the entire burden of those submissions, which was a very full and complete presentation to the commissioner appointed, I understand, by the United States Secretary of State.

In an extradition proceeding, the province which carries the administration of justice, and this being part of it, makes application through the Secretary of State, Ottawa, for the right to proceed—this being a treaty matter—and to present a case for extradition of a certain individual. Now that was where Ottawa entered the appeal. We then carried the complete proceedings; we did this before the commissioner appointed by the Secretary of State for the United States and perhaps members of the House are aware this matter was delayed by adjournment, and so on.

We carried the matter through and the commissioner finally made his decision directing that Harold Banks be extradited to this country. The usual procedure then is that it becomes a matter for the Secretary of State to approve that decision. This, we find, is a matter of course, of custom, or usage. In this case, the Secretary of State in Washington held a hearing. The remark which the hon. leader of the Opposition referred to is that I felt there were strong urgencies placed upon him to do that. He then countermanded, or reached a different decision from the commissioner. I have not had time to study this matter beyond the level we have carried it, having received this word only this morning, but I would think that if there were any further proceedings, and I am not certain of this, they might be carried on at the level between the Secretaries of State.

I might say further I am not sure whether there is an appeal even to a higher court, so I am not prepared to answer the hon. member definitely that no other proceedings could be taken. I do think and I do say that Ontario has done all that could be expected of it to bring this man back here to stand trial on the perjury charge.

Mr. Nixon: If there is, in fact, a further appeal possible, why would not the Attorney General consider it?

Mr. Speaker: The member for York South.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, there are so many questions raised here that I think we ought to let it rest at the moment. My final question is, will the Attorney General table with the House, or provide the House with, a full explanation once he gets it, so we can examine it once again?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I would certainly have no objection to making facts known as soon as I get them. I just received the telephone call this morning.

Mr. Sargent: Who wants him back in the first place? We have enough things to worry about.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: In view of the interjected question, I think I should say now that the reason we wished to bring this man back was in the course of the administration of justice, to have him answer for what was perjury in a trial in a series of events affecting our whole life in this country.

Mr. Sargent: The hon. Minister is not even giving justice to Canadian citizens; why does he not start here first?

Mr. Speaker: Order! Does the leader of the Opposition wish to pursue this matter?

Mr. Nixon: No, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Windsor West.

Mr. Peacock: Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the Attorney General if, in tabling the information which he says he will obtain, he would attempt to list those who made representations to the Secretary of State at this hearing?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I do not think I used the word "table", I am not sure that I was asked to table it.

Mr. MacDonald: I said table.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I said I would provide the House with information, but I am not at the moment suggesting I am going to table everything in this case. I would like to make that very clear.

Mr. Braithwaite: I am wondering if, when the Attorney General tables this information, he could table a detailed accounting of what

it has cost to date in the efforts to bring back Mr. Banks.

Mr. Speaker: Order! The second question is one that is properly placed by notice on the notice paper, or through the Speaker's office. The Minister of Agriculture and Food has a statement.

Mr. Sopha: The last one he brought back cost about $146,000.

An hon. member: What price justice!

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): Yesterday I intimated that I would have a further statement to make in the near future concerning the closing of the Canada and Dominion Sugar Company plant at Chatham. I wish to do that now, sir, with your permission.

The Canada and Dominion Sugar Company Limited of Montreal announced on Monday, January 29, 1968, that the company's beet processing plant at Chatham would be permanently closed on February 29, 1968. The announcement plunged the producers into a very unexpected and most undesirable position. Since that time, many meetings have been held to discuss ways and means of resolving the impasse. No stone has been left unturned as we explored every means by which the plant could be reopened, with the growers, the federal government and the company.

From the very beginning the company has maintained the position that their decision was final; it was not open for reconsideration. Despite appeals, discussions and personal confrontations by the Hon. J. J. Greene, the federal Minister of Agriculture, myself and other Cabinet Ministers, and in spite of the personal intervention of the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) of this province, we have been unable to persuade the company to move from this fixed position.

This decision by Canada and Dominion Sugar Company Ltd., is most regrettable. It causes us a great deal of concern. At the same time, the company has a legal right to make such a decision. To put the matter into proper perspective, I point out that Canada and Dominion Sugar is but a link in the vast international sugar holdings of the Tate and Lyle Company which is based in Britain. Managing director of Canada and Dominion, Mr. Saxon Tate, has stated that the decision to close the Chatham plant was made by the Canadian board of directors, seven of whom re non-Canadian, five of whom are Canadian.

It appears that the decision was a part of an overall policy of the parent company to consolidate its operations, and to concentrate more profitably on the processing of cane sugar. Because this company has access to plentiful supplies of cheap raw cane sugar, and because its Canadian competition relies solely on cane, we have been told that Canada and Dominion considers the beet industry in Ontario to be uneconomical. It is unfortunate that Canada and Dominion came to this conclusion only a few short months after a verbal commitment was given by its managing director, Mr. Saxon Tate, in which he stated the company was prepared to continue the Chatham operation as long as 20,000 acres of beets were produced by the growers.

It was recognized, of course, that this acreage could only be achieved by the agricultural stabilization board of the government of Canada maintaining an adequate level of support. While this company has the authority to make such corporate decisions, we are most disturbed that it has seen fit to callously violate its managing director's verbal agreement with the growers. We object very strongly to the fact that such a board room decision, apparently influenced by the policy of the parent company in Britain, should deprive this province of an industry and a source of revenue and income for many Canadians.

The progressively reduced acreage of sugar beets grown in Ontario up to 1967 might be due to unattractive return in comparison with other crops that could be grown on the same acreage with much less labour and technical knowledge involved.

The 1967 federal government subsidy guaranteed the Ontario growers $15.50 per ton for sugar beets testing standard, which I believe, Mr. Speaker, is 16 per cent sugar. This was a much more attractive price than had previously been available. Coupled with this guarantee was the promise of the federal government to maintain this subsidy until an international sugar agreement could be negotiated.

It was with this understanding the Canada and Dominion Sugar Company assured the sugar beet board their plant would remain open as long as a minimum of 20,000 acres of beets could be contracted annually. It is, therefore, understandable that the sugar beet board feels frustrated and annoyed with the precipitous closing of the plant after having achieved the company's objective of contracting 20,000 acres of beets in 1967, and feel-

ing quite certain that at least this minimum acreage could be contracted for the growing season of 1968.

From the beginning the government of Ontario has attempted to create a climate whereby this crisis could be resolved. At the request of the Ontario sugar beet growers' marketing board, I contacted the federal Minister of Agriculture, the Hon. Mr. Greene, and asked him to convene a meeting with such other Ministers of the federal government as would be interested and involved in this situation. Mr. Greene obliged by calling such a meeting on Thursday, February 15, and the government of Ontario was represented at that meeting by the Hon. Darcy McKeough and myself. It was decided that a further meeting should be held to which the company would be asked to appear, and this meeting was arranged.

However, a subsequent parliamentary crisis in Ottawa dictated that the meeting be delayed until Monday, March 4. On that date, Mr. McKeough and I again attended with the Ontario sugar beet growers' marketing board, representatives of several federal departments and officials of the Canada and Dominion Sugar Company. The sessions continued throughout the day, and at one point were also attended by representatives of the Canadian federation of agriculture and the national farmers' union, as well as representatives from the Ontario farmers' union.

At these sessions, Hon. Mr. Greene acted as chairman, and I must commend him sincerely for the spirit of interest and co-operation he demonstrated. He was quite firm with the company officials, and on several occasions pressed them to reconsider their decision. He asked them if there were any terms under which the price of beets could be made more attractive to the company, or any possible way in which the plant's operating costs could be subsidized. In each case he received the same answer: "The company's decision to close the plant is not open to reconsideration".

Negotiators for the government of Canada are engaged in discussions that could lead to the establishment of a new international sugar agreement. It appears Canada will be a signator to this agreement. Mr. Greene stated emphatically that in the interim it was the hope of The Canada Department of Agriculture that this plant would continue to operate until it could be determined whether or not, in the light of such an agreement, the Canadian sugar beet industry was an economic proposition. In order to encourage this continued operation, the federal Minister made a firm commitment that the agricultural stabilization board would continue for 1968 to support sugar beets on the same basis as in 1967.

It was suggested by the grower representatives that the government of Ontario should consider placing this plant under a trusteeship to ensure its continued operation, and also undertake a full-scale investigation into the economics of the western Ontario sugar beet industry. We have given much consideration to this possibility, as well as to other suggestions. I would like to set forth some of the factors that are involved.

Because this company refuses to sell, rent or lease this plant to any other person, it is clear that the plant can only be obtained by means of a forceful takeover. This government is not convinced that such a takeover is justified in this instance for economic reasons. If the government of Ontario were to take over this plant and operate it, the problems would be enormous.

Most of the staff of the Chatham plant have found new jobs. It would be virtually impossible to replace them with skilled refinery workers. As the Canada and Dominion Sugar Company will retain all management staff and sales staff, a complete new sales staff would have to be acquired and put on the road to sell the product. In doing so we would be forced into the position of offering a higher priced commodity in competition with the low cost cane sugar from not only Canada and Dominion's immense operations in Montreal and Toronto, but also the three other cane sugar refineries located in eastern Canada.

We would be assuming the operation of a plant that needs an estimated $1 million worth of repairs at the outset, and under the terms of expropriation we would be expected to pay a fair market value for the facilities. In its last financial statement the company estimated its capital investment in the plant at approximately $20,000,000.

The request was made by the beet growers' board that a study be made to determine whether or not the sugar beet industry was an economic proposition. However, when one considers that 53 cents out of every dollar paid for sugar beets produced in Ontario in 1967 was paid, or will be paid by the taxpayer, through the federal government subsidy, and that subsidy is only guaranteed to continue for the growing season of 1968, it becomes obvious that this industry is quite dependent on subsidization.

As a matter of fact, were it not for the use of substantial federal agricultural stabilization board funds, the industry might well have disappeared from Ontario production some time ago. In the period from 1958 to 1966, inclusive, the stabilization board paid more than $5.5 million in subsidies to Ontario beet growers, or an average of $622,000 annually. During these years sugar beet acreage was not much more than half the amount required for the maximum operation of the Chatham sugar beet refinery. Indeed it is safe to say that the plant would have closed by order of the company in the spring of 1967 had it not been for the realistic sugar beet subsidy offered by the federal government and for the determined effort of the Ontario sugar beet growers' marketing board to contract the company's required 20,000 acres.

As will be noted in *Hansard* of February 16, page 49, the government of Ontario adopted the position that it was in the interest of national security that a sugar beet industry be retained.

We felt that should some international crisis arise, it would be in Canada's best interests to have at least the basis of a domestic source of sugar. We still believe there is merit to this suggestion. However, we have been assured, most convincingly, by knowledgeable people in the federal government that there is such a diversity of sources of supply throughout the world that there is no real Canadian government concern for future continued supplies of cane sugar.

In the light of these important factors, we have come to the conclusion that the government of Ontario cannot commit itself to a forceful takeover involving the operation of this plant as a Crown corporation. We feel it would be a misuse of public funds, and the establishment of a precedent that could see this government faced with the wholesale takeover of a multiplicity of industries and businesses which are rightfully the responsibility of private enterprise.

Mr. Nixon: My comments, I suppose, should be phrased in the form of a question but I am appalled at the chicken-hearted reaction this government has taken to this particular matter. The retraction of former statements associated with maintaining this industry is a very serious matter indeed. I would ask the hon. Minister, until there is such time as we can comment more fully, what steps his department is prepared to take to see that the farmers involved are going to have assistance in making the transition to other types of crops, since sugar beets will no longer be grown in the province.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: These are matters that have to be considered, but I would say this—

Mr. Nixon: Was the federal government not prepared to go ahead with subsidies a year ago?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: No, I do not think they were. I have never made any commitment in that regard whatever, at any time, and I do not intend to make that commitment now.

Mr. Nixon: That may be so.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: The farmers have opportunities to turn to other crops, all be it that those other crops are not as financially rewarding as is the growing of sugar beets, subsidized as they are by the taxpayers of Canada.

An hon. member: A real blow to southern Ontario.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I agree, it is.

Mr. Speaker: The leader of the Opposition has a question which he would please—

Mr. Nixon: I do not know whether it is your intention, sir, to have me complete my questions, but I will be glad to ask—

Mr. Speaker: Yes.

Mr. Nixon: I have a further question for The Department of Economics and Development—the Minister is present.

During what period were Mr. and Mrs. David Lumsden resident in the Lawrence Heights project of the Ontario housing corporation?

Why did the Lumsden family move out of Lawrence Heights into the accommodation that was destroyed by fire on March 10 under such tragic circumstances?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Speaker, I am informed that Mr. and Mrs. David Lumsden and their two children moved into 9 Flemington Road, apartment 303 on October 1, 1962. This was a two-bedroom unit, as at that time they had a boy aged two and a girl age one year. Another child, a boy, was born the day after they moved in.

On February 18, 1964, another boy was born and because of this addition to his family Mr. Lumsden requested a transfer to a larger unit. On May 15, 1964, they were transferred to a three-bedroom unit at 1 Old

Meadow Lane, apartment 401. At the time of the transfer their children's ages were a boy of four, a girl of three, a boy of two and a newborn baby.

In June, 1966, Mr. Lumsden reported that another child had been born the previous November. The children's ages at this time were a boy six, a girl five, a boy four, a boy two and a girl eight months. Having regard to the ages of the children, a three-bedroom unit was still adequate in size and, in point of fact, the apartment unit they were occupying had a larger floor area than the normal three-bedroom row house.

On September 12, 1967, Mr. Lumsden gave notice in writing to the corporation of his family's intention to vacate as of September 30, 1967. In his letter he mentioned that the reason for moving was: "Not mainly because we need larger accommodation, but more because of the large number of tenants that do not know how to live peacefully." In his letter Mr. Lumsden also thanked the staff of the Ontario housing corporation for their kindness.

There is no record of any request from the Lumsden family to be transferred to a larger dwelling or to a detached dwelling.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Reform Institutions.

Because of the conviction of John Gismondi, an inmate in a provincial institution for the possession of marijuana, and a statement by magistrate Clair Morrison that "Gismondi was not alone in this operation," is the Minister conducting a special investigation into drug trafficking in provincial reformatories?

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): Mr. Speaker, the department is not conducting a special investigation into the possibility of drug trafficking in provincial reformatories. Our institutions are inspected regularly by a team of inspectors who enquire into general matters of security. In addition, institutional authorities are continually concerned with these problems, including contraband drugs and so on, and all possible precautions are regularly taken.

In the instance referred to, the superintendent of the institution involved, informed the RCMP of the discovery of marijuana and asked them to investigate. Following the subsequent investigation, charges were laid by the RCMP and proceeded with. The investigation by the RCMP gave no reason to believe there were other supplies of marijuana in the institution nor did investigation by the institutional authorities give any indication of this.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. Minister if there is any indication that there was, in fact, assistance by any members of the staff, or possibility of this assistance, in the acquisition of the material?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: There is certainly no indication of this, Mr. Speaker. If the hon. leader of the Opposition has any such information which might help us, we would be very pleased to have it.

Mr. Nixon: The only information, of course, is that the man was charged with it in his possession and we wonder how it got there.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, there is no correctional institution in the world that, at some stage or other, is not found to have had some contraband brought into it by someone. The only possible way, Mr. Speaker, one could guarantee against any drugs brought into a correctional institution, is to have such tight security that I am sure even the members opposite would object.

For example, we have various degrees of security—minimum security, medium security. I can envisage the possibility of making completely certain that no contraband would get into a penal institution of any kind, by the mere process, as I say, of making the security so tight, investigating every visitor, making every visitor undress, giving them a physical examination, and so on.

It would be just utterly impossible to run any rehabilitative programme at all in correctional institutions if we were to gear the programme of those institutions to the tightest security required to make certain that no contraband gets into an institution.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Labour. What steps is The Department of Labour taking to assist in the settlement of the strike at Canada Sandpapers Limited at Plattsville?

Hon. D. A. Bales (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, the department is carrying out its usual role as mediator in the dispute in an attempt to bring the parties to an agreement.

The strike began on February 22, and the department has held a meeting with the company and with the international chemical workers union, but failed to resolve the outstanding matters. However, the department is keeping in close touch with the situation in

an attempt to assist the parties to resolve the issues between them.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, a question on a similar matter to the Attorney General: Has there been, or is there reason to fear, serious disorder on the picket line at Canada Sandpapers Limited, Plattsville, Ontario?

And second, for what reason and by whose authority were large numbers of Ontario Provincial Police officers on duty near the premises at Canada Sandpapers Limited in Plattsville on March 11 and March 13 of this year?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, I do not think there is reason to fear serious disorders in this situation. The strike, as my colleague has stated, started on February 22 at Plattsville, by the international chemical workers' union.

Now there have been some incidents of damage—tires being slashed, windshields broken—and trucks taking material from the plant have been trailed by carloads of pickets as far as Kitchener. These have been escorted on some occasions by the provincial police.

The management requested additional protection. The protection is not in great number; but at the time employees are entering and leaving twice a day, the area is patrolled. When trucks are transporting material out of the plant, certain motorized protection is there to escort the truck in the light of the incidents that have occurred. I think it is fair to say that there has been no serious disorder and I do not feel there is reason to fear that there will be serious disorder.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, if the Attorney General will permit me: Did he indicate that there would be two officers on duty there in a car?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: My information is that as the plant is in the Ontario Provincial Police jurisdiction, patrols have started twice daily in the area at the time employees are entering and at the time they are leaving the plant. Two Ontario Provincial Police cars patrol the area at these times.

I thought I had some information here as to the number of police in a cruiser or in a car. This is in connection with the incident concerning the truck which was followed by the picket groups to Kitchener. My information is that at the gate through which the truck passed there was an Ontario Provincial Police inspector plus an Ontario Provincial Police staff sergeant.

Mr. Nixon: Supplementary to this, I would like to ask the Attorney General to inquire a bit more closely. Objective information that is available to me indicates that there are as many as 40 uniformed officers there and nine patrol cars in view at one time. The picket lines—and while I am not aware of the difficulties that he has expressed—are manned by between five and ten people and it is difficult to rationalize the need for such heavy protection.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I will be glad to check the matter. The object is, of course, to prevent disorder, as I am sure the hon. member would expect to be done. But the information I have is that the picket line is five at some times, and up to 30 at others. So there is a fair group of people there.

I do not think that the efforts, as far as I am aware, have been such as to aggravate or provoke a situation. Certainly I would not want to see that and I certainly would want to see that there is adequate protection to prevent disorder of any serious nature.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, if you will permit me, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Education. Does the Minister plan a special meeting with the presidents of provincially-assisted universities to discuss their serious objections to the insufficient grants announced by the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. MacNaughton) in the Budget?

Hon. W. G. Davis (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, I think, as the leader of the Opposition is well aware, I am willing to discuss with the universities' representatives—either collectively or singly, whether presidents, students or faculty—any matters they feel are relevant to them.

I should inform the leader of the Opposition that I have no plan to meet with the presidents on the issue that has been raised. The presidents, I think, should, as part of their responsibility, offer an opinion on the grants to be made to the provincially-assisted universities of the province in the coming fiscal year. I think it is also appropriate to remind the leader of the Opposition and the members of the House, Mr. Speaker, that these grants will be increased by approximately 23 per cent to $209,275,000, not including the other various forms of university support such as student aid.

Mr. Speaker, in the application of the formula, since an automatic adjustment will be made for increased enrolments and the changing mix of students, the increase of approximately 10 per cent in the unit value should allow for both quality improvement and for increases in the cost of living.

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that as well, it will enable Ontario to maintain its position as the province which is making the greatest contribution on a per student basis to university operation.

According to DBS in the current school year we are spending—the public of the province of Ontario—$2,630 per full time student, compared to some $2,259 for the province of Alberta and $1,802 for the province of Newfoundland, which includes their whole programme of free tuition.

I believe also that when we consider the total picture, including the economic climate and the special requirement of the universities, there is room for varying opinion. I think it is fair to acknowledge that if higher levels of operating support could be made available, the universities could contribute more effectively to economic and social development but, at the same time—and I emphasize this—there must be a balance between the expectations and the availability of resources.

The committee on university affairs, which at the moment has a majority of members who are or who have been associated with the academic community, have advised the government that the grants stated are adequate for the orderly development of our university system. Some university officials, I might add, on an individual basis, have also indicated that increases of the magnitude approved would be quite acceptable.

There will of course, Mr. Speaker, be ample opportunity both inside the House and out to discuss these matters and I would be delighted to do so in very great detail during consideration of the estimates of the Department of University Affairs.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, if the Minister will permit, I take it that he does not agree with the presidents when they say that the increase in grants will not be sufficient to accommodate the expected increase in enrolment?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I think if the hon. leader of the Opposition would read carefully the statement by the university presidents, which I think was drafted a few days in advance of the information becoming available to them, it will indicate their concern with respect to the students-faculty ratio. It did not refer to the numbers of students that might be admitted into a particular institution because the whole principle of the formula grant—as the hon. member is well aware—relates to enrolment.

I would say this, Mr. Speaker, that while we recognize it is always desirable to provide just whatever is available, at the same time I believe that the universities, by using their creative instincts and their administrative talents, can in fact do a very adequate job in the coming academic year with the monies that have been provided by the public of the province.

Mr. Nixon: One more, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Highways. Will the Minister accede to the request of the citizens interested in the conservation areas around Hamilton that the new highway joining highways number 5 and 403 be moved west of the proposed conservation area?

Hon. G. E. Gomme (Minister of Highways): Mr. Speaker, in answer to the hon. leader of the Opposition, the matter of location of the proposed highway referred to is still under study. The presentation was made to all interested people and organizations in the area last evening. I suggested that the local organizations and municipalities provide us with their assessment of our proposals and their further recommendations.

Mr. Sopha: A question for the hon. Provincial Secretary. Is there any good reason, and if so what is the reason, that a case of 24 12-ounce bottles of standard brand beer should cost the consumer $4.79 in Toronto, Windsor and Cornwall, and $5.05 in Sudbury?

Hon. R. S. Welch (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, in answering this question, I would like to draw the hon. member's attention to section 30, subsection 2, of The Liquor Control Board Act and advise him that I have been informed by the liquor control board that since its inception in 1927 they have provided for the compensation for this additional freight charge to northern Ontario points.

Mr. Sopha: That is what I thought, there is no good reason.

Mr. J. R. Smith (Hamilton Mountain): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Tourism and Information.

What steps have been taken, or are planned, to publicize the restored Dundurn castle in Hamilton by The Department of Tourism and Information?

Hon. J. A. C. Auld (Minister of Tourism and Information): Mr. Speaker, I would like to send across to the hon. member copies of

some of our publications which feature Dundurn castle.

First of all, our "Heritage Highways" brochure, published in co-operation with the province of Quebec, devotes a half page photograph to Dundurn castle, with descriptive copy on the opposite page.

Quebec and Ontario, along with the Canadian government travel bureau, distributed almost a half million copies of this brochure last year and it is being reissued this year.

Dundurn castle is also mentioned in our 1967 lure book. For 1968, the lure book has been completely redesigned and copies will be coming off the press shortly, including a photograph of the castle. A sketch of Dundurn castle is included in every package of historical sketches which is distributed to every school child who visits the Ontario Legislature.

In addition, our border reception centres and travel counselling offices distribute a small pamphlet on Dundurn castle.

I might add that the castle has been publicized from time to time in our print advertising in the United States and Canada. The most recent example of this is a full colour advertisement on the inside of the back cover of the March 8 edition of *Time* magazine, in which the castle is mentioned along with several other Ontario tourist attractions. I do not have a copy handy, but it is available in the legislative library.

Mr R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Health.

In the recent announcement of the increased rates of Ontario hospital services commission, is it the intention that the new rates and benefits become effective July 1, and payable with the April payment, or are the payments to begin in July for the benefit month of October?

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, that question has not arrived in my office yet to my knowledge.

Mr. Speaker: It would appear that this question was originally directed to the Provincial Treasurer, and re-directed to the office of the Minister of Health. I regret that it apparently has not arrived. I will see that it is delivered and perhaps will be answered tomorrow.

Mr. H. Edighoffer (Perth): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Highways.

Will the Minister advise this House if the ten mile portion of Highway 23 between Mitchell and Monkton is to be reconstructed in 1968? If not, why not?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Speaker, the details of this department's construction programme will be given shortly when the estimates of The Department of Highways are brought before the House.

Mr. Sargent: Why does the Minister not answer the question?

Mr. Edighoffer: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Energy and Resources Management.

In the light of the statement to the recent joint convention of the Ontario municipal electric association and the association of municipal electrical utilities by Mr. George Gathercole, chairman of the Ontario Hydro Electric Power Commission of Ontario; to the effect that given today's inflationary pressures, an additional increase in hydro prices was likely in the near future, how does he explain the sponsorship on the CBC television network on Tuesday March 19, at 9 p.m. of the Ringling Brothers and Barnum and Bailey circus?

1. What is the cost of the televised hour to the utility?

2. How can such extravagance be justified on the part of a monopoly which does not face competition of any kind in its field?

3. Where is the ultimate saving to the Ontario public?

4. What is the theoretical and practical justification for an advertising budget of this magnitude on the part of a public utility?

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Mr. Speaker, the electrical utilities across Canada, in conjunction with the Canadian electrical association, are sponsoring this CBC TV network show on March 19 of the Ringling Brothers and Barnum and Bailey circus.

Ontario Hydro's share of the cost of this broadcast is $10,630.

In answer to the second part of the question, Ontario Hydro and the municipal utilities in Ontario are faced with very aggressive competition in the energy field, such as energy for heating, water heating, cooking, clothes drying, air conditioning, and so on.

In answer to the third part, Ontario Hydro and the municipal utilities promote sales for the same reason that they strive for engineer-

ing and administrative efficiency—to keep costs down.

As customers use more kilowatt hours, the unit cost of supplying the energy decreases and low rates can be maintained.

The relationship between growth in per customer use and declining rates can be traced from the earliest days of Hydro in the province. Sales promotion is an effective way of holding rates at the lowest possible level in an economy where the cost of doing business is continually rising.

And in answer to the fouth part, as mentioned in the answer to question 3, the justification for electrical utility advertising is to promote increased use by customers in order to maintain rates at the lowest possible level.

Mr. Braithwaite: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Social and Family Services. It originally went to the Provincial Treasurer, but I understand you redirected it to the Minister of Social and Family Services.

The question is: in view of the fact that many working women, not presently on welfare, are the sole supporters of families which often include small children, does the Minister have any plans for making special allowances for such cases where the need will become urgent under the proposed increases in premiums for OHSC and OMSIP?

Hon. J. Yaremko (Minister of Social and Family Services): Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member will know, any woman who is the sole supporter of her family, as a result of being a widow, or deserted mother, may be eligible for assistance under The Family Benefits Act, where she is not regularly employed in any remunerative employment for more than 120 hours per month.

Eligibility for assistance permits the receipt of premium free hospital and medical coverage. I might add that where a husband is blind, disabled or permanently unemployable, and his wife is the sole support of the family, the husband may be eligible for an allowance on behalf of his family, and thereby the family would also be provided with medical and hospital coverage without having to pay premiums.

Mr. Braithwaite: Mr. Speaker, will the Minister accept a supplementary question?

Mr. Speaker, through you to the Minister, as I mentioned, the question says specifically, "people not on welfare," and the question originally was sent to the Provincial Treasurer because what I was interested in—

Mr. Speaker: Order! Will the member please place the supplementary question?

Mr. Braithwaite: I am doing that, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The member is making a statement.

Mr. Braithwaite: I have not made it yet.

Mr. Speaker: I would hope the member would not, and that he would now place his question.

Mr. Braithwaite: The question is, Mr. Speaker, where you have female heads of households who, because of dignity or pride do not wish to put themselves on welfare, has the hon. Minister consulted with the Provincial Treasurer with the idea of the Provincial Treasurer making special provision for reduced rates of increases for those female heads of families, as I said, who do not wish to put themselves as a charge on the province? I think this is a very important question of interest to many women in Ontario.

Mr. Speaker: Order. You have asked your question.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, the Provincial Treasurer, in arriving at his decision would have taken into consideration the full government plan for taking care of the needs and wants of everyone. I have outlined to the member the present situation with respect to the provision of services as they exist as of today.

Mr. Braithwaite: How about those who do not want to go on welfare? This is what I would like to find out about.

Mr. Speaker: The Minister has answered the question, I believe. If the member is not satisfied with the answer perhaps he will rephrase it and deliver it tomorrow, because his efforts at rephrasing a supplementary question apparently have not been successful.

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): I have a question for the Prime Minister: Is the proposed plant announced in the Brantford *Expositor* of Monday, March 11, 1968, and likely to be built at Nanticoke, connected with Texas Gulf Sulphur in any way?

Second, is there any likelihood that concentrates from Texas Gulf will be proceeded at this proposed plant?

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, this is a purely speculative story.

The headline—I have a copy of the paper—says: "3,000 To Be Employed If The Plant Becomes Fact." I have no information upon which I could base an answer to the question.

Mr. F. Burr (Sandwich-Riverside): I have a question for the Minister of Municipal Affairs:

How soon will the Minister be able to advise the municipal councils of the amount of shelter grant the municipalities can expect, and the formula for its distribution?

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the members will recall that my friend, the hon. member for Grey-Bruce, asked a similar question on February 21 last. I advised the House at that time that the details of this programme were being worked out by officials of my department and The Department of the Provincial Treasurer. I would expect, Mr. Speaker, that when a formula is ready it will be announced to the House in due course.

Mr. Burr: A supplementary question: Is the Minister aware that if the municipalities have to postpone the sending out of their tax notices, a municipality such as Windsor would have to pay about $3,000 a day in bank interest for every day that the first instalment date is postponed?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, the department is very aware of the problems of municipalities, but there is no reason why they should not proceed along the route of striking their rate and getting ready to send out tax bills.

Mr. Burr: Could I have another supplementary?

Mr. Speaker: The member can ask the Minister if he will answer.

Mr. Burr: Would the Minister accept a supplementary? Would this not depend upon the method by which the money is destined to reach the ratepayer? Would the Minister explain briefly just how—

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, let me answer the hon. member in due course.

Mr. Sargent: A question for the hon. Attorney General. Would the Minister advise or assure the House that no one will suffer because of lack of legal aid and be held in jail without reason?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, the question began with: "Would the Minister assure the House that no one will suffer because of lack of legal aid and be held in jail without reason". I would say to the hon. member and the House that the purpose of The Legal Aid Act is that no one shall be denied the right of counsel in court proceedings or for advice with respect to proceedings by reason of financial inability. That is the purpose of the Act.

I think in its operations it is achieving that purpose, without exception. To the part of the question which amounts to a guarantee that no one will be held in jail without reason, I would say that no one is placed in custody or held in custody except through judicial process. That is, they go before a court, and it is the court which determines whether they go to jail, not the Attorney General.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question: Would the Minister agree that no man should have to apply for legal aid four times before he gets a lawyer?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: This is rather hypothetical, but there are cases where the legal aid provides part payment for its counsel fee.

Mr. Sargent: That is not my point. How many times should he ask?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Let me proceed. There is a committee, a local committee, a director of legal aid—

Mr. Sargent: I know.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: —an area director, and there is a welfare branch of legal aid where the ability, the financial ability, is assessed. It may be that some of the decisions may have to be reviewed, conditions may change. I would not think it would be very usual to find someone had to apply four times and succeeded on the fourth time. I think if they have the right to obtain legal aid, they would have been given it on the first occasion.

I can conceive of a situation where there might be a refusal and a further review granted. I can conceive of situations where legal aid is granted and later refused. If the member would cite a particular case I would look into it.

Mr. Sargent: There was a case yesterday, Mr. Speaker, and the question should have gone to the Attorney General, but it was split up in two ways.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the member would furnish the particulars to the Minister. I am sure that he will receive the particulars of it.

Mr. Sargent: Okay! But this is getting to be an awful mess. I mean, this situation—

Mr. Speaker: If the member has a further question of another Minister, he might—

Mr. Sargent: I can document the reason for it. If he wants the reason I can give it to him, right now.

Mr. Speaker: The member can submit it to him at a later date or after the House rises or after the question period is over.

Mr. Sargent: Thank you.

A question for the Minister of Reform Institutions: Would the Minister advise why two men were held in jail in the persons of Mr. Frank Ellis and Mr. Thomas Tracy, one since February 29 and one since March 1, and they were unable to get lawyers?

Mr. Speaker: The question, the member will please notice, has been worded "and if they were able to get lawyers". This is a question, not a statement.

Mr. Sargent: They could not, it states right here.

Mr. Speaker: This is a question, not a statement, so will the member confirm that his wording is "and if they were unable to get lawyers?".

Mr. Sargent: It is "And if they were unable to get lawyers".

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, in respect to the first part of the question, as to why these two men were held in jail, I hope sincerely, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member will not think I am being facetious, but I really do not know how else to answer this question except that they were held in jail because the court issued warrants of committal and the jail governor can do nothing but accept these people into jail, because those warrants of committal were issued. This is the responsibility of the governor of the jail, that is the only way I can answer this.

In respect of "If they were unable to get lawyers"; I cannot answer that except this might help the hon. member. Ellis saw the duty counsel provided under the legal aid on March 4, and as Ellis came in on March 1 there did not seem to be too much delay there. Tracey also saw duty counsel provided under legal aid on March 11.

Mr. Sargent: Would the Minister answer a supplementary question? Would the Minister be agreeable to the inspection of the admission records at Don Jail and other institutions, and a series of interviews by members of Parliament, members of this Legislature? I do not believe that you are trying to mislead—

Mr. Speaker: Order! The member has asked a question. The Minister has the opportunity of answering it now, later or declining it.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, do I understand that the hon. member is taking it that I misinformed the House when I state that these two members saw duty counsel in those particular days?

Mr. Sargent: They still had no lawyers.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well now, the hon. member implied that I was not giving him correct information. Duty counsel is provided under the legal aid programme, and if they do not have lawyers there may be reasons well and good for that. I would suggest the member direct in a proper fashion, that question to the Attorney General, in a way that will get the kind of information that he wants, rather than in general terms.

Mr. Sargent: Would the Minister answer my question? The one that I asked him.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I have answered to the best of my ability.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sargent: The supplementary was this. Would the Minister be agreeable to the inspection of the admission records of Don jail and other institutions, and interviews by members of this Legislature?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: This has really nothing to do with the question, and the hon. member knows that in the past I have invited the hon. members of this Legislature to visit any of our institutions, that is reformatories, without warning. As you know it was abused by some members some time ago, but this invitation is still there. Now, how far the hon. member feels he ought to be able to go into the records of the individuals is another matter altogether. The hon. member must—

Mr. Sargent: We should not have to.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The hon. member must keep in mind, when he is talking about a local jail, that he is talking about files that have to do with many who are still as yet—

Mr. Sargent: And great injustices.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —innocent people, and I would suggest that if he wants a specific question answered, he should ask the question in a manner so that it will be understood as to precisely what kind of information he seeks.

Mr. Speaker: I would concur with that too, that the member undoubtedly can get in touch with the Minister, and I am sure that his questions can be answered and arrangements made in the best interests of all concerned. The member for Sudbury East has a question.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): For the Provincial Secretary, can the Minister advise the House what consideration if any, the government has given to the request of the Royal Canadian legions for club liquor licences instead of banquet permits?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, I assume that the hon. member is making reference to a brief, submitted by the Ontario provincial command of the Royal Canadian legion, dealing with matters relating to The Liquor Licence Act of the province. I can report that, at this stage, the contents of the brief are still under consideration.

Mr. W. Newman (Ontario South): I have a question for the Minister of Economics and Development. In view of the fact that many striking auto workers and striking workers in general are faced with the threat of eviction by the Ontario housing corporation for non-payment of rent caused by the strike, will the hon. Minister give consideration to having the Ontario housing corporation suspend evictions pending the settlement of the labour dispute involved?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Speaker, the question came rather late and I will have to take notice of it from the hon. member.

Mr. Shulman: I have a question for the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs which I submitted yesterday. Did the Minister state the government's policy when he said, as reported in the Toronto *Star*, March 8, 1968, and I quote:

> The position of chairman of Metro council can never be an elected one because an elected person could never meet the challenge of such an important position.

And does the Minister, as an elected representative, consider the non-elected position of Metro chairman more important than that of a Cabinet Minister?

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Mr. Speaker, it is my view that in the circumstances as they exist currently with respect to Metropolitan Toronto, it is desirable and important that the chairman of the Metropolitan corporation be appointed. It was this personal view that I expressed. With respect to the second question, the two offices are not comparable.

Mr. Speaker: The Minister of Lands and Forests has some answers to questions.

Hon. R. Brunelle (Minister of Lands and Forests): The hon. member for Kent (Mr. Spence) yesterday asked me this question: "Will the Minister advise the House if the department has enforced the eight-inch size limit in the harvesting of perch in Lake Erie, during 1967?

I am pleased to say that our officers enforced the eight-inch size limit on perch harvested by commercial fishermen in Lake Erie in 1967. In total, 26 convictions were registered.

The hon. member for Essex South (Mr. Paterson) asked me: How many pounds of Ontario fish acquired under the federal price support programme for 1968 are still in storage?

This is a federal government programme, and the federal prices support board can advise the number of pounds of fish in storage.

Question number two: What will the support price for 1968 be? This question should be directed to the federal price support board.

Question number three: Will any new control be introduced in 1968 that will affect commercial fishermen in Ontario regarding the size of mesh or pounds of catch allowable per day?

A number of new amendments to the Ontario fishery regulations have been recommended to the federal Department of Fisheries. These include a closed season on walleye for commercial fishing in Essex county waters of Lake Erie, from April 15 to May 14; the prohibition of Canning gill nets, and using gill-net mesh between two and three quarter inches in size and eight inches in size in these same waters, during the same period.

In addition, a closed season for perch taken by commercial fishing has been recommended from December 15 to March 15, and I have signed a Ministerial order within the last few days closing the season this year on perch taken commercially, from March 15 to March 31. Included also in our recommendations to

Ottawa is a change in mesh size of gill nets for use in the Patricia portion of Kenora district, from four and one-half to four inch mesh to allow for the greater utilization of adult fish stocks in many of the waters where whitefish and walleye predominate.

Lake trout lakes have been excluded from this change. Quota changes in Lake Superior for lake trout have been recommended which will increase the quota on Bateau Rocks—quota area number 5—from 3,000 to 6,000 pounds and in Whitefish Bay—quota area number 14—from no quota to 15,000 pounds. Also, a 15 million pound quota for Lake Erie perch being requested by the fishing industry in conjunction with the fisheries prices support board, is currently under consideration by my department.

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Minister a supplementary question? With regards to the eight-inch size limit for the harvesting of perch, will you continue to enforce this in 1968?

Hon. Mr Brunelle: My understanding is that we are continuing.

Mr. Sargent: A question for the Minister of Economics and Development: Will the Minister advise how many loans were made by the ODC last year, the amount loaned, the size of staff employed by the ODC, and the amount of money spent in making these loans?

Hon. Mr. Randall: In answer to the hon. member's question, in the past year, ten loans were provided by the Ontario development corporation, and two of these loans amounted to $2,200,000. The staff employed by ODC on advisory services, both in Toronto and throughout the province, including the provision of tourist and industrial workshops, assistance to inventors, negotiating with finance institutions for non-government finance, and so on, 29. Administrative and stenographic services, 11. Legal, including secretarial assistance, four, loan evaluation, five, and this is a total of 49.

This total excludes the 37 people employed at Centralia industrial park, and maintaining the installation there. The direct cost of making these loans is estimated at not to exceed $35,000.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The 1st order, resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the amendment to the motion for an address in reply to the Speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor in the opening of the session.

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Mr. Speaker, when we adjourned yesterday afternoon at 6:00 o'clock I was in the process of giving what I considered to be a list of priorities that must be established and enacted in order to get things going in northwestern Ontario.

I am going to go back to two recommendations that I had in mind at that time, because I think they are of vital importance.

We must have greater decentralization in government apparatus in Toronto, to at least three different and quite separate centres in northern Ontario.

We must have priority given to placing schools, colleges and training facilities, in which the government is directly involved, in northern Ontario.

A long range plan, at least ten years, for a complete exploitation of northern Ontario forest resources as marketable timber, and regeneration rates permit, with the preliminary understanding built into the plan, that such exploitation will not wait upon private investments and market conditions if government investment will make the difference between development and inaction.

We must have a long range plan for road development and sale of land to prospective cottagers and holidayers, with the aim to make northern Ontario from Kenora to Quebec, from Gravenhurst to James Bay, the summer dormitory for vacationing Americans and Canadians from the great urban centres between New York and Minneapolis.

A combination of carrot incentive and stick requirement that any mineral ores produced, which are designed for export, should be smelted or treated up to the initial manufacturing process in northern Ontario. The question was asked of the Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) here, some ten days ago, to report on his activities with regard to a study that was being made for the establishment of a smelter in northeastern Ontario at Timmins, for the smelting and processing of Texas Gulf ores. He said that this plan was under study. A question of a similar nature was asked of the Prime Minister this afternoon and he had nothing further to report.

I think about the only report the Prime Minister could make in this connection that would make any sense at all, particularly to the people of northern Ontario, is that he direct—not ask—that if foreign-based companies are going to come in to northern Ontario—or any part of Ontario for that matter—and exploit our natural wealth, we

lay the ground rules. It belongs to the people of Ontario, it is held in trust by this Legislature, and I think they have the responsibility and I think they should have the courage to tell these companies that this smelter must be built at Timmins.

I do not know why, but any time a decision like this has to be made we sit idly by while investors in foreign board rooms sit down, work out all the details and then come in here and tell us how we are going to run our country. I think the time has long since gone when we can sit idly by and let people control our own destinies because if we do not have economic control, political control, we will dwindle away along with it. I think that this government and in particular, the hon. Prime Minister, has a responsibility in that regard.

Mr. Speaker, I would like now to turn to a subject which we speak of, but really do nothing about. The problem that has been with us since the days of Cartier and Champlain. A problem that is of our own making. A problem that arose from our own greed and man's inhumanity to man.

In the days of the Northwest Fur Trading Company and the Hudson's Bay Company, right up to the present time, we have been guilty of exploitation, discrimination, segregation and neglect of the only true native-born Canadians, the Indians.

Mr. Speaker, who wrote the history of the Indians? It was the white man. It is largely an interpretation of the aboriginal Indian; scalping, massacres and so on were never part of the Indian culture. We are learning now, for example, the Iroquois confederacy was designed to make war impossible. The social scientist writing on social class often refers to the life chances of an individual or group. To describe the status of people of Indian ancestry, it is useful to think in terms of the distribution of life chances in Canadian society.

By looking at the life chances of this minority, in view of income and occupation, life expectancy and health and the administration of justice and legal protection, one could obtain the picture of the general status of our Indian people. Over 40 per cent of Indian families had an income of $1,000 or less and 75 per cent obtained $2,000 or less. Clearly, this puts the Indian at the bottom of Canada's economic scale.

The 1961 census showed that only 15.9 per cent of the total employable Indians were in the labour force in that year. At best, most of the employment of Indian people is seasonal and short term, so even the above figure does not give an accurate picture.

More than 16 per cent of Indian families live in one-room shacks and more than 50 per cent of them live in three rooms or less, according to the 1965 statistics. Only 15 per cent of Indian homes have running water.

The infant mortality rate, for the same year, was three times the national average; that is to say, for every 1,000 births among Indian people, there were 75 deaths.

The pre-school age mortality rate is eight times the national average, and in the teenage and adult groups it is between two and a half and three times the national average.

People of Indian ancestry require hospitalization twice as often as the rest of the Canadian population. The same substandard trend is found in education. Only one-quarter of the Indian population attends past the grade six level. This is an aside—in the districts of Kenora, Rainy River and Thunder Bay, we have 55,000 people between the ages of 22 and 65 who have less than a grade eight level of education and a good many of those are of Indian ancestry.

Indian reserves were established late in the 19th century. The decision to have reserves was imposed on the native Indian. This system was the problem of non-Indian minds and reserves were set up to concentrate the Indians and yet allow them to continue to live in traditional ways. The reserve system never did provide the expanding Indian population with a stable source of income and so, over the years, welfare payments have become a major source of income. The failure of the reserve to provide a living for the Indian and his dependence on welfare is an insight into the nature of the problems facing them. Because the reserves separated Indians from communities, and provided a potential source of income, this separation led them to view the reserve as security and the town and urban areas as threatening; a piling-up of social problems for people of Indian ancestry has occurred over the years. Cut off from the mainstream of life for over 80 years, one is not shocked at the apparent lack of morale, assertiveness and self-respect of these people.

Mr. Speaker, this is not an Indian problem; this is a Canadian problem. This is our problem—Ottawa has failed miserably in its approach to this, our problem. This government must clearly take the lead to correct the injustices and humiliation that have been the lot of our Ontario Indian population. There are some things Indians must do for

themselves, and there are some things which government can help an Indian do; a wise government knows the difference. I am just hoping that this government is willing to accept that challenge.

I am not going to go into a lot of specifics about our Indian problem but I would like to make one brief reference. I am sorry that the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Davis) is not in his seat at the present time. I could call to his attention a problem that I have been dealing with for the last four months. It concerns the education of Indian children in the town of Armstrong. The average parent or the average child, in the province complains if he has to walk a few blocks to school in the morning, or if he has to get on a bus and travel for 15 or 20 minutes to school in the morning.

I have a list here, Mr. Speaker, of 25 students who have to go 200 miles to school from a community on the main line of one of Canada's national railways, where they cannot even get school facilities. They range in age from seven to 15. The department of Indian affairs has not seen fit to build them a school; The Department of Education for the province of Ontario has not seen fit to make quarters available to them in the existing school. Consequently we have young Indian children six and seven years of age forced to leave their parents and travel 200 miles to the Lakehead in order to get an education.

In the year 1968, in this affluent society of ours, I think this is a disgrace. The Department of Education has taken over the responsibility for the education of our Indian people, wherever it is possible. They have facilities in the town of Armstrong, and all they have to do is put additions on them. But this government, for their own good reason, heaven knows what it is, have not seen fit to take care of the problems such as I have tried to relate.

An hon. member: Shame!

Mr. Stokes: This is only one of the many instances. I could stand here all afternoon and relate injustices toward our native people.

I would like to tell members briefly, as have three of my colleagues who hail from the north, what we expect of this government. It is common knowledge, Mr. Speaker, that there is a feeling of neglect and exploitation of our people in the north. The average person who comes from northern Ontario spends 25 of his most productive years getting enough money together to provide for the education for his children. He knows that there are ample reserves of natural resources all around him. But, nothing happens. He educates his children in a system where 60 per cent of his municipal taxes goes toward the cost of education, at the primary and secondary school level.

Then, if he is fortunate enough to have saved $2,500 a year minimum for each student seeking a university education, he sends them down here and that is the last he sees of them. This, Mr. Speaker, is why populations in northern Ontario are diminishing instead of increasing. We do not expect them to increase at the same rate that they are down here among the heavy industrial towns, but we do not think that we should be falling behind, we think that we should at least be holding our own. And we are not doing it.

It grieves me, Mr. Speaker, when I hear member of Parliaments from the north coming down here and trying to impress this Legislature about everything that we have going for us in northern Ontario.

I would like to quote from a editorial that appeared in the Port Arthur *News-Chronicle* of March 7 that I referred to very briefly yesterday. I want to quote from that editorial; it says:

> JESSIMAN CLAIMS NORTH IS NOT UNDERPRIVILEDGED
>
> The making of his maiden speech is an important event in the life of every politician. Jim Jessiman, Conservative MPP for Fort William, made his in the Legislature yesterday. A great many people in northwestern Ontario must be wondering if they read it correctly, or if it was properly reported.
>
> For many years, nearly every public body in northwestern Ontario has been complaining to both Queen's Park and Ottawa that northwestern Ontario is being neglected as far as aids to economic development are concerned, with the result that this part of the province is lagging far behind the rest of Ontario in the acquisition of secondary industry which brings jobs and opportunity.
>
> This has been the burden of countless representations by chambers of commerce from this area to the provincial government year after year.

And the hon. member has been down here on seven of them himself.

They have asked help of many kinds in order that northwestern Ontario might progress toward achieving at least part of the vast potential that the rich forest, mineral, human, and other resources seem to justify.

Apparently, throughout the years, all these organizations have been in error in making representations to the provincial government. According to Mr. Jessiman, northwestern Ontario is neither underprivileged nor a have-not region. Said Mr. Jessiman: "In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I might say we who live in northwestern Ontario do not feel ourselves underprivileged; do not let anyone tell us we are the have-nots, not in northwestern Ontario. The expression have-nots is a left-wing invention, an illusion, and I know all of us in northwestern Ontario resent being referred to as have-nots."

Members of the northwestern Ontario associated chambers of commerce who today have a delegation at Queen's Park to urge the government to get on the ball, and help give northwestern Ontario a lift, would be surprised to realize that they cannot be included among those who speak for northwestern Ontario.

It might surprise the officers and membership of the northwest chambers even more to learn that all this time they have been the tools of left-wing agitation.

In his address, the hon. member for Fort William (Mr. Jessiman) sort of admitted that everything was not completely rosy as far as northwestern Ontario was concerned, but whatever shortcomings there were he laid at the door of the federal government. As far as he is concerned, the present Ontario government is just about perfect.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): The folks back home heard it in disbelief!

Mr. Stokes: To continue:

The voters of Fort William have rejected the Liberals as inept and the NDPs as misfits, and have finally turned to the Conservatives for action, stability, and to the party which has proven it can get the job done.

After 24 years!

All this is pretty rousing political patriotism, but the member for Fort William weakened it a bit when, near the end of his speech, he said that he expected to make many more suggestions to the government that would enhance the progress, and speed up the development of this part of the province.

Mr. MacDonald: Double talk!

Mr. Stokes: Why should this be necessary if the government had been doing all that it should do, and all that it could do in the years past? Somewhere along the line, the gears in the hon. member's speech became a bit unmeshed!

Mr. Speaker, I think that editorial expresses the sentiments of a good many of the people of northwestern Ontario, and, as you may have noticed, I have not taken a firm line. I have not brought fire and brimstone down upon this government. I have been given assurances by a good many of the Ministers here that they are going to listen favourably to our problems in the north. I am an impatient sort of a person, but I will give them a reasonable length of time in which to prove that they intend to put into practice what they have promised.

Mr. MacDonald: They have not done it for 24 years!

Mr. Stokes: They have not done it for 24 years—but I am going to give them a couple of months. If, at the end of that time they have not, Mr. Speaker, I can assure you that I will do everything in my power to rouse this government, as inept and lax as it has been in the past, to see that the message from all of northern Ontario is brought down to this Legislature in no uncertain terms.

Mr. J. A. Belanger (Prescott and Russell): Mr. Speaker, may I first take this opportunity to congratulate you on your election as Speaker of the 28th Parliament of this provincial Legislature. You have established an enviable record of service to this province, not only on various commissions, but as an hon. Minister of several departments. I know you will give to this position your customary dignity, integrity and astuteness.

I suppose, like many other newcomers to this assembly, I have been amazed at both the scope and complexities of the problems which confront the province of Ontario in this day and age. I can make no pretension to a complete understanding of the many facets of modern-day government. This can only come through long experience, but I feel they are of a nature and character demanding an efficient and co-operative approach, involving the skills and talents of many men and women.

I believe we are well served by our present leaders through the application of the progressive policies of advancement, developed through the past quarter century of Conservative administration in Ontario. They are policies which have paid close attention to the wants and needs of the citizens of our province.

Within this assembly, there are others who can speak for the development of our industrial and commercial sinews with a far firmer voice than I possess. I come from a riding where the people are rooted in the traditions of the soil, and who depend on the products of their farms rather than the output of the factories and commercial enterprises which are rapidly becoming our mainstay in the markets of the world.

Yet, I say, Ontario could not be a great and growing province without a reliance on the vast agricultural potential which exists within her boundaries.

By itself, the problem of providing decent levels of income, housing and education; the creation of incentives and the development of means of increasing opportunity within our agricultural communities, is a monumental task.

In my riding in eastern Ontario, we are a long way indeed from the lucrative markets of western and southern Ontario, but we occupy the boundaries of the burgeoning metropolis which is our national capital—and which—in spite of this pre-eminent position, is an Ontario city reflecting our attitudes and policies.

This is a good thing for, like the national capital, my riding is representative of many facets of our ethnic and social life in Ontario. Its population of about 50,000 people is made up of both Anglo-Saxon and Franco Ontarians. As a people we are inextricably mingled, socially, economically and geographically. In our daily lives, we face the same problems and we have long since learned that advancement and improvement depends on mutual respect, support and understanding.

There are few great people in my riding. We are broken into two main groupings, approximately 80 per cent of us are French speaking and, together with our Anglo-Saxon neighbours, we look to Ontario for aid and assistance in developing the services and amenities other people may take for granted.

We work hard, we are willing to work harder and all we ask is that we be given the opportunity to present our case to the government and be allowed to continue the improvements which have already been carried out.

Those improvements, by the way, could not have been considered without the aid of the provincial government.

The decision on the part of the government to proceed with the establishment of French-language secondary schools is indicative of the progressive steps which have been taken in the past few years.

For those of us whose mother tongue is French, the problem of schooling, particularly in the rural areas of eastern Ontario has been a very serious matter.

For years, many of our children, after receiving their elementary instruction in French were forced to make the transition to an English-language education if they were to continue at the secondary school level. For many, this was an insurmountable barrier. The dropout rate was extremely high. Through discouragement, bewilderment and the awesome task of working in an entirely different milieu, we lost the potential of many of our brightest and youngest minds. This was productive of a shameful waste of human potential which we, as a people, could ill-afford.

Those days are gone. The actions of the government of Ontario in supporting and encouraging French-language high schools can only result in an increase in the pool of trained and competent people ready to serve the expanding needs of our province. Perhaps, too, the leavening influence of our culture and traditions will play its part in enriching the lives of all our people.

Today, in other places, there is a great controversy raging over the "French fact". There has been, yet, no indication of anything near the success attained by the province of Ontario through the application of a businesslike and human approach to what is, essentially, a human problem.

My riding is, perhaps, one of those closest to the difficulties engendered by the confrontation of the two founding races. I am happy to report that the initiation of this forward-seeing programme has met with nothing but praise from both the English and French components of our many communities.

While education is vitally important to secure the proper development of our youth, it is not enough. In every riding where agriculture is the mainstay of the economy we need more jobs and opportunity for both our family heads and our young people.

Nous connaissons tous les problèmes économiques que traverse l'agriculture moderne

de nos jours. Ces problèmes ne peuvent pas être résolus du jour au lendemain. Nous devons aussi considérer les mesures prises par le gouvernement de l'Ontario en vue de modifier et d'améliorer ces conditions. Les allocations de capitaux accordées aux fermiers ont permis a ces derniers d'améliorer et de maintenir leurs terres, leurs bâtiments et leur bétail. Cette idée s'est averée être le stimulant revivifiant si nécessaire a une industrie affaiblie et pourtant d'une importance si vitale.

En tant que propriétaire d'une petite fabrique de fromage établie dans une région rurale, je ne connais que trop bien les effets debilitants de la pauvrete dans ces régions. Son influence néfaste peut s'étendre sur des communautés entières et semer parmi elles la détresse et le désespoir. Elle peut détruire des familles entières et entraver le développement des générations a venir si on ne trouvé pas les moyens de l'éliminer. L'aide fournie par le gouvernement grâce a son programme de subventions continue a soutenir des centaines de milliers de nos citoyens leur permettant ainsi d'entrevoir de meilleurs lendemains.

Pendant que nous etions engagés dans ce programme, que faisait donc le gouvernement du Canada? Il dévouait tous ses efforts a placer le fermier dans une situation ruineuse.

Laissez-moi citer certains passages de l'exposé émis par l'hon. membre de Halton Est (M. Snow). La description qu'il donne sur les politiques agricoles fédérales illustre on ne peut mieux a mon avis les conditions actuelles.

> Pendant que l'Ontario établissait des programmes visant a améliorer l'économie agricole, le gouvernement fédéral s'occupait a détruire ces mêmes programmes. Dans le communiqué agricole de Janvier reçu par les fermiers de l'Ontario, et je pense aussi par tous les fermiers Canadiens en date du 21 février 1968, de la part du Ministre fédéral de l'Agriculture, on y annoncait que cinq programmes fédéraux importants et de longue date devaient être annules ou réduits, et je cite:
>
> 1. La réduction des primes pour les porcs de grade A soit de $3 à $2.
>
> 2. La réduction des primes pour les agneaux de choix de $2 chacun à $1, et l'annulation complète de la prime accordée pour les carcasses de bonne qualité.
>
> 3. La cessation complète en date du 1er avril 1968, de la prime de 2 cents par livre accordée pour le fromage Canadien de qualité.
>
> 4. L'annulation complète du programme de subvention pour l'amélioration des conditions et l'extension de l'espace de réfrigération dans les fabriques de fromage.
>
> 5. Au moment ou l'Ontario augmentait son aide aux fermiers pour l'amélioration de leurs puits, leurs étangs, leurs édifices, leur approvisionnement d'eau, leurs drainages et leurs clôtures, le gouvernement fédéral, lui, réduisait a moitié son assistance relative au programme de rétablissement agricole des Prairies ou celui des étangs de ferme.

A mon avis, Monsieur l'Orateur, les buts que nous poursuivons pour l'économie agricole de l'Ontario ne seront jamais atteints jusqu'au jour ou nous aurons un Ministre fédéral de l'Agriculture capable de développer et de mettre a exécution une vraie politique agricole nationale qui serait en harmonie avec les programmes provinciaux.

Nous vivons dans un ère pleine de changements et ou les distances ne comptent plus. Même dans notre domaine restreint de l'Ontario nous dépendons économiquement des marches mondiaux et de la préfénce commerciale mondiale pour notre survivance. Ce fût le gouvernement de l'Ontario qui, dans sa croisade commerciale pour le développement de la province, indiquait clairement que le bien-être matérial depend des efforts continus et dynamiques a la recherche de nouveaux débouchés commerciaux. Je peux vous dire que nous vendons aujourd'hui a l'étranger beaucoup plus de produit laitiers que jamais auparavant grâce a ce programme. Cela résulta pour un grand nombre de personnes, en plus de travail et plus de revenus. Par conséquent notre niveau de vie s'est améliore a travers tout l'Ontario rural.

A cause de ces changements et de cette transition des marches localises vers des marches métropolitains et mondiaux, un programme de grande envergure qui vient d'être approuve par ce gouvernement, exercera une grande influence sur l'avenir de ma circonscription. La construction de la route 417 qui relie la riche Vallee d'Ottawa tant a Ottawa qu'a la ville géante et dynamique de Montréal, est d'une extrême importance. Cette grande route a été depuis longtemps notre reve dans cette région de notre province. Ce sera le changement vers la grand production, l'augmentation des revenus familiaux, une meilleure éducation, le developpement d'une industrie touristique prospère, l'amenagement de nouvelles usines et de nouvelles industries. Ce sera la route vers notre avenir.

Dans un sens cette route sera en somme l'étincelle de vie qui stimulera le réveil du

géant endormi sur les rives de l'Outaouais pendant les derniérés 115 années. Les vieilles méthodes d'existence disparaitront avec sa construction et seront remplacées par un renouveau de vie, fraîche et dynamique.

Cette grande route ouvrira une vaste et riche péninsule qui s'étend entre l'Outaouais et le St-Laurent. L'accès que cette route ouvrira vers la ville de Cornwall au sud, Ottawa a l'ouest et Montréal a l'est, apportera une renaissance jamais connue auparavant.

C'est un des travaux les plus importants jamais entrepris par le gouvernement de l'Ontario.

Mr. Speaker, in our area of the country we have few hospitals. They are located in the centres of population such as Ottawa and, in a secondary sense, in Hawkesbury. This is in an area of more than 1,200 square miles!

We recognize the need for curbing unneeded medical expenses which must be borne by the provincial Treasury. On the other hand, our sick and disabled need care. It is, perhaps, time to examine our methods and streamline them to meet the needs of today.

We are approaching the time when Ontario will have sufficient hospital beds and services to care for its people but the provision of beds without a proper method of use will serve no useful purpose.

Today, construction and maintenance of an active treatment bed gives rise to astronomic costs—about $30,000 for construction and $11,000 for annual maintenance. The construction of a rehabilitation unit or one used for the care of the chronically ill costs about $10,000 for construction, and about $6,500 annually for maintenance charges. We cannot continue to absorb, from the public purse, charges for active treatment beds which are not used for this purpose. This can be done through the establishment of treatment centres or nursing homes designed to meet the needs of the convalescent or the chronically ill, and allow active treatment beds to be put to the use they were designed for.

Perhaps there is a little too much empire-building in various municipalities who want everything under one roof and under one administration. If this is the case, we then have the moral and legal right to demand that provincial money used for this purpose be rigorously controlled to ensure the best possible level of service. In some cases, I know there are long waiting lists of people who need immediate medical treatment. To deny them this service through improper application of the services which now exist is a shameful waste. As legislators it is time we took steps to bring this condition into proper perspective, and insist on the employment of management techniques which will assist rather than hinder the healing of the sick.

There are, however, many things which remain to be done. In the areas east of Ottawa we posses one of the finest tourist areas still undeveloped in Ontario. We possess the shores and waters of both the Ottawa and Nation Rivers. We have vast expanses of land which can be developed for sports and recreational use. We face a time when work weeks will be cut and people will have more time for leisure pursuits. Our population is one of the most mobile in Canada. Attention should be given to this type of development both by the government and private enterprise.

Perhaps this development could be keyed into the changes now taking place in the formation of a regional government serving Ottawa and the municipalities which lie to the west of my riding. Eastern Ontario, regardless of boundaries and jurisdictions, is a single economic, geographic and social unit.

Because of our location, remote from the high population areas of southern and western Ontario, our part of the province lacks the intensive development of secondary and priary industry which is becoming the mainstay of our growth. There are many who think such development is impossible in eastern Ontario. I disagree. It is my contention that, sooner or later, the eyes of the industrialists and the financiers must focus upon us. We are the last repository of well situated land, capable of serving and available for economic development. We possess a pool of skilled and professional people which has yet been untapped, save by the public service of the government of Canada.

Even now, new industrial strength is being developed in the town of Hawkesbury. Along the western boundaries of my riding we are experiencing the first—and ever mounting—pressures of urbanization.

Even in 1962, there were firm indications that the population of much of this vast area would increase three- and possibly four-fold within the next three decades. If we were to include the development forecast in the adjacent areas of the province of Quebec, the area surrounding Ottawa and extending east towards Hawkesbury will become a centre of population reaching almost 1.8 million people. No other area of Ontario holds such promise of growth in such a short span of time. We must, therefore, examine

this potential and bring it to orderly and planned realization.

In pointing out this condition which will soon confront us, I wish to point out that the people of my riding and the people of eastern Ontario are not looking for any special handouts. They would be refused. Our people, an amalgam of English, Scottish, French and Welsh extraction are a fiercely independent breed. They go their own way and make their own opportunities. They expect their government will bolster their efforts and provide services which are required, but beyond this point they believe implicitly in standing on their own two feet and seeking their own destiny.

They want no part of socialistic ideologies—

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): The member just said he wanted to plan the whole area—that is socialism.

Mr. Belanger: —which destroy initiative and weaken the resolve and determination of the individual.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): How about all those handouts the member has been talking about?

Mr. Belanger: That is what we do not want!

Mr. Speaker, if I may continue. We are a lean and hungry lot. It would be quite accurate to say that our English and French ancestors fought one another bitterly throughout the valleys of the Ottawa and the St. Lawrence regions, and learned to respect each other in the midst of that long bloodshed. Our determination could be shown in the fact that after the warring was done those selfsame people, speaking different languages and respecting different traditions, closed ranks to fight famine, disease and the rigours of our winter to hold and maintain their land and pass it down from father to son for close to two centuries.

We have learned to live with each other and it is a lesson which could be well taught to others. Just before the last election which sent me to this assembly, I was told by many experts that, all things considered, it would be impossible to develop an active interest in the policies of the issues of the day.

I was told there was too much factionalism. I was informed that the English and French components of our communities could not work together.

I am proud to say that these myths were soon dispelled. We found that the people were very well aware of the tasks they were willing to undertake. We found that, given the opportunity to participate fully in the choice of their government, our people, both French and English, were eager to rally in support of measures and principles they thought worth supporting.

I can say I was luckier than many other colleagues in this assembly, for I am supported by people who could combine the *élan* of the French tradition with the drive of the Anglo-Saxon to build, in a matter of days, an effective and dedicated organization which could not be denied the fruits of victory.

Abe Lincoln once said you could fool some of the people some of the time, some of the people all of the time, but never all of the people all of the time. I think none of our people were fooled by promises made by others. I think they were completely committed to the continued growth of this province through the evident programmes and achievements of the Progessive Conservative administration which has served them so well in the past—and which continues to give that high level of service today.

In Ontario today, particularly in eastern Ontario, we face new, unique and challenging opportunities. We face new demands for skills, for education, for productivity and human services. We face a future where the rights and privileges of our several peoples, be they French, English, Polish, Chinese or Negro, will gain not only the respect due them, but the understanding which comes only from the hearts of men and women.

We have opened the door to an era of unparalleled growth and development, and to standards of living which were not dreamed of less than 30 years ago. We live in a province which, like a giant, towers astride the backbone of the North American continent.

It is our task to keep that giant tall and strong and I know, in this assembly, that task has been placed in capable and confident hands.

As for me, I can only say it is a privilege to be in a position to assist in the developement of the great, imaginative and far-seeing programmes which will keep our province leading the nation—and well in the vanguard! Thank you.

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): Mr. Speaker, it is with considerable pleasure that I arise as the member of the newly-created Welland South riding, which has been cap-

ably represented by the hon. member for Niagara Falls (Mr. Bukator), and the hon. member for Welland (Mr. Morningstar).

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Two great men! Especially the hon. member for Niagara Falls.

Mr. Haggerty: I extend to you my congratulations on your election as Speaker of the House. I would also like to congratulate the members who moved (Mr. J. R. Smith) and seconded (Mr. Meen) the Speech from the Throne. I express my gratitude to the citizens of the Welland South riding for placing their confidence in me that I may represent them in this House.

The newly created riding of Welland South extends some seven miles along the Niagara River southerly, and reaches approximately 35 miles along the shores of Lake Erie westerly. It is comprised of the town of Fort Erie, Erie township, the village of Crystal Beach, Humberstone township, the city of Port Colborne, the township of Wainfleet, and Pelham township. The riding has a large percentage of industry, as well as being agricultural, with an ever-increasing influx of tourists and summer residents.

Mr. Speaker, Fort Erie is the heart of the Peach Bridge area. It is known as the "gateway to Canada"; it is the second largest port of entry into Canada; over 5.5 million vehicles cross over the Peace Bridge into Canada every year.

This riding, with the Niagara Parks system, the Old Fort Erie, the miles of lakefront, with the many attractive sandy beaches, and the warm waters of Lake Erie, combine to attract more visitors than any other single recreational area in Canada. The tourist trade is, therefore, an important part of our economy. Crystal Beach is known as the playground of Canada, with its large midway amusement centre. All of this is centered within a 2.5 hour drive by automobile from the large metropolitan areas of both Ontario and neighbouring cities in the United States. The population of these areas combined, in round figures, is about 4 million population.

It was just a year ago that a study for a causeway or a bridge across Lake Erie was initiated by the state of Ohio. Perhaps the reasons for this study could be that there are not enough recreational facilities for its residents, for the state of Ohio is highly industrialized.

New York state is a leading manufacturing state in the United States, followed by Ohio, Pennsylvania, Michigan.

In Ontario, one-third of all manufacturing produced in Ontario, is done within a 100-mile radius of Metropolitan Toronto, and one-third of all the buying power is in this area. The problem of growth is not only in the province of Ontario but in the United States as well.

Mr. Speaker, this brings two problems to my attention. One, is outdoor recreation, the other, is pollution. Both are of a very serious nature.

While the population has expanded, the amount of existing and potential public open space has diminished. An example, public access to the lakeshore is very limited. In recent years, there has been a growing concern about the availability of outdoor recreational sites in the Niagara peninsula, along the shores of Lake Ontario and Lake Erie.

Between the years 1872 and 1896, under the leadership of the great Liberal Premier, Sir Oliver Mowat, the Niagara parks commission was set up. It has been described as the key foundation in the province's tourist industry and a major guideline for establishing future parks in Ontario.

Mr. Speaker, the government of Ontario is well aware of the press releases since 1963, regarding the battle of beaches, but the problem has existed for a number of years. Citizens of this progressive Ontario should not have to take part in protest marches to bring to the attention of this government the need for public access to our beaches which they have long been denied as Canadians.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, the Premier (Mr. Robarts) has mentioned that the government has been in power 50 years out of the past 68 years, and of the progress that has been made in Ontario. I am quite aware that in 1967, 94 provincial parks were used by some 10 million people. But what, in the last 50 years, has this government done to preserve the lake rights of Canadians to the beaches in this riding?

Absolutely nothing! In Bertie township, the only access to the beaches are four road allowances. These roads are 66 feet in width, with barbed wire fences projecting out into the water. Some of these beaches in this riding are patrolled by guards and dogs. Last year, a number of people were charged with trespassing and brought before the local courts. Two additional road allowances had been closed off and used as township parks, and these are fenced off right out into the water. This fencing to the water prevails throughout the entire riding.

On a warm summer week-end as many as 600 to 800 persons crowd into this road allowance, and yet beyond these fences only a handful of people may be using the beach for a distance of one-half mile on either side of the road allowance.

A shore line survey of Lake Ontario in 1963, by professional planner, Norman Pearson for the Niagara region development association classified 8.1 miles of the region's 46 miles of lakefront as park land—about one inch of beach per person.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that when the study and report of recreational development and the Lake Erie shore by John N. Jackson, professor of applied geography, of Brock University, is released, it will state that the problem is far greater on Lake Erie. A crisis does exist.

Local municipal officials in the county of Welland and the Niagara region development council have had a number of meetings with the Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Brunelle) and have suggested and submitted many sites as requested by the Minister and the parks integration board of Ontario.

For the past ten years, we, the people of Welland South riding, have been given every excuse as a reply.

(a) The site is too swampy, rocky, not suited for park land and yet this very land has been farmed for nearly 200 years.

(b) The park sites are not built in a highly industrialized region; and if any place, this is where parks are needed most.

(c) The land is not suitable for acreage. Three to five hundred acres has been suggested, but the department has purchased sites in Haldimand county of 128 acres and 190 acres.

Mr. Speaker, I refer to a letter of March 21, 1962, to the hon. member for Welland:

Dear Mr. Morningstar:

We received the report from The Department of Public Works advising us that the owner of Shisler Point is not interested in selling his property and, indeed, will not consider selling any part of it.

Ontario parks integration board discussed this matter at its meeting on Thursday, February 15, 1962 and were provided with a complete review of all the circumstances involved on the proposed establishment of a park at this location. After the whole matter had been carefully considered, the members of the board were of the unanimous opinion that the property as it stands is fulfilling a very useful and necessary purpose. It is evidently open to everyone, at a very nominal fee; the people who use the present facilities are mainly from Buffalo and nearby parts of the United States and it is felt that the government would be providing services for non-Ontario population if the Shisler Point area were converted into a provincial park.

Now the province of Ontario spends thousands of dollars a year to promote tourists in Ontario and yet we tell them by this letter that our American friends are not wanted.

Mr. Speaker, the problem of beaches and parks will be far greater this year. The increase in tourists, along with the influx of summer residents who live here for three or four months, create problems that local municipalities cannot cope with. This government must take an initiative in providing a solution to the problem.

In fact, in some municipalities, their population increases from 1,200 to near 15,000, some move from 10,000 to 30,000. I would not want to see all the beaches opened to the public, but the time is coming when the people will demand that the government of Ontario announce a firm policy, on beach ownership in this region.

Mr. Speaker, the government must act now in providing a provincial park in the Welland South riding. The government must be able to provide facilities for the Ontario citizens and the large number of Americans crossing the Peace Bridge for a one day trip to limited beaches in this area.

There is one particular site that I would recommend to the Prime Minister and to the government for its consideration. It consists of approximately 1.5 miles of the finest, sandy beach to be found anywhere on Lake Erie. Yes, I am aware of the present owner of the Sherkston beaches who does provide facilities along the same lines as some parks in Ontario, but the charge for admission is $1 per person. When you have a number of homes behind this lake front, Mr. Speaker, with a family of four who want to attend this beach day by day in the summer time, $4 can amount to around $28 a week. I do not know where anybody in this class—wages and so forth—can afford to pay $4 a day so that they can get to the beaches in this area.

I would like to suggest to the Prime Minister that this government declare this strip of beach public land. Although there is a question of ownership, I am sure that this would not affect the owner's private business

in any way. This same owner could provide parking area for cars on his own land and not on the sandy beaches. I am quite sure that a far greater development would occur in this area that would be to the advantage of the owners of the Sherkston beaches. There are an estimated 10,000 to 15,000 cars parked on beaches on Saturdays and Sundays in the summer months.

I quote the recent words of the federal Minister, Mr. Laing, responsible for our natural parks policy:

> On our urban fringes we have a problem of major consequence. Who will ensure that parks to absorb the heavy recreational demand on urban fringes are there for today and for tomorrow? To create parks within this fringe we require action. This action is not forthcoming to the extent I think it should be.
>
> The most critical park problems are within 2.5 hours' driving time of the urban core. This is the critical need in Canada, as it is in the United States. We in Canada are moving all too slowly to meet this demand.

Mr. Speaker, you can readily agree that Welland South riding falls into this category; the government has done nothing.

I would also like to bring to the attention of the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests—this is an article dated March 9 in the Welland *Evening Tribune* and reads:

> SEEKS APPROVAL FOR NEW QUARRY AT SHERKSTON
>
> The request made by the Sherkston beaches to Humberstone township council Monday night was to open a quarry for commercial purposes, not as a recreational facility.
>
> Sherkston presently has one of the best swimming quarries in the area which serves many visitors during the summer months. There is no present operation of a quarry at Sherkston for commercial uses. Council has tabled the request until further information can be obtained.

I understand that they apparently read a by-law—first reading—but I do not know whether they concur with opening this commercial quarry or not. I suggest to the Minister that this site is one of the best that can be found any place for a provincial park. It could consist of some 1,000 acres, the present farm buildings could be made into an Upper Canada village and this could be a great attraction in this area. I certainly hope that the Minister takes this into his considerations this year.

Mr. Speaker, I referred in my opening remarks to two problems. The second problem is also of a very serious nature, and that is water and air pollution. Lake Erie has been called a cesspool and the Niagara river an open sewer. If we were to use a helicopter and fly along the shores of Lake Erie and the rivers and streams in this region, we would see stretched before us the discoloured watersheds surrounding the many industries and local municipalities. Perhaps the members of this assembly should visit this site, as my leader has, to see the algae six inches to one foot in depth on our beaches and out into the water. It has cost the municipalities and the property owners large sums of money to spray the algae along the shore just to get rid of the odour.

One of the prime causes of pollution is the nutrients that are being dumped and disposed of in our lakes and rivers.

(a) By outdated municipal sewage system, some with very little treatment made; (b) industry and its waste products; (c) by small craft and large vessels that ply upon our watercourses.

Mr. Speaker, all the material dumped into our lakes and rivers, in the process of decay, deprive the water of oxygen and when this process occurs, oxygen is removed and the water becomes useless. It becomes dead and stagnant.

Last summer Nickel beach at Port Colborne was closed by the recreational director and the county medical health officer for reason of a contaminated watershed. What action was taken by the medical officer of health, or by the Ontario water resources commission, to get at the sources of pollution? Nothing was done, as usual.

I recognize that legislation is pending on the abatement of pollution from the small craft boats. I take the opportunity at this time to commend the hon. Minister of Energy and Resources Management (Mr. Simonett) for taking this action, for it is long overdue.

Mr. Speaker, who is going to inspect and enforce the regulations? I am concerned about the large foreign vessels. Are these vessels going to comply with legislation? Are they equipped with holding tanks for human waste? What about the waste from the galleys?

Mr. Speaker, there are three municipalities in Welland South riding, and other municipalities of Ontario, that will spend large

sums of money to build the necessary treatment facilities to improve the quality of drinking water. Yes, this problem was recognized some 59 years ago under The Boundary Water Treaty Act of 1909 which prohibits the pollution in Canada, or in the United States, to injury of health or property.

I am aware of the increased density of population and the increased industrialization which confront us with many problems. We in this House have listened to many speeches made by the hon. members on the government side in the 25 years of Tory government in Ontario. I ask you what progress has been made?

Little has been done on the abatement of pollution in Ontario. In fact, it is increasing day by day. Pollution is our greatest concern in Ontario, and all the fresh water lying north of the 49th parallel is considered liquid gold to the United States. They have allowed their water to become so polluted that, perhaps, it is beyond reclaim.

There have been rumours that the Canadian government will sell our fresh water from our northern resources to the United States. This government should censure all rumours, for one can only see that our Great Lakes system, especially Lake Erie, will move from a cesspool to a septic tank. I will read this quote:

> Pollution is catching up with us. As a lover of sea food, I hate to face the facts. In the past there have been some sporadic epidemics of hepatitis, serious liver disease, that were traced to the shell fish from polluted waters. But now it seems clear that in some parts of the country shell fish may be continuing to cause hepatitis.

Dr. Raymond Koff and his colleagues have been keeping track of hepatitis patients in the Boston hospitals. A large majority of them turned out to be people who eat raw oysters and raw and steamed clams. What is more, when people who did not have hepatitis were sampled at random, it turned out that the majority of them did not like clams or oysters. Dr. Koff says that fried oysters and clams get sufficiently heated through to destroy the hepatitis virus, but steamed clams are usually cooked only a minute or so; that is not enough heat to kill the virus. His report in the *New England Journal of Medicine* definitely indicts polluted water. The virus is common, he says, in sewage that has not been sufficiently treated.

Of course, members can pick up the local newspapers, many of them, and you can see where you have hepatitis epidemics in certain areas. Perhaps this is the cause.

I might suggest, Mr. Speaker, perhaps one of the solutions to this is greater assistance to the municipalities. We have a municipal education fund here; I think the money comes from the Canada pension fund. This is passed down to the local municipal level where they can borrow the money at 5⅜ per cent—5.5 now, somebody just mentioned to me.

We can borrow money reasonably from the Ontario water resources commission, but the problem arises when municipalities want to install further sewage treatment facilities, trunk lines under local improvement programmes.

To finance these it costs the ratepayers 6.5 per cent—I think I could roughly say now 7.5 per cent to be on the safe side. This is way out of proportion. It is time perhaps that the government of Ontario should initiate a plan for a municipal loan bank that all municipalities in Ontario may borrow money at a fair interest rate.

Mr. Speaker, some members of this House have seen the Canadian broadcasting corporation's documentary, "Air of Death." Shocking as it was, it has presented the serious problem of air pollution in Ontario. On November 6, 1967, the announcement was made of a Royal commission to study air, soil and water pollution in Haldimand county where fluoride fumes were blamed for poisoning cattle and damage to crops.

In a report of the Niagara peninsula conservation authority of June, 1964, it was reported, and I quote:

> Some chemical analysis of air pollution carried out by The Ontario Department of Health showed that some of the crops in the marsh were contaminated with nickel oxide from the International Nickel Company refinery at Port Colborne. Corn in the marsh was carrying 35 points per million of nickel oxide but no crop damage was reported. Damage was found on crops outside this marsh at various levels of contamination. Example: corn, 85 parts per million showed crop damage; oak leaves, 129 parts per million showed foliage damage. Air pollution has caused power failure in the city of Welland which caused some considerable damage in 1957.

I think not too long ago the city of Montreal went through the same problem.

Mr. Speaker, on June 2, 1967, I attended a seminar on air pollution at the international air pollution forum at Niagara University in New York state. To my knowledge, there

was not a representative from the government of Ontario, but one from the federal government in Ottawa. It was noted that the source of air pollutants in the United States was as follows:

Transportation: automobiles and buses, 60 per cent; industry: 18 per cent; electric steam generating stations—and I suppose this could apply perhaps to the Hydro in Ontario—13 per cent; residential homes: 6 per cent; garbage incinerators: 3 per cent.

It was also stated that the death rate is 24 per cent higher in a contaminated air shed than in an unpolluted area.

So you can see the Americans have been doing the necessary research and homework.

On January 2, 1968, government regulations came into force—The Air Pollution Control Act of 1967. I would agree that this bill is good, but I would bring to the members' attention that it could be improved. The Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond) should take note of table 2, referring to the emission of pollutants, the amount of concentration for industrial and commercial land, the amount of concentration for residential or rural land use.

Example: I.T.9 fluorides in industry, 4.0; residential, 1.0. Are not human beings involved in both cases?

Mr. Speaker, as you can see I am concerned about the health of our citizens of Ontario, the people who are totally disabled as a result of chest ailments caused by pollution of our air, occupational hazards, industrial disease. The lung disease, emphysema, is fast increasing in Ontario. The director for The Ontario Department of Health, Dr. R. B. Sutherland, said that it has a faster rate of increase than lung cancer in Ontario and has increased 200 per cent in seven years. It is known that smoking contributes to this disease, but I am also sure that air pollution plays a large part. I refer again to the death rate in the United States; it is 24 per cent higher in a contaminated air shed.

In a recent study in Montreal, the air pollution there, it has been found, makes drivers accident-prone. Mr. Speaker, I would recommend to this House that the government enact legislation to further abate the pollution in Ontario.

1. Anti-pollution devices on all automobiles, trucks. Regulations prescribing exhaust emission control.

2. The emission of contaminated air must be at the lowest safety factor standard level of control.

3. Need for more inspection in industry to protect all employees. A complete programme is needed here.

4. More education in our schools explaining the hazards of smoking.

5. The government of Ontario should take far greater steps for uniformity in the regulations of the abatement of pollution in our Great Lakes system with the United States.

6. I believe we need more research here in Ontario to protect the people of this province.

If anybody has been following the news comments from Cayuga, dealing with the fluoride situation at the ERCO company there, he will find out that experts have come from England and from the United States—apparently we lack them in Canada —to Ontario.

Mr. Speaker, there has been enough dialogue and little action taken to improve the abatement of pollution of water and air in Ontario. We need action.

Now we come to some of the election promises made across the province of Ontario. I have a copy here:

PREMIER JOHN ROBARTS WILL CONTINUE TO PRESS FOR TOLL-FREE CANAL

> We, the Conservatives, have protested against imposition of tolls on the Welland ship canal in 1959, 1964, 1966 and 1967. We remain opposed to tolls on the canal in any form.

Mr. Speaker, I have to travel on the Queen Elizabeth way to St. Catharines and I have to dig into my pocket and pay a toll at the bridge at St. Catharines to be able to pass. I continue another 30 or 40 miles to Hamilton and again I have to dig into my pocket and pull out some more money for tolls. Now I could well agree with this if the hon. Minister would remove the tolls on these bridges, overpasses on the Queen Elizabeth.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): How about that?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Haggerty: Mr. Speaker, on February 26 I asked a question in this House, perhaps it was referred to the chairman of the Niagara parks commission. It deals with the Niagara parks $90,000 study for preservation of parks in the Niagara peninsula.

1. Will the chairman advise that the study includes the land and shores of Lake Erie

for recreational potential in the Niagara region?

2. Have tenders been let for the site for a new marina on the Niagara River at the old shipyard in Bertie township?

Mr. Speaker, I have not received a reply on this today and I do not know if I will receive a reply on this. Perhaps the chairman thought that it might be a little contentious, but I leave this thought with him. I was seeking information; I was trying to arrive at the conclusion that there is a need for a park on Lake Erie and that perhaps the Niagara parks should extend their boundaries to Lake Erie.

The proposed new marina in Bertie township consists, I think, of some $300,000 cost. Last September, the announcement came out in the paper. Is the chairman aware that the federal government has been talking with the village of Crystal Beach about spending some $1 million for a marina at Crystal Beach? I was wondering perhaps if, through you, Mr. Speaker, the chairman would include this study along the shores of Lake Erie.

If they have $300,000 to spend for a marina in the old shipyard site in Bertie township, perhaps this should be included in the Crystal Beach marina with the assistance of the federal government. I am sure they could get this marina they are looking forward to.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on and on here tonight on some of these promises that were made.

Some hon. members: Go ahead!

Mr. Haggerty: I come to one of the Conservative candidates—my opponent—and it says here:

> Mr. Taylor told a large gathering at the three Peace Bridge area municipalities they have been out of step too long. As a result, many advantages of having a member with a direct voice at Queen's Park have been lost to us.

He goes on to suggest that if he was elected they would have top priority in building a new tourist centre at the gateway of Canada at Fort Erie. Now perhaps some of the members are not aware this building is actually a two by four. A gateway to Canada, this is what it is, a two by four, you can park perhaps four cars in front of this building.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Haggerty: I might say there has been some hope in this matter of obtaining a new tourist centre in this area. I know some of the departments have recommended it, but, perhaps, this year we might see a move in this direction—that, in this area, the gateway to Canada, that we do have a proper tourist centre here. Perhaps we could issue hunting licences, even perhaps a bank where the Americans can change their money and be on their way heading to the glorious north country.

Mr. Speaker, I think this pretty well winds it up, it is a quarter to six. And I do want to say to the members here and to you, Mr. Speaker, that if I do rise in the House to criticize, it will be for the good of the province of Ontario.

Mr. W. G. Pitman (Peterborough): Mr. Speaker, first I would like to say how pleased I am to take part in this debate.

I would like to record my very short impressions as a new member of this House, but as a member who sat rather a short time in Ottawa, I would like to—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Pitman: What was that?

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): He cannot fall as flat on his face as the member for Grey South (Mr. Winkler) did.

Mr. Pitman: I would like to say this, that in my humble opinion, the level of debate in this House in the weeks that I have been here far exceeded that which I have experienced in the House at Ottawa.

I would also like to suggest that the management of affairs, that is, the passing of bills in this House seems to be almost breathtaking, as compared to what transpires in the House at Ottawa.

And I think, if I might say this, the level of interjections really is far better than anything I experienced in Ottawa.

For that reason, I would like to suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that—I know it is usual to pass on congratulations—I think, perhaps, at this point, it is more appropriate to pass on consolations as to the problems you have experienced over the past two weeks.

However, I must say that you are trying to run a tight ship here and we are on course, and I hope that over the next few weeks there will be no effort to try and limit the kind of interjections, the kind of "back and forth" comments that have been going on

in this House, because I think there has been a good deal of worthwhile debate that never is recorded in *Hansard.*

That might be a very good thing, Mr. Speaker, but it is nevertheless for the edification of all of us who are here. This is a very intimate and a very intense chamber and I think we want to keep it that way.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that you have quite obviously one of the most difficult jobs in this entire House. Your job is that of balancing; it is a very delicate balance, balancing freedom and order. And I would suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that that is the responsibility of all of us here. This House is here to carry out the business of the province but it is the job, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, of this side of the House to make sure that justice is done—and to see that it seems to be done. And we are going to continue in our questioning, we are going to continue in our criticism without innuendo, we are going to continue in that course for four long years. And at the end of those four long years—

An hon. member: That will be the end.

Mr. Pitman: Evidently the Ministers are so desperate for power they are insisting now it is going to be five long years, but I suggest that four years will be long enough for the people of Ontario to stand, and I am sure that they will then be ready to place the responsibility of the running of this province in the hands of those who are ready to give the kind of progressive, forward-looking policies—

Mr. T. Reid (Scarborough East): Of the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Nixon).

Mr. Pitman: May I add to that, my friends to the right are not those who are ready to provide that kind of government.

However, I must say I do hope that we will find that the committee which you have suggested you will be setting up, Mr. Speaker, to look into the rules of this House, will be able to get that fine balance and we will not destroy the kind of debate which has gone on here over the last number of days.

I think this debate has been most interesting and most valuable and I am not trying to flatter these members here, they will soon realize that, it does not come to me easily. I am not trying to flatter them but I do suggest that, in this debate, we have gotten down to the real "guts" philosophy of each of the parties in this House, and I think that it would be a very good exercise in political reasoning for some of the political departments in our universities to carry with them the *Hansards* of the last two weeks in this House.

I am sure they would find there some of the most basic concepts of political reasoning from what might almost be called the almost esoteric dissertation of the member for Lakeshore (Mr. Lawlor) up here, to what might be called the more primitive discussions of members from the other side. Of course, I am sure it would take at least a number of weeks for these political students to discover exactly where my friends to the right really stand.

An hon. member: Oh, we know.

Mr. Pitman: We have been searching, we have been looking, but we look in vain.

Mr. Speaker, it is usual in a speech of this nature to exalt the beauty of one's region and the intelligence of the people—

An hon. member: That is self-evident.

Mr. Pitman: Yes, indeed, I admit that, it is so self-evident and also, I must say, it is really unnecessary because almost two weeks ago, we had certainly an invasion of members from the other side. They were all over the place, there were seven Ministers there, sir, something which no constituency in this province has experienced, or has been forced to experience—

Mr. MacDonald: They were too late, they lost the riding.

Mr. Pitman: —I am sure, since election time. And so I do not think I need to tell you about the seductive beauty of this constituency. All I need to suggest to you is that it was indeed so appealingly beautiful that they could not even get their members to go to the meetings.

I just want to read a very short excerpt from the *Globe and Mail,* that paragon of accuracy which the other members respect so highly, and it describes one or two of the workshops that were carried on in the city of Peterborough.

First may I say how delighted we were to have them in the city of Peterborough. The Peterborough constituency has done nothing really very accommodating to the members of the other side over the last two elections—including the federal election, I think my friends to the right will suggest to—so we were delighted to have them come.

But I do want to suggest the obvious, the constituency had so many delights, indeed, on that weekend there were more delights than can be imagined. There were go-go girls, we are very delighted to see this government go anywhere, and go-go girls perhaps might give them the suggestion, and there was psychedelic dancing, and also the enjoyment of an Ontario Miss YPC contest and a very lovely Peterborough girl was chosen on that occasion, may I say.

But to come back to this meeting, in the workshop—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Pitman: Yes, I am glad that he said that. I mentioned the member who preceded me in this House was there.

I want to say that at this point this gentleman performed a very great service to that constituency in the time that he was in the House. I do want to say that. That gentleman's voice was not raised in the House very often, but I know one thing, that he spent a great deal of time in the offices of the government here, and he did make sure that the voice of Peterborough was heard in these offices, and I intend to emulate him to that degree at least.

To come back—I seem to have disgressed—to the seduction of Peterborough.

> At the workshop entitled, "Effective Meetings," Toronto lawyer Craig Ross held up a card with rows of squares representing chairs and said: This is the classic form of a dull meeting with the chairs all facing straight ahead. The 88 chairs in the room were all facing straight ahead and 77 were empty.
>
> Meanwhile, in the workshop on "Success Programming," chairman Bruce McAudren, the party's student president, had gone through the first two of five keys to programming a meeting—purpose and planning—and was on the third promotion.
>
> The 12 persons in the rooms had their choice of 90 chairs and most of them had chosen those near the rear.

Well, I do not wish to go on, but I do want to suggest to you that obviously I do not need to say anything more about the beauty of the constituency that I represent other than this. It is a strong industrial centre and it reacts very quickly to changes in technology and the trade.

It is also an agrarian community which makes my concern about agriculture very real. We even have air pollution, this may seem unimaginable, but we do have pockets of air pollution in an area such as Peterborough, I am sure when you realize the problem of air pollution in a tourist region like this, and a comparatively uninhabited area of Ontario, then, I am sure that the words of the previous gentleman will come with some impact on this House.

This is a problem that is going to increase. It has already begun, even in rural areas and semi-rural areas in Ontario.

Of course the constituency has many kinds of municipalities such as the city of Peterborough, but also villages and rural municipalities. That is why I am particularly concerned about the direction this problem is going in the area of regional government. That is why tonight I would like to take this opportunity of speaking to the Speaker and the 117 men who represent the several million of the province about this very point.

In 1966, the Premier (Mr. Robarts) of this province placed before this chamber a design for development. I would like to read a part of this design for development because I think it is only right that we should have a chance to judge the actions and record of this government year by year as it moves towards this ideal.

This year, we will see in a moment, we had a blueprint for development, but I wonder if this government can really tell us if we are any closer to any kind of development than we were in 1966. Allow me to read:

> **The timing and impact of our large and expanding expenditures in investments must be effectively planned and coordinated within the overall needs of the provincial economy. Similarly, we believe that the regional plans and priorities should always contribute to the total environmental development and economic performance of the province.**

These are proud words, but how much have we seen so far:

> **On this dual basis the responsibility for the control and administration of any regional undertaking by the government should be in the hands of a central authority, which can cut across both departmental lines and county or municipal boundaries in meeting and solving or meeting regional problems.**
>
> **I look in vain to see this kind of central authority—one that is cutting across any of these lines. In every part of Ontario we find municipalities, whether they are rural municipalities, or villages, towns, or cities, looking to this chamber and this government for a plan, for some direction, and finding none whatsoever.**
>
> **The philosophy of the present Ontario government has always been to encourage and assist individuals to develop their full capabilities; to encourage economic competitiveness; and to provide a climate of expanding employment opportunities for a growing labour force.**

The provision of government services and support of these objectives has produced a tremendous expansion of the economy in recent years.

This is the speech of the Premier, and I would expect less levity from the other side.

In that last sentence, I noticed, and I think that this is interesting in the light of the philosophic conversation that has gone on here, expansion of employment is related to expansion of the public sector.

Planning for the provision of these services and for the huge expenditures must be equally co-ordinated.

Where is this co-ordination?

Regional development policies are instrumental aspects of a broader provincial growth policy, and on this basis, appropriate regional development requires comprehensive planning.

It is also the role of this government to ensure that regional land use planning.

But where have we found this regional land use planning in use in Ontario? This was not one of the things that was pointed out with so much pride in this latter election campaign.

It is up to the government to see that the regions are developed in accordance with an orderly plan which would include environmental and economic considerations.

Well, it is a very good speech, I must say, and I would like to make that clear, but we should like to see a little action to go along with the speech.

Mr. Speaker, it is 6:00 o'clock.

It being 6:00 o'clock p.m., the House took recess.

No. 25



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

First Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Thursday, March 14, 1968

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1968

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Thursday, March 14, 1968

Resumption of the debate on the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Pitman, Mr. Sargent, Mr. Trotter 801

Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Trotter, agreed to 829

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to 829

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, MARCH 14, 1968

The House resumed at 8:00 o'clock, p.m.

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE
(Continued)

Mr. W. G. Pitman (Peterborough): Mr. Speaker, when we adjourned at 6:00 o'clock I was reading to the House the speech of the hon. Prime Minister of Ontario (Mr. Robarts) on April 5, 1966, which was titled "design for development". I was at that time —I do not wish to repeat—going into the details of how the Prime Minister suggested that the regional planning would be done, that is how the expenditures of the province would be related to this, and all the policies of employment, and so on. But later on in this speech this design becomes a little more detailed and I would like to know what happened to all of these details. On page 2259 of *Hansard* of April 5, the Prime Minister said this:

> Mr. Speaker, to summarize, the "design for development" outlined in this statement of policy is broad and comprehensive. Our aspirations cannot be fulfilled overnight.

I might say, sir, that that is the understatement of the entire speech. I continue:

> The limitation of resources in terms of manpower, finance and experience means that we must gradually acquire the tools to forge ahead with regional development planning. However, the nine measures which we are about to introduce—

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Provincial Treasurer): Oh, ye of little faith!

Mr. Pitman: We have faith to move mountains, sir, but I am afraid sometimes our faith is stretched. To continue:

> However, the nine measures which we are about to introduce in our regional development policy provide the guarantee that the proper machinery for the task will be available to this government. The first is the establishment of the Cabinet committee with broad terms of reference, upon which we place great emphasis.

Might we ask how often this Cabinet committee meets? What do they talk about?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: They do not talk about you, I can tell you that.

Mr. Pitman: I would scarcely expect this Cabinet committee to be talking about me, Mr. Speaker, but one might even ask, "do you play cards?" and if so, "which Minister is winning?" There is a committee of the United Nations which meets in the United Nations in New York. It is a disarmament committee which unfortunately has been given no work to do and it meets every morning at 10:00 o'clock, and I am wondering if this is the kind of committee that we have here.

An hon. member: It is a pretty disorderly committee, all right.

Mr. Pitman: To continue from the Prime Minister's speech:

> This committee will be concerned with the interrelated processes of policy, priority, planning and co-ordination of government activity.

Well, on that basis one can assume that it has not met yet. He went on to say:

> The need for such a committee to assist in carrying out the regional development programme is accepted by this government. One of our principal instruments of regional development policy will be the use of government budgetary expenditures directed to regional needs.

Mr. Speaker, I perused this Budget carefully and I can see a great many other needs being looked after regardless of Budget, but certainly none of them has any relationship to the regional development in this province. The statement goes on to say:

> In this sense, the need for priority planning of government expenditures, which we stressed in the recent Budget statement, and regional development planning are closely inter-related.

Further on it says:

> Two is the formation of the senior departmental advisory committee to advise and assist the Cabinet committee to review plans prior to submission to the Cabinet committee—

What happened to this committee? Has it made any report? Produced any white paper?

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): If you had listened to my contribution in this debate earlier—

Mr. Pitman: Mr. Speaker, I am looking forward in a moment to reading this year's contribution—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, I apologize for interrupting the hon. member in his

maiden speech, but I did not think he would mind. I did make some comments about the next step when I spoke in this debate.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Pitman: I refer again to the speech of the Prime Minister. He said:

Three is the presentation of our legislation reconstituting the present regional development associations as advisory citizen bodies to be named regional development councils.

And there, Mr. Speaker, something has been done. Of course, they really do not know what they are supposed to be doing, whether they are expected to be regional industrial promotion organizations or tourism organizations, but at least the councils are there—two years later. I continue:

Four is the presentation of legislation to permit the enlargement of the scope of activities of the Ontario development agency.

It is true, Mr. Speaker, that that has been done too, but I think that if there is anything that we have learned from this section, it is that the Ontario development corporation certainly has very, very little relationship to regional development. In fact, even taking the economics out of that particular title, making it into a department of trade and development, shows this. And that is rightly so, the point being that it might very well be stimulating the economy but it certainly has little to do with the development of a regional economy.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Obviously this scheme is working very well—

Mr. Pitman: I think today—I may trust my hearing is wrong, Mr. Speaker, but I think I heard the answer of the Minister to the member for Grey-Bruce that there were ten loans—is that right?

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Ten loans.

Mr. Pitman: Ten loans and there were five people who had to look after the designation of these ten loans in one year.

Mr. Sargent: Forty-nine people.

Mr. Pitman: I did not count the rest. I was looking at the five who were trying to find out where the loans should go.

An hon. member: That is why it is working so well.

Mr. Pitman: An hon. member just said that that is why it is working so well. I do not want to belabour this point, but it has already been mentioned that in one particular region, which in this debate shall remain nameless, the one centre which is designated the "growth" centre was ringed by designations of equality of industrial opportunity and the one area needing growth was given no designation whatsoever. If this is relating industrial development to regional development, it is a very tenuous relationship, may I suggest, sir. Next quotation:

Five is the preparation for comprehensive regional economic research through the regional development branch of The Department of Economics and Development.

There, Mr. Speaker, is something that has been done. There is some research, but this government is extremely good at research.

Six is a corollary of the above and involves establishing the terms of reference for regionally related research which may be contracted out to Ontario universities and consulting firms.

Well, we have heard very little about that.

Seven, is our expectation that our comprehensive research programme will provide the necessary insight required to formulate development plans based on the concept that regional growth centres are the unifying social and economic force within the region.

Mr. Speaker, if I can just, for a moment, suggest to you that in this initial address the Prime Minister was quite right. It is the only way you are going to develop a region—to decide upon a growth centre and allow that growth centre to bring prosperity to the entire area around. With that technical structure on which our industry today rests, you must have this kind of an organization, but this government has failed to do this and I will come to that a bit later.

Eight is the establishment of a regional advisory board composed of the senior civil servants in the region.

Well, how is this coming along? How many of these boards have we got? What have they produced in the last two years? How far along are they in this movement towards some kind of a regional development?

These boards will advise the senior departmental advisory committee on matters of interest in the region.

And finally Mr. Speaker,

Nine is our intention to work toward the gradual establishment of common administrative and planning regions among the operating departments and agencies of the provincial government.

It is my understanding, Mr. Speaker, there are something like 35 different regional developments within the departments. How far along are we towards any kind of co-ordination of regions for activities which are going within this government?

I suggest to you that two years later we have not gone very far. As the hon. members undoubtedly know, this speech of the Prime Minister two years ago came largely as the

result of the Krueger report which indicated that there were some very serious gaps in the government's concepts of what was meant by regional development. I will just quote one or two sentences.

> With the exception of the work of the regional development division, The Department of Economics and Development appears to have done little to co-ordinate other department policies and programmes related to economics and development. In fact, most government officials seem to be unaware that legislation has given The Department of Economics and Development the same co-ordinating responsibilities as those of the preceding Department of Planning and Development.

The majority of senior civil servants interviewed indicated that the concept of a co-ordinating type of department was excellent, but would work—and here I do emphasize—only if there was Cabinet support for the idea, and a strong Minister in command who understood the functions of other departments and who could adequately influence government policies.

We also recognize that it is virtually impossible to co-ordinate economic and development policies and programmes when there is no overall official policy statement. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that we are no farther along towards an official policy statement from this government than we were two years ago when this statement was made in the House.

One of the most urgent and fundamental tasks is to formulate a master development plan which becomes the blueprint for policies of all departments.

I suggest to you that although the Prime Minister in this year's Throne debate uses the term blueprint—I am no master of semantics, Mr. Speaker, and perhaps it might help me—I am not sure whether a design is any farther ahead than a blueprint or a blueprint is any farther ahead than a design. All I know is that there was less in this Throne Speech in terms of actual statements of policies, than there was in the designs which we had two years ago. In fact, sometimes I have a kind of a Tory nightmare this might go on and on.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): It has been for a long time already.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: It will go on for a little while. You can be sure of that.

Mr. Pitman: The nature of the nightmare, Mr. Speaker, is the suggestion that we might have this government for years on end, but I would like to suggest—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Pitman: I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, I can contrive no greater insult to the democratic process in Ontario than to suggest that this would be the case, but nonetheless—

Mr. MacDonald: Four years anyway!

Mr. Pitman: In 1970 perhaps we might get a pattern for development. By 1972 perhaps a motif for development. By 1974 perhaps a contour for development. By 1976, perhaps a format for development. I would probably suggest that perhaps Bobby Kennedy might be finishing up his second term in office by this time. By 1978, a configuration of development; for 1980, a profile of development. By 1982 an outline of development. By 1984—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Pitman: —a structure of development. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that if this government is in office in 1984, it will be a 1984 with a vengeance in this province.

Well, Mr. Speaker, as I say, this speech this year went on with this whole theme. "The term regional development in the first place is a term that is easily misunderstood because it is basically a concept."

I suggest to you Mr. Speaker, that is all it ever will be in this House—a concept. "It is, in fact, an exercise in policy co-ordination."

Mr. Speaker, it is not an exercise in policy co-ordination, it is an exercise in setting goals, and this is what this government is unwilling to do. Yet there must be goals.

To continue: "Now, if you are thinking of particular activities and events, and it is obvious that regional development is going on all the time—"

This is exactly, I think, the very point. It is a concept of this government that regional development is something that happens whenever two department heads happen to meet each other in the hall. I suggest to you that regional development is a dynamic thing. It demands the setting of goals on the part of all members of the Cabinet who are concerned, common goals and interrelating policies so that these goals intersect.

"We could spend the weeks," said the Prime Minister, "cataloguing acts of industrial development, mining, transportation, tourism, and urban goals."

The suggestion here is that in piling activities on top of one another that somehow magically there appeared some kind of regional pattern. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, this just is not the case.

"In fact it is the need for orderly development of the province's resources and the province's wealth, and ulimately in the planning of land use in the entire province. To accomplish this objective on a broad policy-wide basis we require a careful set of plans for each of these economic regions."

Here we are, Mr. Speaker, two years after a design for development, we are still now going to produce plans for each of the ten economic regions.

"So that all our government activity and expenditure, wherever it may be, whether on transportation, whether on education, whether on power, water resource development, all co-ordinated and directed towards the achievement of specific goals of economic development."

Some of the questions that the Prime Minister asked at this stage of the game I think are rather surprising, in fact rather shattering. For example, he suggests, Mr. Speaker, it implied some restrictions as though this was something which we should be rather concerned about. Obviously, any kind of regional development is going to imply some kind of restriction. I am sure even the member for London South (Mr. White) would recognize that we are going to have to restrict if we are going to allow growth in certain areas.

"How do we want our land to be used?" asked the Prime Minister. This is a very good question in view of what has happened to some of the prime agricultural land in the Niagara escarpment, for example, and here we are still asking this question.

"How decentralized do we want our industry to be?" Well here is a major question, and I suggest to you that the Minister of Trade and Development certainly has not given any kind of an adequate answer to this. I thought he was being very helpful the other night in some of the other more philosophical remarks he had to make about his department and when he commented: "Tell us how would you go about designating areas."

I suggest to you that one thing you must do is to give some kind of a criterion—a criterion which relates to the growth areas that you want to produce, and within that criterion certainly we need some flexibility. We are willing to admit, along with the Minister and his officials that in some cases the federal plans have been inflexible and that there have been communities which should have been receiving grants or advantages who have not been getting those advantages because of the inflexibility of a criterion.

Surely we must know where we are going? We cannot decide things by some kind of charisma, and this is the impression which is received by industrialists and by people who are concerned with goals in Ontario.

Well, how large do we want our cities to be? Here is one of the major problems in our society. We are in Ontario, starting to move towards some form, some have suggested, of megalopolis, which now stretches from Hamilton to Oshawa, and may very well stretch some day from Windsor to Kingston.

Is that the kind of society we want? I think that the Prime Minister in his remarks indicated that this was not the kind of society that we wanted in Ontario, but I suggest to you that the transportation policies, the policies in many of the Ministries who are present here tonight, are encouraging that kind of development—just a simple continuation of the urban sprawl. With this goes a rising crime rate, and greater traffic problems, and no goal by which we can get out of this kind of situation. I do not think that we are asking too much.

Some time ago, a study was done for the regional development branch in The Department of Economics and Development in the province of Ontario by the chairman of the department of geography of York University.

In this study, presented to the Ontario government, this gentleman attempted to identify the kind of development which were the choices for this government to make. The choices were: extreme decentralization; concentrated decentralization; or extreme concentration. Of course he rejects extreme concentration as the simple expanding of the metropolitan area, the Golden Horseshoe. He rejects also the extreme decentralization. Perhaps I might read a small portion of the report presented to the government a long time ago, and still I suggest, the Premier is asking what could be called the most basic questions which must have been brought up in these committees which have been talked about the last two years:

> In order to obtain maximum benefits of the tremendous investments which were made by previous generations in terms of farms, villages, towns, cities, roads, railways in Ontario, new technological trends cannot be located solely in accordance with their contemporary locational factors. They have to be relocated to the existing pattern of the environment. For this reason the concept of concentrated decentralization appears to be the most reasonable and pro-

> gressive alternative for the decades to come. The concept places considerable emphasis on fostering complementary relations between central places and their hinterlands. This approach to fostering viable prospering growth centres in these parts of Ontario should not be seen as merely giving the cities preferences which ought to be directed towards the towns and villages.

And this is exactly what I suggested, the equalization of industrial opportunities. We have a whole mass of villages and towns, and drop goodies on these villages and towns, with no idea whatsoever as to how this is going to affect them, or how the regional development of this province over the next ten years is to take place. The city serves as a centre of employment for its rural hinterland. Thus economic development and growth pools stimulate the well being of the population of the whole province. The city with a population of at least several tens of thousands can, in conjunction with the metropolitan centres, provide urban functions which are demanded by the people of the province of the present and next generation —functions which cannot be provided by smaller towns and villages. With our great private mobility, services which the city and metropolis provide are also at the disposal of the rural population in the city's hinterland. The city and its hinterland is the basic unit which is underlined in development regions.

Well now, what has the government done? The study designates certain areas which are growth areas, and it suggests other centres which are potential growth centres, middle order centres, I perused a number of centres which were designated by this equalization of industrial centres opportunity and of the 14 or 12 middle order centres two or three are designated. And what are some of the others? Of Kitchener, Oshawa, St. Catharines, Kingston, Peterborough, Sarnia, Cornwall, Brantford, Chatham, North Bay, Barrie, Orillia, Owen Sound, some asked for designations and were refused. There you have the situation. Belleville and Pembroke were designated among this list, and the others were left out. And yet, these are the growth centres, for the regions which were cited in this particular study.

My final document of persuasion is one which was given at the Montmorency conference. An extremely progressive speech, it must be a form of self-flagellation which is carried out by those on the other side. This particular speech is a paragon of an intelligent approach to the whole problem. If I might identify it for you, sir, the speech was by Dr. Eric Bycroft of the University of Western Ontario, and in this speech he made a number of points which I wish the government might just take under consideration. It is titled "The advantages of an urban-based democracy."

> But if the war for good cities—which is in part a war on poverty, intolerance and obsolete habits of mind, and in part an effort to create a more stimulating and more efficient environment for all of us—is a successful war, they will repay us richly in the adjustments we have to make.

The speech quotes a federal Minister, who will be very well known to those on the other side, the hon. David Walker—Senator David Walker, I mean, Mr. Speaker—who said:

> The future greatness of Canada and the future well-being of Canadians depend as never before on how we fashion our urban surroundings.

And surely the whole problem of regional development ties in with the whole problem of urban renewal. And what kind of a goal has been set by this government in this area?

> Two Canadians out of three are now urban dwellers. The townsman is now the typical Canadian. Urban growth is an integral part of national development and therefore a government's national development policy. Industrial growth and urban growth are the two aspects of a single process.
>
> We are gravely concerned nowadays about the depopulation of many small towns and the drift to the big metropolitan areas. We are resorting to all kinds of tinkering and tax abatement.

I am sure we would have to regard the province's development plan as a tinkering—another incentive to key industries moving into small places. "The futility of these panaceas is now perfectly evident," he says. I would remind you, Mr. Speaker, we have got a Conservative blueprint, but we have nothing in this country clearly stated on the whole question of urban and regional development. As Professor Bycroft stated:

> We have nothing in this country to compare with the cogent, comprehensive, well-documented statements which Presidents Kennedy and Johnson have put into their messages to the Congress in the past six years on urban and rural poverty, on

housing, urban transportation, on recreation and open space and on the model cities programme. We have nothing to compare with the documentation on urban conditions that has come out of such intensive legislative committee studies as those associated with the names of Senators Harris and Williams, Senator Joseph Clark, Senator Ribicoff, Senator Muskie and many others.

We have nothing to compare with the Paul Douglas committee, the special presidential committee now holding hearings on urban conditions throughout the United States, not to mention the new committee to examine the problem of racial conflict. We have nothing analagous to the assignment given by the President to Vice-President Hubert Humphrey to maintain a close liaison with the governors and mayors of everything that pertains to the improvement of conditions in the cities.

Mr. Speaker, if I might conclude my remarks, there are many implications here. We saw the implication this very week, sir, in the Budget which was brought down in this House. The Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Welch) was forced to admit that this is an *ad hoc* budget and many of his remarks related to the desperate need to make some kind of a reallocation of tax sources with the federal government. My feeling is, Mr. Speaker, we are entering almost a kind of 1930 situation, when functions of government at various levels—municipal, provincial and national—became out of line, where the functions were so much concentrated in the provincial and municipal areas, and the taxation sources were so much in the federal areas that we came to the end of the road. In that case we were in an era of depression, but I suggest to you a year of inflation could make the same situations exist.

We very well may need some kind of a new Rowell-Sirois report to take a look at this whole programme, at how we are going to try and work out a means by which the provinces can find a means to secure the revenues for their affairs and then pass those on in some way, an effective way, to the municipalities who are starving for tax sources.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Pitman: We must do this. I am just coming to that, if the member for Downsview (Mr. Singer) will allow. This was the very point. This was the whole reason that the Smith report reluctantly—very reluctantly; if you read the first paragraph of the chapter 23 of the Smith report, you see just how reluctantly—went into the whole area of regional government. But the point was that until there was some effort to organize the municipal chaos which existed in the province of Ontario, the Smith committee realized that there was no way to get around the problem.

Before this government can go to the federal government and suggest to that government any new tax sources it must have—and one of the things that I cannot help wondering is why this government is not asking as a man that the Carter commission report be implemented by the federal government, because that is the only way we cannot haggle over existing tax sources and it is only if we plumb those sources which we have not yet plumbed, it is only where we go into tax areas which are today virgin territory that we are ever going to be able to support the kind of development which this province needs.

But I suggest to you, sir, that we cannot go to Ottawa with nothing in our hand, and with palms out asking for more money. I think we have a responsibility to go to Ottawa with a plan for the development of this province and then we can say, "These are the tax areas which must necessarily be placed in the hands of this government." But the development plan must precede—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Do not be too sure.

Mr. Pitman: We saw what happened with the housing, Mr. Speaker. We went to Ottawa with the housing and said, "Give us money, give us money," and we saw what happened. We got no money and very little housing this year.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): $340 million. Do you call that nothing?

Mr. Pitman: Compared to the need, I would suggest that was a very small amount.

However, I suggest to you, sir, unless we do that, we have no right in this province to ask for more. I hope, sir, you were moved as much as I was, as I watched the television set last night and saw a province in this country suggesting that it might not very much longer be a province. We are just that close to breakdown in our relations on federal-provincial relations, where a province which is one of the senior provinces, which has been an honoured province in this nation since 1873, is talking about becoming a commissioned territory, virtually.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Now which one are you referring to?

Mr. Pitman: I am referring to Prince Edward Island, and I thought it was a very poignant interview.

Mr. Sopha: Do not say 1873; it was 1871.

Mr. Pitman: I do not mind being corrected, sir. I think you will find it is 1873; 1871 was the province of Manitoba.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Pitman: I would be very glad to do that.

Mr. MacDonald: You are backing the wrong league. The member is not like the rest of us.

Mr. Pitman: Mr. Speaker, to return to my thesis, I suggest to you that until this province has a development plan there is no hope that we can do this. And I suggest to you it relates to something else as well. It relates to our very national unity. Now I give full marks to the Premier and what he has done —at least what he has said he is going to do for the cause in relation to French-English relations. But I suggest to you that what the French-speaking people in Canada want to see is some direction and some excitement in this province to convince them that we really want to be Canadians. And I suggest the Watkins report is not irrelevant to that discussion either.

But only if we in this province really want to develop our province as a Canadian province and that we do this on that basis of wanting to strengthen the entire Confederation of this nation, can we stem that separation. And when this province decides its development means the end of urban sprawl and the end of slums and use of urban renewal to clear out slums as part of a regional development spreading out into the countryside, only then when they see this kind of exciting plan, I am afraid, are many French Canadians going to feel themselves at home in this nation of ours.

I suggest to you the results of this chaos are found in the townships surrounding the urban centres. Many of these townships are hung up; they do not know exactly what they should do. Should they save something comprehensive in the area of welfare? Perhaps regional government is coming. We do not know how fast it is coming, they will not tell us, Mr. Speaker, and should they go ahead and develop some kind of regional pattern of their own and then find they are completely out of touch, out of context with the provincial plans for regional development? They cannot tell. I am sorry the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. McKeough), who I am sure is very busy, is not here. Probably the Minister of Municipal Affairs is picking up the pieces for many other departments in this particular government, Mr. Speaker.

In the area which I come from, we have a city where there is a desperate housing shortage. The townships around would very much be willing to provide housing but they know that they are unable to do this because this would create suburban development in rural areas which, of course, as in the time of the former Minister of Municipal Affairs—and there has been a continuation of that policy at the present time—I suggest would be detrimental.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): They cannot pay for it.

Mr. Pitman: Exactly, they cannot finance the service. That is what I am just saying; The Department of Municipal Affairs is picking up the pieces and trying to stop development which in the future, sir, might create serious problems for these municipalities. But they do not knew what direction the province is going. They get a little bit of indication with the basic shelter grant and the taking over of justice, but they realize that this is only a beginning. And yet, they have no way of having long-range plans of their own, of planning their development, or of knowing that these functions which they may very well expend present tax revenues on, might very well be phased out or maybe taken over by some other level of government in the future. It comes right down to it, Mr. Speaker —the whole question of planning and just how important that planning is.

I do want to suggest to you, sir, that there is a very real cost in not having a plan, in not having any regional context. We distort our priorities, we obviously cannot face up to our needs in the areas such as welfare where we have all kinds of areas where we are unable to get any kind of a reaction. On top of that, we find The Department of Education having to go ahead. Having waited in vain, I presume, for the entire province to work towards some regional context, The Department of Education has to go ahead and develop its enlarged administrative unit on the county basis. We will be hearing a great deal more about this I am sure in a debate in the very near future.

I suggest that in a sense the Minister of Education (Mr. Davis) becomes the "fall guy" for the provincial government; he is the one who has to go out and try to sell a large administrative unit where the local areas have no way of knowing whether this educational unit is going to add any relationship whatsoever to the economic organization, to the administrative organization of the province in the future. These are the costs, and they are very severe costs.

Mr. Speaker, I do suggest this to you, as I said at the beginning of my comments, we have four years. We are going to harangue, we are going to persuade, we are going to embarrass, we are going to prod, we are going to infuriate, we are going to humiliate you—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Pitman: —in order to secure the kind of Ontario we know there can be.

Mr. MacDonald: Hear, hear.

Mr. Pitman: And at the end of those four years we will convince the people of this province to place their affairs—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Pitman: —in the hands of a political party which has a commitment for progressive change, which is aware of the leadership role and is ready to give really responsible government. That is the challenge I give to this House this evening, sir.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Mr. Speaker, may I in the time-honoured custom extend to you our best wishes from the front row here, and congratulations on reaching the top. Knowing your great performance on behalf of the citizens of Ontario in senior Cabinet posts in years past, I know that you will give this House the fairness that it deserves, I thank you for your treatment of those of us newcomers here.

I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, a word of congratulation to the government in their appointment of a very fine member, the member for Eglinton (Mr. Reilly) as Whip, and the member for Waterloo South (Mr. Reuter) as the House Chairman. They have all our highest regard, and I know that the House will have a very efficient leadership through them this year. The closest I ever got to the top, Mr. Speaker, was one time we had a leadership race in the Liberal Party. One day I came back into the hotel and I ran into a group of my supporters, not a very big group, but leading the group was a large, enthusiastic woman obviously "with child", and she was carrying a large sign which said "Sargent is the man".

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sargent: I am glad, Mr. Speaker, we have the government laughing now because they will not be in a few minutes. We do miss the Chicago gang; we lost George Peck, Al Eagleson; Tom Wells and Darcy have become respectable and Gaston is in the wings, and Paul Yakabuski has moved to the Chicago gang over there.

But I want you to know, Mr. Speaker, we are very proud in the official Opposition of the way we have supplanted the back row in the very fine talent we have. I know that the press, the government and the other Opposition members have been very impressed with the—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sargent: We will not argue that one. I am very proud of the talent we have in the regenerated Liberal Party and I think you are going to hear a lot more. The press are starting to catch on to the real talent we have, and you are going to hear more from them. I think every party in the House has received a lot more wonderful talent—and believe me, the government needed them.

The NDP—it is too bad to waste so much talent, not geared to the growing nation we have—

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): A matter of judgment and questionable at that.

Mr. Sargent: But they have matched the Tories in the acquisition of another charming member of the opposite sex and we welcome her here. The crusading Dr. Wojeck is in our midst, and the kindest thing I can say to him is that according to his first effort here, he proved one thing; that his word count is high and the idea count is low. It would be interesting some time to hear him define to what degree he would socialize our country; in what areas he would plan to take over in the regimentation of our people.

In the Tory smug minority, Mr. Speaker, we have the member for Grey South (Mr. Winkler). And I would say, the kindest way I can talk to him is this—that his efforts at doing a hatchet job on the member for High Park (Mr. Shulman), I say to you, sir, there is nothing more pathetic than an empty speaker, speaking to a full house—and I say,

Mr. Speaker, very sincerely, that there is no room in this Legislature for anti-semitism or any other group. That is the most important thing that we must protect in this Legislature.

Mr. E. A. Winkler (Grey South): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I would say that the implication in the hon. member's words is entirely false, without foundation, and expresses his ignorance.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, if the cap fits, wear it.

Mr. J. H. White (London South): I believe, sir, that the insinuation should be withdrawn. I think that this is perfectly shameful in this chamber.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): If anything went on or was said in this House, particularly from a member—even though it might have been from a member from this side of the House—which bore any signs of anti-semitism, I would step right up here and speak against it. Now there has been nothing in the House of that nature which I have heard.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Well, you turned your head.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I would not turn my head. Now, if anybody has any charges of anti-semitic remarks that were made in this House, I suggest that he stand up, speak up, or shut up.

Mr. Speaker: I would prefer to believe that the member for Grey-Bruce was making a statement of his own opinion as to how this House should be run. I think that it was a fair statement in that regard, and unconnected with his previous words.

Mr. Sargent: Thank you, Mr. Speaker; thank you, Neil. We do have a very smug minority; so much so that in the last session, Mr. Speaker, we had 27 Cabinet Ministers, more Cabinet brass than we have in the government of Canada. More than it takes to run the great American government, the largest administration in the history of the world. They have not got the talent, the Cabinet push that we have in Ontario. A glaring waste of the taxpayers' money by this government. I would say that there is much more talent in the back benches than they have in the front row anytime.

This government is without doubt, the most disgustingly rich group of people with the possible exception of their friends, the distillers, who keep their slush fund well filled. We see by the Throne Speech that you were optimistic. We do not blame you. If we had your dough, we would be optimistic too.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): That is liquid assets there, fellows!

Mr. Sargent: This overstuffed Cabinet, with the word honourable attached to it, and all their names. I would say that possibly in the last 25 years we have had 200 or 300 of you, including the ones who have resigned or been put in jail, or committed suicide, possibly a total of 400, so we are getting a good look at this 25-year government here.

This Throne Speech that we have here is about 12 pages in length. It would seem that the present session is going to be short. Now we find that we are short $250 million. In analyzing, we find that it is 12 pages long, and it takes about 40 per cent of it to tell us what good guys you are.

In this theme of keeping Canada strong, they never mention the great brain-washing programme that is in effect in Ontario where we are using public funds. We must pass up this big "snow job" that is going on and realize that the average man in Ontario—all he wants is more meat in his sandwich, not this gigantic sleigh ride that we are on with this JPR being the star. It has got to stop!

Realizing that the organization over here spends about $15 million a year of the taxpayers' money in travelling and entertainment, and various operations, the public gets kind of fed up when they know these things.

After the Budget release this week, the people of Ontario are not in any mood for any more of these goings on. If someone introduced the ten commandments they would cut them down to eight.

The Prime Minister from London North (Mr. Robarts) goes happily from day to day spending other people's money, even though about 60 per cent of the people disapprove. In fact, it has got to the point that he is making what a lot of politicians make in forgetting that they have been appointed and not anointed.

To bring out an old saying of Ken Hubbard: "It seems like the less a statesman amounts to, the more he waves the flag."

The Prime Minister has convinced a lot of people in Ontario that he is a great guy, but millions of people in this province are in debt up to their ears, and believe me, these people are chained to interest. They are

slaves to interest. We have a new poor in Ontario now, the middle income group are the new poor, and do not forget it.

I say to the hon. Prime Minister that he has more nerve than a canal horse to waste our money in such gobs as he is doing. This hon. Prime Minister is drunk with power, and although his aim is to be a father of Confederation, he will eventually come to realize that he has a mess here in Ontario to clean up, so let us get on with the job. Look after Ontario first.

Mr. Speaker, whoever is writing the script for this money-spending orgy, has taken the format from *The Rise and Fall of the Third Reich*,—the arrogant manipulation of people's money to brain-wash them and set up a bureaucratic state not responsible to the people. We have that here in Ontario; over 100 boards and commissions not responsible to the people; beyond reproach, and run by political hacks whose actions are hidden away from the public scrutiny. It is a scandalous situation; a government which is in debt.

Our gross debt as of this point is over $3 billion. Let us have a look at just how much money this is. To most people, $1 billion is beyond comprehension. Just what is $1 billion? Well, I will tell you. One million dollars, as the statisticians tell us, in $1,000 bills makes a stack eight inches high. One billion dollars makes a stack of $1,000 bills that is 670 feet high, or as high as the Toronto Dominion Bank down here. So $3 billion is three times as high as that building, or one half mile high. That is what the $3 billion of debt is that we are in today.

Mr. Speaker, the increase in gross capital debt as of February 14, 1967, a year ago is $454 million, for a debt increase of approximately $1.5 million per day. Now, this is a debt increase of over $1,000 per minute. So by the time that I will have finished this speech we will have gone into debt another $75,000 and by this time tomorrow—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sargent: The hon. member for Sudbury says I should stop now. But by this time tomorrow it will have increased another $1.5 million.

An hon. member: What is a million dollars?

Mr. Sargent: And these figures are projected on last year's statement. Now, this morning, we read in the *Globe and Mail* where the hon. Treasurer of the province of Saskatchewan says, and I quote him—

Mr. MacDonald: He is a good authority.

Mr. Sargent: He says:

> The Ontario government's action in budgeting for a deficit of more than $250 million is a disgrace to responsible government in inflationary times like this, Saskatchewan's Treasurer said in the Legislature yesterday.

Mr. Speaker, I think if the Provincial Treasurer had any sense of responsibility to the people of this province he should resign—right tonight.

It is a shocking situation when a man cannot run a better department than this. I will show you later on how he could have saved us $160 million in one stroke.

Mr. MacDonald: We are in business again boys.

Mr. Sargent: I recall this advertisement in the election last October: "When you live in Ontario you have a good deal going for you."

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Sargent: I do not know, Mr. Speaker. There is complete irresponsibility in neglecting the needs of the average Ontario citizen.

Every time we have had an increase in the Budget here, they go to the little man; gasoline, sales tax, other kinds—tobacco, hospital insurance, OMSIP. But Mr. Speaker, the ones that are making fortunes in this economy are not saying tax corporate business *per se;* the great areas of profit are the insurance companies—and the banks were making fantastic fortunes. Why did the government not go to them and tax them instead of the little man?

Mr. MacDonald: Put the same question to Mitchell Sharp.

Mr. Sargent: It is time that we had some sense of responsibility to the people instead of to your friends in big business.

Now at the same time we had these ads last year, saying what a good deal we had here in this government. We had HOME ads appearing across the province describing how you can get home ownership made easy; we are told by the statistics that the average wage across this country is between $4,700 and $5,000 a year. Yet you had to be making a salary of $7,200 to acquire one of these homes made easy deals. In the United States they have the Levit group down there, building homes for $21,000 with a 5 per cent down payment—all over the nation.

The net result, Mr. Speaker, of this whole sad fiasco in housing is that the government has known of this urgent housing need for the past ten years.

An hon. member: Very true.

Mr. Sargent: They have been totally unprepared and as little as one year ago tonight they had no plan whatsoever and we still have no housing.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Right.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, the BNA Act says very explicitly and I quote:

> While the housing expediture has been an active tool of fiscal policy at the federal level, strictly speaking, the control of this area belongs to the provinces.

Very clearly spelled out. In summary, Mr. Speaker, in all of God's green acres this is the fairest province and the richest province in our land, and yet we cannot provide a home for the average Ontario citizen, let alone the low income group.

What a dismal picture. What a disgrace.

An hon. member: Right.

Mr. Sargent: There is our Premier running around the province trying to run Canada, spending people's money on everything but the things that count. Even E. P. Taylor's horses are better housed than most of our people.

This man who heads up this government can stand there and waive $30 million from a project that started to be $5 million; now it is $30 million and he cannot even get the thing on the rails—the centennial project. You will get it probably in 1970.

Spending countless millions of dollars and I can prove that; gilding his image, paying lawyers $500 a day when his friend, Mr. Sheppard in London, received a fee of $150,000 in the Atlantic hearings. Yet he cannot arrange a programme to make the owning of a home in Ontario within the reach of even the middle income group, not thinking about the average man.

He says call him Prime Minister, call him Premier, call him John, call him the Talisman kid, but as long as he is the boss.

Now let us have a look at the rest of this smug majority, who are elected by a minority.

An hon. member: Forty-two per cent.

Mr. Sargent: Probably a lot of people will think it is not cricket to attack these public idols, upon whom so much ink has been spilt.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Wasted, not spilled.

Mr. Sargent: But in this area of public responsibility I believe it is time that the people of Ontario knew the inside story; now the press is our only hope. Unfortunately, when a newsman gets to know his way around this institution, it is a good chance the government will spot him and offer him a good government job, I wish every one of them luck.

The government has picked some pretty fine men from the press corps, but I think it was Mark Twain who said that the only way for a newspaperman to look at a politician is down. This assessment is well deserved from what we see in this House and I am one of the worst offenders. But seriously, in most cases we get the press that we deserve, but if there are any breaks coming in the coverage of this Legislature, it is all in favour of the government and we can do nothing about this.

Mr. R. J. Boyer (Muskoka): He used to be a newspaperman.

Mr. Sargent: I used to be and I am proud of it and I know what I am talking about. However, it has been my observation that most Queen's Park newsmen, in radio and television and the news, while very capable tend to be overworked and over-extended; I also believe that most of them are underpaid. Mr. Speaker, this is a test in objectivity of the publishers. Let us see if they print that one.

But leaving this where it is, I think that you know what I am getting at. I do not want to sound like a mafia chief who appeared at the city editor's desk, shifted his shoulders and blew out a puff of cigar smoke and drawled "why do you not print the good we do?" As, in my own case, I think I can honestly say that the newspapermen have made me look better than I am, more often than made me look worse than I am and I never—

An hon. member: That is not bad; four out of 40.

Mr. Sargent: And I have never found any of them unfair. But it is an unfortunate situation that the area of communications is the only media, Mr. Speaker, with which we can get our message to the electorate.

The Prime Minister has declined to mail *Hansard* to the people who are the stockholders in this great business we run in Ontario here. He says they do not rate this amount of expenditure, but they are the ones

paying the freight for the time on television. So the area of communications between us and the people of the things that affect their lives, of them and their children, are narrowed down to this thin, delicate line of communications by the press gallery. Believe me, if they knew the truth, this Opposition would be the government.

Mr. Speaker, in the Throne Speech four lines were given to the establishment of units of school administration. Four lines to tell us of a dislocation programme that will waste hundreds of millions of dollars. In Ontario schools there are people who are opposed to this and it is interesting to review that the announced launching of this bombshell came from the Premier and not from the Minister of Education (Mr. Davis).

Now we hear that the Prime Minister and the Provincial Treasurer have decided to bury the hatchet in the Minister of Education.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sargent: But the Minister is hard to shake, even though the electorate is opposed to his picture in all the mailings. But if you believe the prose, nothing stands between Bill Davis and the top except a ladder—and the Prime Minister has pulled the ladder away, I think, by this glaring disregard of the rights of people who sit on school boards.

For example, in Port Elgin we have a beautiful $1 million school there and this is going to be done away with because it does not fit into the new programme. But they still owe $300,000 in debentures on this school.

The member for Nipissing (Mr. R. S. Smith) tells me that there are dozens of similar cases in the north country. Who is going to assume this debt? There is a growing unrest in school boards and by trustees all across the country. There is a very large problem to be faced by the government this year and this will be handled more completely by my leader (Mr. Nixon) in forthcoming debates. But I would like to say before leaving this subject of schools that I would draw your attention to the difficulty the school boards have in building a new school.

This past year I have seen so many frustrated wonderful people who sit on school boards and try to build a school. As an example, it shows a lack of liaison between the three departments—municipal affairs, the municipal board and the school board in the building of a school.

As an example we built a new district secondary school in Walkerton and they had their first meeting—this filing page shows a chronological list of meetings to get the school built. They started on February 7, 1965 and they had their opening on January 12, 1968, a complete lack of liaison of someone trying to gather the loose ends of all the various departments. I suggest to you that there is a complete lack of liaison between these three departments.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak for a few moments about the rights of people, and some of these wrongs. First of all, because of redistribution and being from the riding that I am from, I am concerned because we have assumed this new yardstick, representation by population. This shift in voting power means that more and more of the people who live in the smaller, outlying parts of the province will have less and less to say about their futures. So the voting strength then, is in the cities, and even before we come to this we have the unfairness, the inequality in the unconditional grant system. In Toronto, they get $8 per capita, and in outlying places they range from $3 up to $8.

On top of this, we in the outlying parts are paying for hundreds of millions of dollars of development in this area on an unfair basis, such things as subways and GO transits. For the last three years we have asked about the amounts of money being paid to Toronto by this government—loans and financing like that—and the amounts are never forthcoming. There are questions set on the order paper and they are never answered, even at the end of the year.

Today we heard the Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Randall) give us some very glaring facts. May I say, Mr. Speaker, before I get into this that I have the highest regard for the Minister; he is one of the finest men I know personally, but he is in the wrong slot. You see, his department should never be there in the first place. I will show you why. They need a good salesman there and this man is the original salesman that sold ice boxes to Eskimos; he is a great salesman. That is why we have the Madison Avenue type of snow job that we have in this department.

This department, the Ontario development corporation—their terms of reference is to have monies available to loan industry, to sick industry—last year loaned $1,800,000 in a total of 12 loans. Now the smallest finance company in any small town in the country with two employees loans more money than this.

This year, we were told today, they have made 10 loans amounting to $2 million and it took 49 people to do this and the Minister said that the cost was $35,000. I do not know where he gets that figure, because to employ 49 people at today's wages may cost $350,000. If it cost $350,000 for salaries and it cost $35,000 to make the loans and about $100,000 for promotion and advertising and all that goes with it, then you have a half million dollar package to loan $2 million.

Now do you wonder why people are getting fed up with this hanky-panky?

Mr. Speaker, we have many other injustices that this government can correct, to play a more positive role in matters that affect the lives of all our citizens, a consciousness for the rights of small people. You represent them, but you do nothing about it.

We have in this province one law for the rich and one law for the poor. I have the greatest regard for the Attorney General (Mr. Wishart), but I think he is in such a hodgepodge of confusion that nobody knows what anybody else is doing, and they cannot get together on anything. I sincerely believe that he is an honest, sincere servant of the public, but I wish I could say what I have in my mind.

Talking about the most current, glaring thing that people can measure—Parkinson's law is in effect in this area of injustice too. We cannot measure the millions of dollars you fellows talk so glibly about, but we can talk about things that affect a fellow who gets in jail and cannot get bail. But with a millionaire like Viola MacMillan—she was indicted in 1965—it took you almost three years to put her in jail. What a shocking state of affairs, Mr. Speaker, when top lawyers on behalf of wealthy clients can dictate to the courts when trials shall be held for their clients.

The poor man gets quick justice in this province, believe me! They get him in there and lock him up even without any reason, and he does not get out sometimes for as long as five months to find out what is going on. But here we have this wealthy, affluent citizen—it takes 2.5 years to put her in jail. You get her there and what happens? Well, we will see.

I have a letter here from the editor of the Kingston *Whig-Standard*. I do not know his politics, but he must be a pretty intelligent man to be the editor of a daily like that. He says:

> Dear Mr. Sargent,
>
> The enclosed tear sheet with the article marked may be of some interest to you.

The member for Sudbury got a like communication, because they are concerned; they represent people. This is a statement by William Nickle, the former Ontario Cabinet Minister and Progressive Conservative MLA for Kingston and the Islands. They say he is a great guy. I do not know him. I will save the time of the House, I will boil it down to his statement. The prologue to this says:

> Allan Grossman, the Ontario reforms institutions Minister in the Ontario Legislature, Monday afternoon would only say in answering a question surrounding the case of Mrs. MacMillan as being paroled for sure, and that the reasons for the decision by the Ontario parole board are confidential.

Today Mr. Nickle issued the following statement with respect to the case. He said:

> I read with great concern a report in the Kingston *Whig-Standard* of Saturday, March 2, that Vialo MacMillan who has served seven weeks of a nine months jail term for manipulating the stock market will be released on probation this month. Mrs. MacMillan was found guilty by the trial judge. Her sentence was confirmed by the Ontario court of appeal who ordered Viola MacMillan to serve nine months in Mercer reformatory.
>
> The institution where she served most of her sentence, Ingleside, I know nothing about.
>
> Viola MacMillan at her trial and at the court of appeal was represented by one of the most able counsel in the province, Mr. Joseph Sedgwick, Q.C. The maximum sentence in reference to the criminal code which Mrs. MacMillan breached is five years.

She had a good lawyer. I am not quoting, I am out of quotation now. I say she had a good lawyer and the maximum sentence was five years. She could have got a lot more with a different lawyer. Now, I am getting back to the quotation again.

> According to Frank H. Cross, the chairman of the Ontario parole board, who has given a public press release, Viola MacMillan will be paroled this month.

And I understand that she was on hand last night at the prospectors' party down at the Royal York. Getting back to the quotation:

> If Viola MacMillan is paroled this month, then I am forced to the inevitable conclusion that in principle our parole board has established a formula—one for the rich and one for the poor—or is everyone in the reformatory who serves seven or eight weeks of a nine-month jail sentence as a matter of policy going to be paroled?

Mr. Speaker, on this matter of civil rights, rights of people, Pierre Berton in his book, *The Smug Minority*, is pretty definite on the rights of people and there are some who would discount his opinions. I am an admirer of Pierre Berton. He has the guts to say what he thinks.

Mr. Sopha: He gets well paid for it too. He always insists on that.

Mr. Sargent: Yes.

Mr. Sopha: It is a terrible book, by the way.

Mr. Sargent: He says:

> It has long been clear whose side the law is on. Only the poor drunks go to jail. Only the Chinese social clubs are continually harassed by the gambling squad. Only the parties in the poor districts are raided by the police. The legal system supports the evictor, be he slumlord against the evicted and the creditor against the debtor. If an illiterate housewife is hoodwinked by a good salesman into signing a non-cancellable contract and a promissory note for shoddy goods outrageously priced, the law in almost every case will be on the salesman's side. The commercial world would soon fall apart if promissory notes were tossed out, a Toronto judge told one immigrant couple who found they owed close to $400 for a $28 Japanese-made knitting machine sold them on the basis of a series of phoney promises. The law forced them to pay but it did not take action against the fly-by-nights who had wrung thousands of dollars from the gullible.

My colleague from Parkdale (Mr. Trotter) has pioneered this fight for rights for people on this side of the House and he has done a wonderful job on it. Getting back and finalizing this point—I suggest the Attorney General hear this part of it; it is very important, I am sorry, he says:

> Compare the magistrates' courts, which are the courts of the poor, with the Supreme Courts, where the big property cases are heard. The courts of the poor are shoddy and crowded, the acoustics wretched, the clerks and sheriffs' officers ill-tempered and magistrates harried and impatient.

Mr. Sopha: Absolutely. Absolutely right.

Mr. Sargent: Quoting again:

> "Get on with it," is frequently heard, "Get on with it." By contrast, the courts of the propertied are cool and temperate palaces.

I could go on, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. member would permit me to say a word here?

Mr Sargent: Yes, sir.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Surely the hon. member is aware that the policy of the government has been announced for some months. The province is taking over the complete cost of the administration of justice and that legislation is coming forward. Certain steps have been taken in that regard, and legislation is coming forward to complete that. This will go a long way towards providing facilities, of which the editorial or the article complains.

And I think it should be pointed out here and now that by the law as it stood up to the present time, it was the responsibility of municipalities to provide the facilities everywhere in the counties of Ontario for the carrying on of the administration of justice, including the magistrates' courts. Now I think the hon. member is perhaps making a point which will have little force, or little effect, as we move in this session, and as we have moved a long way to implement the policy which was announced, of the assumption of this responsibility by the provincial government.

Mr. Sargent: I do thank the Attorney General, but as the member for Niagara Falls (Mr. Bukator) says, it has taken 25 years to realize this. The member for Downsview says it is late, but you can do it immediately if you want to move.

An hon. member: A lot of things that can be done now.

Mr. Sopha: He has not been to "C" court recently.

Mr. Singer: No, I invited him two years ago, and last year too, to come and see the magistrates' courts in city hall. He has not done that.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Oh, yes I have.

Mr. Singer: Did you ever see the prisoners' dock on a Monday morning?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Yes, I have.

Mr. Sopha: And the quality of their treatment, and that palace on top of that county court building?

Mr. Singer: And the screaming of policemen, "Shut up, sit down, and get out." Yes.

Mr. Sopha: That is justice. You do not need a new building to remedy that.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: The hon. members will have a chance to debate on our new legislation to establish provincial courts.

Mr. Sopha: We are grateful.

An hon. member: You have got a long way to go.

Mr. Speaker: Will the member please continue his speech?

Mr. Sargent: I think the hon. Attorney General, Mr. Speaker, could inculcate these things if he had his way but the machinery is so obsolete over there that they cannot move. I hope that he will realize that the court is the place where a person needs courtesy when he is in trouble, and he sure as all get out does not get it in the courts of this province.

The last shot on this is the fact that we have a young man—in Ron Haggart's column—named Wilson McManus, 48, and out of work. He was sent to jail for five days for stealing a ten-cent newspaper from the honour box at Queen and Parliament Streets and goes on to tell of the dispropriate sentence he got, when a man steals $40,000 and gets a fine. It is one law for the rich and one law for the poor. We hate to flog that, but it might take effect if it is said often enough.

Mr. Speaker, another area that is important, is that of expropriation rights to farmers in the acquiring of rights over their land by the Ontario energy board. Mr. Waterton, the man who gave me this two-and-a-half page presentation on this, is an associate of mine in business; he was a former test pilot for AVRO, he was with the Hawker-Siddeley group in flying the first jets in Europe; he was an associate of Max Aitken, Jr.; he is a noted journalist, and he is knowledgeable. He has a farm up my way and this is his presentation to me, and I hope that I can say it quickly enough not to waste the House's time. But it shows what happens, what rights the people have in this province when dealing with such operations as the operations of the hon. Minister of Energy and Resources Management. I do not think that he knows what is going on or he would do something about it.

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Would you consider this a conflict of interest?

Mr. Sargent: But I recall some years ago we had a meeting in private bills where we had the Union Gas meet with us, and they wanted to get through a bill to change the assessment on—I recall the mechanics of this—the gas pipelines. And some of the government members were very definitely opposed to this because it was going to mean about $70 million in lost tax revenues to the cities and towns of Ontario, which had gas pipelines or were going to have gas pipelines.

So, in came the top-flight lawyers and all the friends of the government, the expensive lawyers, to put through this amendment to The Assessment Act. And they got it through all right, and the taxpayers of Ontario lost about $70 million worth of tax revenue because of the friends the government had in the company. But this is a prelude to what I am going to say now. These large corporations—the government feels it is nice to behold in their converse rights with them, in these operations. So it is with the gas transmission pipelines put through the Owen Sound area by Union Gas of Chatham in 1966.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: That is your friend, Ed. I recall discussing this matter with you.

Mr. Sargent: Now, Jack, try and say something intelligent for a change.

Mr. Sopha: The effort would put him in the hospital for a week.

An hon. member: You are asking for miracles, are you not?

Mr. Sargent: He says in his letter to me that it was iniquitous, a matter in practice, basically wrong. Who will seriously negotiate when they know that they have expropriation to fall back on?

The final answer for the land owner must be litigation, costly, time-consuming, and often unrecoverable as to the time an individual puts in. The courts will recognize lawyers' fees, but if a man does his own legal work, he gets nothing. If he loses, he loses what he has to pay the lawyers. Expropriation, he says, as practised by the Ontario Conservatives, is communistic in character. He says at least the communists are honest

about what they do. They say they are going to take your land and they do.

Now, sir, the Ontario energy board and other agencies of the government of this province, lead people to believe that they have a case against expropriation, when in fact they have not. The Ontario energy board is stated to have the powers of a Supreme Court. Now the Provincial Secretary may laugh at this. I am not knowledgeable about the matters of law, but I think this a matter of rights for people. In practice he says: "In practice it sits on hearings and blackmails humble farmers." Now this man is a very responsible, knowledgeable man. He says:

> It sits on hearings and blackmails humble farmers and landowners into believing that it is, in fact, a court of law. When pressed on this point its members were extremely evasive at a hearing in Owen Sound. They repeatedly stated they had the power of a Supreme Court. Finally, after repeated questioning they admitted that the hearing they were conducting was not a court of law. They also pressured the farmers and land owners into giving evidence under oath; again pressed as to whether or not such evidence was on the record, they admitted after trying to avoid the subject, that it was not on record, but they were taking notes and copies of these were not supplied to the land owners concerned in the hearing. Therefore, land owners were not given the privilege of correcting or discussing the notes made by the board members. There was at no time a court reporter present. Hearings took place in the county court room and the panoply of the law was used to awe land owners without it being a court of law, the members of the board occupying the position normally used by judges.

Here is a situation whereby a body has the authority of the law, sitting in judgment on land owners who have not the normal processes or court facilities of a court of law. Throughout the hearings in Owen Sound, the board showed complete familiarity with the problems of Union Gas but little sympathy for the land owners. Its chairman, Mr. Diamond, on several occasions in the case of McNeal and Mrs. Potter, assured the land owners that the gas company would clean up the land; that up to the expropriated land they could do what they wished with their own land. Now this, in fact, was not so because anything which may disturb the pipeline is forbidden, be it blasting, or drilling, even though it is not on the pipeline right of way. In closing, the hearings were at least a complete farce. They had already secured, by agreement with another land owner, by expropriation prior to the hearings in respect of one piece of property to be traversed. Union Gas had already commenced operations up to the boundaries of the land, the subject of the hearing. At the hearing, which was to determine whether or not the land should be expropriated giving the gas company the right to a pipeline easement, its engineer admitted that sharp bends and particularly right angles were avoided in laying pipelines of the type under discussion. There was never, therefore, any remote possibility of not expropriating the land which was the subject of the hearing. It was, therefore, nothing but a complete farce at the taxpayer's expense.

And finally:

> Union Gas engineers questioned as to why their line could not go down the highway right of way, the CPR right of way, or cutting this particular property, said it was not done. The chairman of the Ontario energy board saw fit to utter the same statement in support of the gas company. It was then pointed out that the same company's gas line followed the highway into Owen Sound from Collingwood. This, incidentally, was prior to the law permitting expropriation. Under further questioning the Union Gas engineers admitted that it was technically feasible to install this particular pipeline on the CPR right of way but it would be more costly. So using expropriation, farmers' land was the cheapest way out for the gas company.

Now Union Gas is not a government agency, at least not officially. It is a commercial company which showed for the year 1966 a net profit of $7,655,000. By its new Owen Sound pipeline it is estimated it would gain 10,000 new customers. One-fifth of the gas was purchased in the fiscal year and came from the United States. Among its directors are: Mr. R. W. Poggen, president of Chrysler, the president of Ford Motor Company, a banker from Buffalo, Mr. R. L. O'Brien, all United States concerns.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: You are wrong.

Mr. Sargent: For the Union Gas Company —United States firms I am saying. They completely ignored all laws of trespass, using any part of land owner's property as they chose before and during the laying of their pipeline. Their promises of cleaning it up

were not honoured. The only resort the land owner has against them is litigation.

Now pipelines do explode, yet the company will not post a bond of indemnity, Mr. Speaker. The laws and odds are completely loaded against land owners in favour of these utility companies because the Conservative government of Ontario has decreed it shall be so.

It is wonderful to be a gas company. He concludes by saying:

> when law is on your side, you can employ expropriation, another word for stealing in practice, and do not have to resort to normal commercial practices in order to get what you want. Capitalists profit by communist methods and the Ontario Conservatives make it all possible. The payment offered by the gas company was $234 for a strip 50 feet wide by 1,500 feet long. No building may ever be put on it. He has to pay the taxes forever and this agreement lasts forever. That is the rights of people in your department.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday we asked the Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. Stewart) about consultants in a $5,000 study that they are doing in agriculture. I asked him how much the consultants were getting and he, in effect, said that it was none of my business. He said that he did not know, or he would not tell me; I do not know, I could not find out. It matters very little; he would not know the actual figure, anyway.

You know in this government, I bet you we spend literally millions of dollars each year in consultants. Every year, millions of dollars in consultants except getting consultants who would do a public audit, an outside audit, of what goes on.

So you reach out into industry and you get some old retreads, and you bring people in that you call consultants. And then you have consultants all over the lot. Someone asked just what a consultant was, Mr. Speaker, and I heard a pretty good story the other day about the definition of a consultant.

The story was about a young girl. We are the most consultingest government in the world, but this is the story about a young girl in an eastern college who went out west to spend a summer at a ranch, and she began to ask the questions about farm animals and the way things happened. She began to ask the cowboys one day what a gelding was. They all passed her off and did not give her the answer. Finally, she got one old cowboy off in a corner and asked, "How does a gelding differ from another horse?". He pawed the ground a little, and finally he said, "Well, ma'am, a gelding is a horse that runs with the herd, but on a consulting basis only."

Well, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that as for my approach to agriculture, we have about the finest critic in Canada on agriculture in Murray Gaunt. Even he, with his mild manner, has a tough time understanding the machinations of this Minister. I would like to say in complete sincerity that in this area of serving the people, we all must realize that politicians do not act. They react, and somewhere the reaction is going to hit the Minister square on the nose one day.

No single issue is more important and more urgent than the farm income question, and nowhere in Ontario is it more critical than in the area which I so proudly serve, the area of Grey-Bruce. Unless there is a complete change in the attitude of this government and this Minister towards the vital role of the agricultural industry, there is grave danger of a major disaster in the farm and rural life of this province.

Unless immediate action is taken, there is no future in farming, and we all know that, either for the young or for the old. The average age for farmers in Ontario today is 55 years of age. What is the reason for that? If agriculture fails—and the warning flags are up—the whole economic life of Ontario will collapse. It is a well known truth that there cannot be urban expansion and industrial growth anywhere in the world, except on a strong and healthy agricultural base.

Mr. Sopha: The Minister does not think so, he is reading a book.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, the member for Sudbury will agree with me.

Mr. Sopha: He has it upside down, too.

Mr. Sargent: The fact is that this Cabinet does not recognize agriculture as a senior Cabinet position—they have a junior member running it—and it does not receive any priority. It takes a back seat. The Minister does not, nor will not provide the leadership needed in farming today and the record proves it. The fact also is that the Robarts government and the Minister in this department are disaster-orientated. They do not move except when there is some major disaster in agriculture and then they try to patch it up. It will not work. They just apply a band-aid to the symptoms, instead of

attacking the real problem in agriculture today.

Consequently, the state of the industry grows progressively worse from year to year, and this is the reason why farmers have had to stand up and fight, and march to Queen's Park in tractors and blockade the session and plan even more drastic steps to get overall planning and action.

The central issue here is farm income. Last fall in the elections it was the central issue, and knowing that farmers were unhappy, and that the root of unrest was in all areas of the province, and knowing that and facing re-election the government came up with a $500,000 study. The province of Nova Scotia gave $2 million for research into this problem, but this government gives $500,000, the richest province in Canada. It sets up this amount of money for farm income studies and sticks out its chest and pounds it, hoping to stay in power.

Look around this great province. Every segment of our economy is booming, packing houses, food chains, all getting rich but not the farmers. Every industry, every big business gets together and sets prices to protect themselves, fixing bids, fixing prices, conspiring at every level to show big profits. On the other hand, labour unions in every area —steel, automotive, shipping, and public employees, teachers, doctors—go on strike to get their demands, and that is their basic right, collective bargaining.

But what happens if the farmer wants to go on strike? Or to demonstrate? What happened was that the Attorney General was going to have the OPP arrest them, fine them if they got their tractors on the highway.

Did you ever know a farmer who worked a 40-hour week? Or getting double or triple time for overtime? Last week we had an electrician in Owen Sound working overtime on a very importat job that had to meet the specifications. His take-home pay was $625 per week. $625!

In the area of medicare, I would like to give you the words and thoughts of a $2 million corporation which has consultants, well paid, who tell us their views of the stand of the government on this medicare. They say that Ontario's anti-medicare case is phoney.

A quotation from the Toronto *Daily Star*, and it spells it out very definitely, was on Saturday, November 18, 1967. It put the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. MacNaughton) in his place squarely, showing that they do not even know what they are talking about.

Finally I would like to place that figure on the record, because he should read that some day, and every member of the House should read it. But in his speech during this debate on medicare, the leader of the Opposition, my leader, stated on page 120 of *Hansard*:

. . . if Ontario were to opt into the federal formula for medical insurance, we would then have at our disposal $160 million of federal funds. That is a ball park figure, but it is not too far out—$160 million in federal funds to be disposed of by the government of this province on the priorities that they themselves set.

Having quoted this statement, it is interesting to note the approach taken by the member for York South. According to his statement, found on page 225 of *Hansard*, he would like to impose a 3 per cent surcharge on corporation profits and a 6 per cent surcharge on personal income tax in order to bring in medicare.

We can only marvel at the actions of the federal counterparts, when they led his followers to vote against such a surcharge. So how can we have faith in his suggestions when they cannot even get together on even this basic thing?

Mr. MacDonald: The member is so mixed up, it is futile to try to straighten him out.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, I will sit down and let him explain how this comes about, I cannot understand it myself, how he can be so naive and so off base?

In the address by the hon. Prime Minister in Niagara Falls on January 24, 1968, he said: "We will postpone any action in this regard for at least a year."

Mr. Speaker, if this government had entered the federal plan this year, as the leader of the Opposition has suggested, we in Ontario would not have a deficit of $252 million, it would only be a deficit of about $100 million.

We have, in effect, tossed out the door $160 million through the lack of thinking on the part of this government. In other words, as Oliver Wendell Holmes said, "No generalization is worth a damn, including this one, these are facts."

The biggest unknown factor in spending on the part of taxpayers of this province, Mr. Speaker, is the area of Hydro, and I give the government fair warning that this side of the House will want to know the complete facts this session of what is going on in Hydro. This giant spending body has gone unchecked long enough and I will just say briefly that we expect the government this

time in the Budget analysis to be given the opportunity to go into the thing completely and fully, because it is always, as we all know, discarded and held off so we cannot get a look at it.

I have mentioned before that this bunch of people are remote from the taxpayers and are not being checked into to see what is going on. And there are many areas of thought that there are literally hundreds and hundreds of millions of dollars being wasted by people who are gambling and experimenting in unknown fields. The Prime Minister said to us he was building another ten new Niagaras through these nuclear plants. That is all we need, like ten holes in the head, is ten new Niagaras. This is the intelligence of the people who would continue to waste our money.

Mr. Speaker, the most important area of government—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Sargent: Well, if the Provincial Treasurer would like to discuss it, I would be glad to discuss it with him. After his performance in the last few days he should keep quiet for a long time. In fact, he is lucky to be here; if he had a strong leader he would fire him.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, the most important thing in our lives is trying to make a living, and death and taxes. The basis of tax assessment and taxing is the assessment department—as you all know who have been in this business of serving people, the most important thing for the cash box of the municipality is the assessment department. And we have a worse mess in assessment in this province than any other province in the Dominion. The new boy who has taken over here has a big challenge, and I am not so sure that we are going to get any better, although he said that he would have the answer in five years, after his statement here:

> We realize there are 164 municipalities in this province, but 17.5 per cent have no appraisal records of any kind; 803 municipalities or 85 per cent do not use mechanical systems to prepare assessment rolls; 142 municipalities or 15.1 per cent did not close their assessment rolls by October 1 nor did they have an extension of time; 133 municipalities or 14.2 per cent did not prepare their assessment rolls in accordance with the Act; 283 municipalities or 30 per cent do not assess property under sections 53 or 54, which is assessment and collection of taxes for part of the year; 170 municipalities or 19 per cent did not include population figures on the assessment roll; 162 municipalities or 17 per cent did not bother to assess or collect business tax; 619 municipalities or 65.8 per cent did not send assessment notices to tenants and many people were deprived of voting and school support privileges; and 590 municipalities or 62.7 per cent showed completely unacceptable deviations from the value norm for certain classes of property.

It goes on to say that in every county there is an unacceptable deviation in the ratio of the assessed value for market value for the various municipalities. It goes on to say what an awful mess things are in.

Briefly, Mr. Speaker, I know from my experience as a mayor—and I know we have the mayor of St. Catharines here, we have people who have been mayors of municipalities—and the most frustrating thing is that as a mayor or reeve or warden you can see a problem and get it solved and get the job done. Here we sit in complete frustration to see sometimes rather stupid people get up and treat us as if we do not know what we are talking about. A lot of things we do not know but we can ask questions, but they hate us asking questions even. And the complete frustration is to see the incompetency, and the grinning Provincial Treasurer is the last guy who should smile.

Mr. Sopha: The taxpayers are not laughing, I will tell you, they are not laughing in Sudbury. The Treasurer is not a pinup.

Mr. Sargent: To a considerable portion of our people, municipal taxes have been a real hardship. And where this department falls down is that it fails to realize taxes are paid by individuals in vastly differing financial positions and not by mathematical abstractions. Firstly I would say our system of assessment in Ontario is too rigid and does not equally distribute the basis or the burden on municipal taxpayers. Secondly, the difficulty with all the taxation in this country is that municipal taxation makes no provision for the ability to pay, in fact it bears most heavily on those at the lower end of the income scale. This $151 million basic shelter grant they are going to mail out, is a try at equalization, but any system that means transfer of funds back like that is basically wrong to start with. The formula our leader here had—80 per cent of the education costs off real estate—was a clean formula, a sensible one. But this is not selective—

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Provincial Treasurer): How are you going to raise it?

Mr. Sargent: I will tell you how to raise the money in a minute. This is not selective. You mail the $47 to the Guelph area, $50 to some places—we do not know what we are doing—but you mail it to millionaires and to the paupers too. Completely unorganized; a disorganized approach to try to equalize the inequities. I would propose two reforms:

firstly that assessment at least for residential and farm and commercial properties be based entirely on the rental capitalization basis; and secondly, that muncipal taxes should be graduated in somewhat the same way as income tax is graduated. Thus, bring the concept of the ability to pay into the municipal field and this has got to come.

Briefly, in a nutshell, what will have to come about immediately is the taxing of properties for the benefits that accrue to them such as fire, police, and so on, and that we relieve the full costs of services that do not benefit properly such as education, health and welfare. These things are basic and will have to come.

I think it can be pretty well said by Don O'Hearn's column. He says that this week the new Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. McKeough) made a speech, and continued:

> His department is the branch of the government that should be out in front in meeting many of our problems. What did Mr. McKeough promise? He said that the Smith report had made recommendations on regional government and he felt that in five years a plan could be developed from these and further study.

Mr. Speaker, I am taking too long here to get my point across but I know that we must get back to things like free enterprise and this system is the only answer. We must, I think, Mr. Speaker, get the area of big business moving to do things for this country. I think it is up to this government—

Mr. MacDonald: You were railing at big business five minutes ago; now you change your line.

Mr. Sargent: It is up to this government, Mr. Speaker, to give big business some elbow room and get them into the act, with projects such as are going on in the United States now.

The insurance companies and the big business corporations in the States are getting together and they have set up a $1 billion cash sum to finance slum clearance, hospitals, factories and housing. I think it is time that this government had some people who would do things of a positive nature like this, and not so much having government do things for people. Get business into the act to do things for the economy which has made them wealthy and rich. Because, in the area—

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Keep thumping Eddie, keep thumping.

Mr. Sargent: It is something that will have to be done to save our economy.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that we have our friends on the left here and I have the greatest respect for their thinking. My dad was a socialist and God love him, he believed that that was the answer for the day—

An hon. member: It did not rub off.

Mr. Sargent: I feel that if a man wants to work and do something extra for his family he should be paid extra. I do not think we should get anything for nothing, and I think that the finest way I can tell you this, in closing, is with a little article in which a school teacher discusses socialism and says:

> A high school teacher in Yonkers, New York, recently made the following report as to the possible application of socialism in schools—

Mr. MacDonald: The whole school system is socialism.

Mr. Sargent: We will see in a minute if you agree when this is over.

> As a teacher in the public schools she says I find that the socialist communist idea of taking each according to his ability and giving to each according to his need is now accepted without question by most of our pupils. In an effort to explain to them the fallacy in this theory, I sometimes use the following approach.
>
> When one of the brighter or hard working pupils makes a grade of 95 on a test, I suggest that I take away 20 points and give them to a student who has made only 55 points on this test. Thus, each would contribute according to his ability, and since both would have a passing mark, they would share equally. Now, after I have juggled the grades of all other pupils in this fashion the result is usually a common ownership grade of between 75 and 80, the minimum needed for passing or for survival.
>
> Then I speculate with the pupils as to the probable results if I used this theory for grading papers. First, the highly productive pupils—and they are always a minority in school as well as in life—would soon lose all incentive. Second, the less productive pupils would, for a time, be relieved of the necessity of study. This system would continue until the high producers had sunk to the level of the low producers.

At that point, in order for anyone to survive, the authority would have no alternative but to set up a system of compulsory labour and punishment against even the low producers.

Finally, I return the discussion to the ideas of freedom and enterprise, the market economy, where each person has freedom of choice and is responsible for his own decisions and welfare. Most of my pupils then understand what I mean when I explain that socialism, even in a democracy, will eventually result in a living death for all, except the authority and a few of their favourite lackeys.

Mr. M. Makarchuk (Brantford): That is as simplistic as the rest of your speech.

Mr. Sargent: It is my maiden speech. You have got to forgive my mistakes.

An hon. member: That was no mistake.

Mr. MacDonald: The problem is you are not a maiden, but you are acting like one.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Now, now!

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, I say in closing, that we are somewhat like the shotgun wedding in the southern mountains. The old gent says to the father of the bride, he says: "Jed that new son-in-law of yours drags around like he has lead in his britches, and Jed says by gad he has."

Well let us get the lead out and let us get moving.

Equality originally meant equality of opportunity. No group in our system is guaranteed anything at all—absolutely nothing. No party, unions, organization has special favours. To each individual is opportunity, the right to follow happiness and hope. We have millions who think that they can get a free ride. They want to join a group or a block and vote for something that they should work for, and in our system, this cannot be done, Mr. Speaker, if we are to survive. If a man wants to work 40 hours and I decide to work 80 hours, then I deserve a better home, and it is time we told the people of this country that these things are available if only they get moving.

What is a promise of Canada to the individual—we will keep the ladders up and we have got to keep them up.

This session may present us with the best opportunity to cover great distances in the struggle to help people. Today's dawn gives us still hope for a peaceful world. We must be able to distinguish a gift from the Trojan horse. The hazard today is to lose this rare opportunity of being committed to yesterday's battle plan. Nothing, Mr. Speaker, is going to help us more in this generation than a sense of history, unless it is a sense of humour, and I would like to say in closing that I cannot miss this opportunity to tell you that the hon. Prime Minister is alleged to have said, last October in the election: "I say to you gentlemen that all my party wants is a chance to complete its programme," and someone said: "what is your programme?" He said, "to stay in office another four years".

Mr. J. P. Trotter (Parkdale): Mr. Speaker, I want to join with the other members of this House to congratulate you upon your election to the most important post that you hold. To use the words of the last speaker, the member for Grey-Bruce (Mr. Sargent), I am glad to see that you have reached the top.

I know from your years of experience in public life that you will carry your duties out well. I do not expect that you will find in the four years that you serve in this present capacity that you will find it very easy, but I do hope that it will be a success.

You know we all have suggestions, Mr. Speaker, of how the office should be run and about the changes that have been made. I have been one of those in the past that wished they had brought up to date what we call the Tudor prayers. One other suggestion I have made on various occasions is: why can we not get rid of the hat? You know, you are a handsome looking man, but the hat does not do you any good.

I know it is a hangover from days gone by, but I really do not think that you would wear a hat like that in your law office. I do not think you would wear a hat like that going down the street. Years ago when that type of chapeau was in style, other clothes they wore were also in style, but the coats and the pantaloons have gone out of date and I suggest the hat has, too. I would just as soon see you more or less leave it in the archives of the province.

Mr. Speaker, there are many items that a person could discuss. There have been a number of issues that have been important to the province of Ontario over the years. I am most grateful to the electors of Parkdale returning me to this House, once more to give me an opportunity to represent them and to express my views on the issues of the day.

When you look back, it is amazing the changes that can take place in the thinking of the government. One of the first topics I can recall being discussed in this House was when those of us who were in Opposition were urging the government to install what are now called "Go-Go trains."

I remember early—back about 1960 and 1961—the former premier, Leslie Frost, telling us how utterly impossible financially it was to have these commuter trains that we thought were so important and were going to be very much needed. Now I have survived an election campaign having seen the government campaign on their installation of these "Go-Go trains". There is a lot of truth, Mr. Speaker, that the policies of the government today are what the Opposition was saying two or three years ago. This is why I hope tonight to make a few suggestions to the government in the hope that it will be government policy at least in two or three years from now, if we can expect a Conservative government to move that quickly.

Mr. Speaker, one of the major issues in Canada and in the province of Ontario is an issue that has been sadly neglected in this province despite all the headlines that various announcements on housing have received here. Never before has this province faced a crisis in housing that it faces today and nowhere is it worse than right here in Metropolitan Toronto, the capital city of the province of Ontario.

I asked the housing registry of Metropolitan Toronto to supply me with the number of applications that it has received for public housing. As of December 31, 1967, there were active applications on the housing registry of Metropolitan Toronto numbering 10,247—that was just for public housing—10,247; and for the senior citizens, Mr. Speaker, there is a waiting list as of the end of December, 1967, for 4,603.

Now if you were an elderly person, Mr. Speaker, and you were getting on in your late 60s or your early 70s, what hope would you feel you had of getting an apartment—a senior citizen's apartment—if you were in a waiting list that had 4,603? The problem has become so severe in the city of Toronto, particularly for senior citizens, that a lot of them, when they see how long the waiting list is, just do not bother to apply.

There are many, many hundreds of people in the city of Toronto and in Metropolitan Toronto, Mr. Speaker, who are living in rooms up in the third floor of old rooming houses; they are living out their last years in a very sad state. It is a forlorn hope for many of them to have a decent place to live. They have been caught in the crunch of the high cost of living; their earning years were spent in the days when the dollar was a dollar and now when the dollar is down to 50 cents what they have saved is not enough to give them a decent home. We as a government, we as a people, in this province have let down our senior citizens as well as those people who need public housing.

Of the 10,247 applicants, Mr. Speaker, as well as the adults that are included in the family, there are 20,838 children, so that you can see that this is affecting a large proportion of the young people here in Metropolitan Toronto.

I emphasize Toronto simply because of the population explosion. The situation in this city is more exteme, but the story is the same in almost every large municipality in the province of Ontario. Hamilton, Ottawa and Windsor—they are all having their serious problems and it is a result of complete lack of foresight, a complete lack of planning, by this government that has been in power for so long and that has done, considering the opportunity it has had, relatively very, very little.

I know that the hon. Minister who is in charge of housing, the Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Randall), the other day announced that we are going to spend $400 million on housing in the province of Ontario because this government says that housing is a priority. I agree with them, but when we look at what this government is actually doing, we find that out of $400 million, $340 million comes from the federal government, the remaining $60 million comes from the province of Ontario—which is only $15 million more than this province spent last year on housing.

When you see these huge figures of $400 million thrown around, Mr. Speaker, I want to remind you that this government is actually spending $60 million on housing and only $15 million more than it did last year.

There is much talk that we have to cut back, that we have to cut down the Budget; but when we see the housing situation in our cities and in our rural areas as well, we have simply got to learn to treat housing as a vital issue in this day and age. I remember a couple of years ago when, as I have been doing for a couple of years, I was attempting to find a home for people that were being thrown out in the street. I phoned the Toronto housing authority and they said just tell the people to bar their doors because we

have no place for them. I went down on Seaton Street in Toronto to a place called Seaton House—I believe I may have told this to this House before, I know I have told it on other occasions—but they had about 90 people—women and children and the fathers—crammed into this so-called emergency housing where the unemployed men usually lived during the winter time. Nothing but institutional wire divided the area. And the air force or the army type blanket was thrown over the wire in order to divide the families one from the other. At that time dysentery was affecting most of the children; there were about 60 children there.

This was two years ago in Toronto, an affluent city in one of the most properous parts of the world; and this is what is going on. Yet despite the so-called efforts of the government in this province there was a net increase in the last three months in Metropolitan Toronto of 690 applicants seeking public housing.

So we actually have here 10,247 applications and by the time you add the families in that it comes to well over 30,000 people. It is a serious situation and this government is in the main almost entirely responsible for the situation that we have here. The policy of the government has been one of expediency over the years and it simply lacks vision.

I can remember in 1962 when the former Minister of Economics and Development, Mr. Macaulay, came out with a great plan for what he was going to do about housing. He set up 12 points, on each point he had a committee, and then at the end he had another committee to examine the work the other committees were doing.

Not a house went up and yet we have had many announcements, housing by headlines, and still despite some effort and some houses that have gone up across the province, it does not nearly begin to meet the demand or to meet the requirements of our people.

Mr. Speaker, immediately prior to the recent provincial election the Tory government brought out a piece of legislation billed as the answer to the housing crisis, namely, the home ownership made easy programme. I do not know if it was the member for Grey-Bruce or not, but when that HOME plan came out, I heard it said that it meant "help out my election." Well, it evidently worked that way for the government, but I think if you examine the actual results that this so-called HOME scheme is obtaining, it is a pretty paltry performance. The truth of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that the so-called HOME scheme offers hardly any promise of appreciably reducing the housing shortage. Such an isolated piece of legislation represents a patchwork approach, an example of expediency. It ignores the fundamental causes of the housing crisis and fails to correct the underlying problems.

It does nothing to lower the cost of housing; nothing to unravel the incredible administrative tangle of agencies and authorities which are involved in obtaining housing approvals in this province; nothing to reduce the grossly excessive discretion vested in appointed officials whose behaviour can neither be anticipated nor controlled; nothing to expedite planning procedures and nothing to resolve the present division of responsibility and lack of co-operation between the federal and provincial governments. With an election in mind, and nothing more, the provincial government last spring announced its plan to ease the shortage of housing by servicing a large supply of land and making it available to builders and homeowners on a subsidized basis in the Metro area. And you know, Mr. Speaker, the announcement seemed better and longer around election time.

We have heard about the Malvern project, the Edgeley project, and the various plans in the southeast part of Toronto. I know one provincial candidate for the government party had a great scheme but nothing has ever come of this. And I had the opportunity, with some of the other members, of touring Metropoliton Toronto not too long ago and we just did not see any houses at all where all these plans had been announced months ago—no sign of a shovel going into the ground, no sign of any streets being planned. This is simply housing by headlines and it is a shame and a disgrace the people in the province of Ontario are being treated this way.

We have heard about the Bramalea project. This got great headlines last summer; again well-timed just before an election. And at that time, Mr. Speaker, the government bought 650 existing—now I say "existing"—lots. And they were purchased from the Bramalea Consolidated Development Company. Of course, Bramalea really is an area well beyond the boundary of Metro. It is getting very close to the home town of the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Davis) in Brampton. Yet admittedly in Bramalea, that distance away from Toronto, 80 per cent of the people who live there actually work here in Metropolitan Toronto. But half of the lots that the government bought were immediately leased back

to Bramalea, and the remainder it was announced would be made available directly to the public on a 99-year lease basis with ground rent calculated at 7.25 per cent, or on an outright purchase basis at between $9,000 and $10,000 a lot.

Well now, here was an opportunity to buy a lot at $9,000 or $10,000—if you can imagine the average person being able to afford this type of item; a so-called bargain. The government, with all its influence and the great hoorah from the press and radio and the TV, had the people standing in line all night for the opportunity to buy one of these. This was supposed to be something new. Mind you, not too many weeks went by when a lot of the people who stayed up all night to try and buy a lot found out that they were really being played for a bunch of suckers and this is what many of them are.

Since then, the programme out in Bramalea has gone from disillutionment to disillusionment. Many were turned away. Many of the hopeful buyers were turned away because they did not qualify under the minimum income requirements, that is, of approximately $7,200 for detached homes. And $7,200 is normally the minimum requirement to get a CMHC loan, Mr. Speaker, yet 80 per cent of the people who are earning in the province of Ontario do not earn that kind of money. So even in this so-called generous government scheme you automatically eliminate 80 per cent of your people.

What is most important to bear in mind, Mr. Speaker is that this housing problem that we now have today and which weighs so heavily upon us, is not just hitting the poor —the poor have always had the problem of housing—but it is now hitting what we have regarded as the backbone of this country over the years, that is, the middle-class. Mr. Average Man and his family simply cannot afford a decent house unless he goes miles and miles away from where he is working, and then if he gets that far away and can afford to buy a lot he simply cannot afford the transportation.

Many of these people, after they had bought the lot, found that they could not afford the $175 monthly payment. Since that time they have gone higher. Still more were discouraged by the quality of home offered by Bramalea itself under the programme—a 1,100-square-foot bungalow with no garage, no storm windows, no screens, no landscaping, and costing $14 per square foot as compared to $12.50 per square foot for comparable homes offered by Bramalea on the private market.

You know, something that I can never understand, and I do not think the average person can understand, is why do things cost more when the government gets into it? The house that the Bramalea Corporation puts up costs about $12.50 per square foot but the house that is on the lots operated by the Ontario housing corporation is $14 per square foot. And yet the government is suppored to be helping the home buyer.

But of those people who thought at that time that they could handle these new lots and took advantage of the leasing circumstances and tried to work their finances into the government scheme, since that time at least 99 have turned their lots back to the Ontario housing corporation. I think that is a very minimum figure, Mr. Speaker, from what information I have received. But at least these 99 lots leased directly from OHC have been turned back because the individuals have been unable to find their own builders and mortgages. OHC then started to ask merchant builders to take the lots off their hands on a speculative basis and, in most cases, such builders are not interested because the limit on the cost of a home on these lots is $15,000.

Mr. Speaker, why in the world would Ontario housing corporation pay $6,700 for a lot to the Bramalea Corporation and then go and sell it to a private buyer for $9,000 to $10,000, making a profit on the lot? The answer to this: The government's policy was not to interfere with the cost of private plans. They did not literally want to lower the price of land. Now the whole policy of government should be to lower the cost of land, and the whole thinking and the scheme of the government operation at Bramalea is utter stupidity because the government is simply going to have to get into the buying of land in a big way.

To buy it, it is literally going to have to become a land banker with the deliberate policy of lowering the cost of land. But when a government body like Ontario housing corporation goes in, buys a lot for $6,700 and then says to the people around there, "Well we do not want to increase the cost of land here. We will re-sell it at $10,000," this is a shocking state of affairs. The government is not going to begin to solve this extremely serious problem that we have with us.

I think one reason that the government is slow to change is that the present Minister of Economics and Development is a dyed-in-the-wool free enterpriser. He is a marvel-

lous salesman, I give him credit for that. If he is going out selling a product, there is no doubt about it, he has had an outstanding career.

But, he is dealing in something entirely new. It is just against his grain to have the government interfere or take part in anything, even though he is a government Minister—he is representing the Crown. But, the present Minister and the entire government and every one of us in public life, have got to face up to it that today government is going to have to draw the main guidelines and be the major partner in any housing schemes of any extent that are going to take place. The present Minister, like a good salesman, has made incessant announcements about Flemingdon Park and about the Malvern project and about the Edgeley project.

But, Mr. Speaker, there are no houses and this is the whole essence of what we need in the matter of housing—simply houses. Certainly the government, with the power it has, with the facilities it has at its disposal, if it had the will and the drive could solve the problem if it wanted to. The pity is that housing has been used in many cases as an election gimmick. The best announcements out of this government have been at election time, or just prior to election time. The tragedy for many hundreds of thousands of people, not only in Ontario, but throughout Canada, is that governments—I do not care if they are Liberal or Conservative or federal or provincial—have continued to regard housing as sort of an economic arm or a fiscal arm for the policy that they want to establish in the country.

If things are good they cut back the flow of money for mortgages; if things are bad they put some money into the system through mortgages for housing. But we have to face up to the situation, that today housing is a utility which our people must have, and should not be used at the whim of governments, either as fiscal policy, monetary policy or as an election gimmick.

Last year, Mr. Speaker, a house in an area like Etobicoke, the average price was $30,000 and we thought that was extremely high, utterly beyond the reach of the average person. Today, that same house, I am told, costs about $32,500. Where is this going to end? It is coming to a tragedy for many, many people in this country, and governments today, in concerted effort, certainly with the province and the federal government have to be far more vigorous than we have been in the past.

The truth of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that the HOME programme fails in principle to attack the problems at the root of the housing crisis. The HOME programme has not increased the number of building lots available to the public. All the lots offered at Bramalea would have been made available in any event, and although the Ontario housing corporation, was supposed to make available another 5,000 lots—they are actually there and they could be made available—there is no indication as to when this will be.

The problem is that their release for sale is dependent upon an agreement between Bramalea and Chinguacousy township, whereby the developer must supply sufficient industry to maintain a satisfactory balance between the residential and commercial and industrial assessment.

There is another thing about this government programme Bramalea. On the matter of costs. The Bramalea people, when they made their deal with the township of Chinguacousy, said, we will pay the principle and interest on your education debentures. This will get the township off of the hook for the heavy cost of education—and this was fine.

The Bramalea made the agreement with the township of Chinguacousy. But what happened? When you have that type of agreement the provincial government does not give any grants. So, Bramalea is paying the shot, but the cost goes on the lot.

There is another reason why these lots are expensive. The Bramalea Corporation decided they would encourage industry. In some cases, they sold land to industry at $1 an acre, the idea being to bring industry in which is a good idea. But for the cost of the whole development they have got to get the money somewhere, so it goes on the housing lot. These are just two particular instances where this can be expensive for the housing lots, and this is where Ontario housing corporation chooses to make a great show of how smart they are.

Well, no wonder. At least 99 lots that have been taken up by people have now been thrown back on government hands. Sure, the federal government is at fault, to some extent, for the interest rate. I am not here to make excuses for them at all. But let us, in this House, face up to the fact that constitutionally the responsibility for housing is with the men and women who sit in this House and with the government.

There is a foolishness in the programme that they have started when you bear in mind that 80 per cent of the people in Bramalea work in Toronto and the other 20 per cent work in Brampton. I know they are trying to bring new industry into that area, but Bramalea in many cases is just a dormitory area.

You have 20 per cent working in Brampton and you know Brampton is probably one of the most beautiful towns in Ontario. It has a population of 34,000 and it has got room for 50,000. You could put 16,000 more people in the Brampton area and the government says, why do you not build houses in Brampton instead of having people living in Bramalea who work in Brampton? There has been no plan passed for a subdivision in the Brampton area in four years. You may ask why. Simply because there is not enough water in Brampton, and this shows the utter lack of planning on the part of the government.

The Ontario water resources commission has dillied and dallied for over two years. I think they have finally come to an agreement. They may be announcing it any day, but they have dilly dallied for over two years getting any type of water into Brampton.

The other odd thing is that Brampton went to the township of Chinguacousy and said that they needed the water, could they make a deal? This went back and forth, and just to show how confusing it can be, the township of Chinguacousy said: "We will give Brampton the water, as long as Bramalea does not need it."

I think there are 12,000 people there now and they have land for 125,000, so it is going to be a long time before the township of Chinguacousy really wants to give a lot of water to Brampton.

Yet this is all in a general area. I hope that every private member in this House has read the Smith report, because it talks about regional planning, not huge areas, but in this one particular area of where the Ontario housing corporation has had all this foofaraw about the lots.

It has been chaotic planning, both by the local people, the local planning boards, certainly by the Ontario housing corporation, and by the Ontario water resources commission. They are all at fault. But it is the government that is at fault because there is no determined individual, or any policy with any drive or direction. This is symbolic. It is such a tragedy for so many hundreds of thousands of people in the province of Ontario who cannot get a decent house, and I plead with the members of the Treasury board and members of the government for heaven's sake to quit issuing statements that get headlines and give us something practical.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the problems created by urban growth are becoming staggering. You know, we may point out, these problems may be in Brampton, Bramalea and Toronto, but there are so many changes taking place in urbanization that we are going to have to change completely our thinking and get rid of this patchwork, piece-meal, bits and pieces of the ways we put up housing. Just to show you how Canada has changed and the world is changing, but we even more so particularly in southern Ontario; but the changes of urbanization are going on all over the country, and even literally on our frontiers.

In 1961, 70 per cent of Canada's population of about 18.2 million lived in cities and towns; by 1980, Canada's projected population will be about 25 million of whom eight of ten will live in cities and towns. Now I know that this is a figure for all of Canada, but this applies particularly to us, because we are the most heavily urbanized part of Canada. When I say that I mean all of Ontario, and particularly the southern part.

The truth is that the rate of urban growth in Canada exceeded that of the United States by about 50 per cent in the 1950's, and in the post world war two period it has been the highest among the industrially advanced countries of the world. It just show that we, as men and women in government, have got to become modernized in our thinking. It is more important than doing away with an old hat; it is a problem that is going to the very roots of how we will live. It is going to affect us, not just financially, but it is going to affect us socially and in our law courts. It is going to affect our mental hospitals, every mode of life and the type of housing as we have it.

Not only has the absolute number of people living in large urban centres of 100,000 or more increased, but since the year 1900, the proportion of the population of Canada living in such centres has increased and will increase to the point where by 1980, there will be 29 centres—that is 29 large cities—accommodating 60 per cent of the population of 25 million Canadians.

In other words, 60 per cent of our people will be in 29 cities; a third of our population will be in the three cities of Toronto, Montreal, and Vancouver; those three cities will account for one third of the population of

Canada, so you can see that we have to decide where are we going to put the people in Toronto.

In the next 12 years—by 1980—we will have an extra million people in this area. Now we are going to have to ask ourselves, are we just going to just pile them up like sardines in the downtown area, in apartments; or are we going to build satellite cities around this area; or are we going to gradually expand to the north? I do not know, because I have some ideas of what should be done but I hear nothing from this government on this very major problem.

We have here a waiting list of 10,247 applications; that is not just people—it means about 30,000 people, who are desperate for housing. Not counting the agents, not counting emergency housing, what is this government going to do when in the next 12 years we have an extra one million people in Toronto?

One thousand people come and settle every week in Metropolitan Toronto, and that does not include the natural growth; one thousand people. This, in many ways, means prosperity; by and large it is a wonderful thing because the immigrants who have come to Canada since world war two have made a greater market for all of Canada than all our combined market with the United Kingdom and Europe.

By and large, it is a wonderful thing, but in relation to housing, we are going to have to put more money into the public sector. There are only two places that this money can come from—the provincial government, and the federal government, and both have been extremely lax in dealing with the problem. I think I can hardly imagine what a shocking mess this country would be in if The National Housing Act had never been passed.

You know, we here tend to keep throwing back the buck at CMHC and the federal government. But, as I am going to repeat to you again and again, it is just not sufficient for the province to treat the problem in that way.

The housing shortage is, and this should be obvious to everyone, causing social problems. Of all the families on the Toronto housing authority list, a study of 411 of them indicated that two-thirds of the homeless families have incomes of between $2,000 and $4,000. You see, even when you want to have a programme under the Ontario housing corporation to supply individual homes to people, you are not going to reach this kind of income, even with CMHC mortgages.

We must have in this province a vast change in how we house the people who have an income of between $2,000 and $4,000. Eighty-seven of the 411 families paid over 50 per cent of their annual income in rent. How can anyone have a decent standard of life or save any money to get anything better? Our grandfathers would teach us to be thrifty, to practice thrift. I am sure most of us do, or a lot of us would not be here, but how can anybody practise any kind of thrift if 50 per cent of his income is going for rent? They are going to become the hard core poor who will continue from generation to generation unless government will provide the opportunity for people to help themselves. I repeat—the opportunity for people to help themselves.

I do not believe in a lot of handouts so that they are going to live off the public purse, but there is no doubt in my mind, Mr. Speaker, the vast majority of people want to progress, they want to get some place, they want something better for their children. I know there is always a small percentage of people who will live off welfare. I remember once giving a speech and I said that I think only about 5 per cent of the people on welfare try to deliberately live off the public purse. One man who had had quite a bit of experience in treating welfare came up and pulled me aside afterwards and said it is only 2 per cent but they are very, very bad. But what about the 98 per cent that we can help?

There are studies from our Department of Social and Family Services showing that people want to be helped and they can be helped, and housing is one of the main causes why people cannot help themselves. Robert Bradley, the head of the Toronto housing authority, has said, "For some families there is a choice between eating and paying the rent. The choice for many people coming to the city is the street. They are the casualties of our affluent society." Some of you might say, "Why do they come the city anyway? Why do they not stay back where they were in the first place? We are caught up in these inexorable changes that are with us. It is a fact that the vast majority of us who are in Toronto come from elsewhere. Even as I look over the benches, Mr. Speaker, the Attorney General is from New Brunswick; the Provincial Treasurer is from Manitoba; I believe the Premier was born in Alberta; and the Minister of Health is from a place called Scotland, I think, yes, a great place; so that just as many

people have to come to Canada and they are settling in cities.

This is by and large a good thing. But we certainly have to provide the homes in which they are going to love, and if Toronto is going to have one million more people by 1980, we simply have to decide, using Toronto as an example, how we are going to treat these expanding communities. You are going to find up in Sault Ste. Marie and Sudbury the same problems that are with them to some extent now, are going to be with them far more in the future because they are bound to grow.

The range of issues resulting from urban growth is tremendous and so are the challenges of issues and problems. I do not intend to limit them but I just want to list a few. One is the sharply increasing and improving urban housing which we need. It means that there must be some control of economic and social costs of poor housing and urban decay because in some of our large centres this is an extremely serious problem. We have a problem of creating urban reforms that are satisfactory socially and financially; we have to create efficient and balanced transportation systems; and we have to control water and air pollution.

I mentioned at the beginning of my speech, Mr. Speaker, how we were lectured by former Premier Frost about how it was economically impossible, and yet these things have now come to pass and the "Go-Go trains" are going to go farther.

We talk about water and pollution problems that we have and yet this is something again in which there has been shockingly little action taken—concrete action—and this failure is both at the door of the provincial government and of the federal government. Indeed it is at the American government's door. But this does not excuse us here because our policies have never been that determined nor have we had that much drive or purpose that we have ever embarrassed the Americans or the federal Canadian government by what we want to do. I have never heard of any particular policy that this government has had in regard to pollution. It had to be pushed into everything it has ever done.

With all these changes that are taking place with urbanization, we have the problem of political structures and economic systems of local government administration. In other words when we talk about political structures we are going to have to have regional planning and if we do not have that we are going to have an utter mess. One authority cannot govern the province of Ontario today, with over 900 municipalities, over 900 zoning by-laws and all the utter confusion that this leaves even in the housing system. Too long have governments considered housing a financial policy. They have extended or cut mortgage funds depending upon the economic situation. Housing is a utility, Mr. Speaker, and it should be treated as a utility just as we treat water or food; it is something we must have.

The attitude of people toward their housing has changed greatly in recent years. Going back to the beliefs of our forefathers we were always taught that man's home was his castle. In some respects this is still true but it is probably more than that today. We like to think it is our castle in respect that it is a place that we can go and get away from the world, but today in modern society our homes have changed considerably. A man's dwelling is his social centre, his study hall, his library, and it is a place where we can collect all these things we buy, or hope to buy, on the modern market for mass production.

Our economy would not survive if we did not have mass production, whether we are buying appliances or golf clubs, but our homes have become the repository of all these things. The social and psychological significance of housing is tremendous and goverment simply has to learn to cope with the situation and to cope with it now. The social planning council of Metropolitan Toronto has defined a good housing programme with a comprehensive approach, as having the following elements, and I think it is well for all of us to dwell on this: private and public enterprise. We were going to have to look upon this matter of subdividing and building new communities as both a tremendous opportunity for private enterprise and for public enterprise.

But as I said before, Mr. Speaker, with the long-term planning that is needed, with the great scope that is needed, government today has got to be far more vigorous, sir, and it has to lead—it has to pave the way and show how the programme is going to go. Any social planning is going to involve all levels of government. The needs of the low and modest income groups must be given far more consideration than they have in the past, and the needs of families, single persons and the aged. All these types of individuals have different needs and we are going to see that their needs both social and physical, are supplied. Again, when we think of housing it is just not a house but it is the transportation, it is the

employment, it is the shopping, it is the recreation.

Mr. Speaker, I did want to give the House a few suggestions of what I think should be done.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I think this is a convenient point to adjourn the debate.

Mr. Trotter moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, I have been asked the order in which we might approach the estimates when we reach them, which I presume will be next week. We will start with The Department of Highways and then The Department of Health and then the Provincial Secretary. Those three departments will be the first estimates called. Tomorrow we will resume this debate.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 11:00 o'clock, p.m.

No. 26

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

First Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Friday, March 15, 1968

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1968

5

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Friday, March 15, 1968

Presenting report, Mr. Welch 833

Secondary Schools and Boards of Education Act, bill to amend, Mr. Davis, first reading 833

Age Discrimination Act, 1966, bill to amend, Mr. Bales, first reading 838

Questions to Mr. Davis re the Canada and Dominion Sugar Company, Mr. MacDonald 838

Questions to Mr. Dymond re construction of incinerator plant on Detroit River, Mr. B. Newman 839

Question to Mr. Randall re rental housing, Mr. B. Newman 840

Question to Mr. Stewart re compensation to sugar beet growers, Mr. Makarchuk 840

Questions to Mr. Davis re duplicate student award cheques, Mr. Pitman 840

Question to Mr. Simonett re Hydro right-of-way, Mr. Gisborn 841

Questions to Mr. Dymond re hospital insurance rates, Mr. Ruston 841

Resumption of the debate on the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Trotter, Mr. Gaunt 841

Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Gaunt, agreed to 847

On notice of motion No. 2, Mr. T. P. Reid, Mr. Ferrier, Mr. W. Newman, Mr. Knight, Mr. Stokes, Mr. Gisborn 847

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to 857

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

FRIDAY, MARCH 15, 1968

The House met at 10:30 o'clock, a.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: This morning in our galleries we have visitors from the following schools: in the east gallery, Poplar Road public school, West Hill; and in the west gallery, St. Clement's separate school, Etobicoke and at 11:30 we will be joined in the west gallery by Bayview junior high school, Willowdale.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Hon. R. S. Welch (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present to the House the annual report of The Department of Highways of Ontario for the fiscal year ending March 31st, 1967.

Mr. Speaker: Presenting reports.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

THE SECONDARY SCHOOLS AND BOARDS OF EDUCATION ACT

Hon. W. G. Davis (Minister of Education and University Affairs) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Secondary Schools and Boards of Education Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might be permitted to give a little longer explanation than is customary on first reading?

This bill, Mr. Speaker; it is an honour for me to present to this House the legislation to which the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts), referred in his announcement of the government's intention to establish boards of education on a county-wide basis in southern Ontario and to designate similar larger units of school administration in northern Ontario.

The legislation which I have introduced is the most significant development in the organizational structure for education in the history of this province. In the information that was sent to the school boards, I stated: "The major goal of the reorganization is to create educational jurisdictions capable of extending equal educational opportunity to the boys and girls of Ontario."

If you examine, Mr. Speaker, the legislation which I have proposed in this House in recent years, you will see that everything has tended to further our progress towards this ultimate goal.

The legislation to establish boards of education is based on several guiding principles. The first, related to our major and ultimate goal, is that all children regardless of their so-called station in life, the particular nature of their individuality, or the chance of their geographic location have a right to equality of educational opportunity. The second is that the programme of public education should be a continuous and integrated process from kindergarten to grade 13. The third is that all the members of a school board, one of our oldest democratic institutions, should be elected to office by a direct vote of the people. The fourth is that boards of education which are responsible for providing educational facilities, services and personnel, should be fiscally responsible directly to the electorate for the financing of the current and capital costs of education. And the fifth is that The Department of Education, through the legislative grants and the services of its specialized personnel, should be responsible for equalizing the educational and financial differences that may still remain among the boards of education due to variations in population, or geographic, economic and financial considerations.

It is not by accident, of course, Mr. Speaker, that our cardinal principle is related to the provision of equal opportunity for all children. The availability of a total school programme, the provision of special services to schools, and improvement in the ability to attract, retain and organize to best advantage its professional resources, are all factors which will be an advantage to the new boards of education as they seek to extend and improve the quality of our system of education. The new boards of education will facilitate planning on a broader base than is now

possible in most situations, and will permit the establishment and implementation of a system of priorities in the programming and financing of education in their jurisdictions.

These boards, I am sure, will be able to utilize to the maximum the accommodation, transportation, special services or staff, thus establishing a sound basis for the expenditure of the tax dollar without prejudice to the educational needs of the children.

I would like, Mr. Speaker, to dwell on the matter of special services because of their importance to the fulfilment of the role of the schools. The Schools Administration Act clearly sets out the right of a child to attend school and the duties of boards and teachers. We feel that inherent in this basic legislation is a requirement that the type of education to be provided must meet the needs of all boys and girls in a school jurisdiction. This point of view will require the establishment of a programme for special education. The results which are emerging from the increasingly effective co-operation between medicine, psychology, education and sociology, where it has been possible to provide for specialists in these fields to work together, can be made available on a broader basis only in jurisdictions sufficiently large to permit the application of the findings to meet the needs in local areas.

In some areas, Mr. Speaker, the regional office of the department will make available needed special services to isolated boards. The Sudbury regional office now has a complete service unit to deal with problems encountered by children in these areas where formerly no means of helping them were available. The psychological services unit of this regional office provides pupil counselling, diagnosis, remedial treatment, parent counselling and special education services in general. The lessons learned in the operation of this resource centre will be available to the new boards of education.

The field of special education represents one area where it will be possible to provide programmes to meet more adequately the needs of children in all parts of the province. In addition to the educational advantages, Mr. Speaker, there will be other benefits accruing from the reorganization in the area of equization of costs. The larger units will be supported by a broader tax base of reasonable stability and predictability. The cost of the total educational programme will be spread across the entire tax base, thus eliminating many of the inequities which now exist among the present boards. The creation of the new units will permit the department to develop a simplified grants plan designed to reduce further any imbalances which may still exist.

The legislation provides for a school division to be established for each of the 38 administrative counties. Provision will also be made for the combining of two or more school divisions into one school division. The divisional boundaries will adhere to the county boundaries, and the cities and separated towns, except those which I will specify in a moment, will be included in the county divisions.

Each of the defined cities of Hamilton, London, Ottawa and Windsor, and the city of Toronto and the area municipalities of Metropolitan Toronto will be a school division. The Ottawa school division which will include the city of Eastview and the village of Rockcliffe Park, and the Carleton school division will be dealt with in the legislation to be introduced by the Minister of Municipal Affairs in this session. A board of education having jurisdiction over both public and secondary schools will be elected in each division. The number of boards of education in southern Ontario, therefore, will total 48.

The board of education for a county school division will consist of 14, 16, 18 or 20 elected members, based on the total population within the division. This total number of members will be divided between those members elected by public school ratepayers for public and secondary school purposes and those elected by separate school supporters for secondary school purposes, in the proportion that their respective residential and farm assessments bear to the total residential and farm assessment of the school division. The minimum number of trustees to be elected by public school ratepayers, however, is six.

In county school divisions that include one or more cities or separated towns, the number of trustees to be elected by the public school ratepayers in such cities and separated towns will be determined by the ratio of residential and farm assessment in the manner outlined in the previous example.

The number of members representing the public school ratepayers in the cities are to be elected by general vote. The number of members to represent county municipalities will be allocated to a municipality or group of municipalities by the county council on the basis of provincial equalized residential and farm assessment. Where there is a

sufficient number of trustees for a municipality, wards may be established.

The members representing the separate school supporters will be elected at large from the school division with provision for wards where there are more than four trustees to be elected.

All school trustees will be elected at biennial elections for two-year terms with the first elections to be held on the first Monday in December, 1968.

The members of the board of education in each of the defined cities will continue to be elected in the same manner and in the same number as at present. In addition to this number, however, the separate school supporters will elect trustees for secondary school purposes—a minimum of two—based on the ratio that the residential and farm assessment for separate school purposes bears to the residential and farm assessment of public school ratepayers in the defined city. These trustees will be elected by general vote at the next municipal election in these defined cities.

The legislation also provides for the designation, by regulation, of school divisions in the territorial districts. In the guide for northern Ontario, which the members of this House have received, the suggested designations for the divisions in northern Ontario were outlined.

A number of rural school sections and township school areas that are too remote to be included in designated school divisions will remain under the jurisdiction of local boards as at present. These boards will exist for public school purposes only. The schools operated by these boards will receive expanded service from The Department of Education and will continue to receive special northern assistance and northern corps teachers where this action is warranted. In short, The Department of Education will employ the present means and explore new ways to overcome the limitations imposed by geography, remoteness and sparseness of population in providing equality of educational opportunity to the children attending schools in remote parts of the province.

Provisions, parallel to those in southern Ontario, are to be made for elected boards of education in northern Ontario except that the number of trustees will be reduced to eight or ten in the smaller school divisions.

The proposed legislation, Mr. Speaker, will not affect school boards established under section 12 of The Public Schools Act or under subsection 4a of section 51 of The Secondary Schools and Boards of Education Act. These boards operate schools on Crown lands, in hospitals, and so on, and they are not affected by this legislation.

The board of education will be responsible directly to the electorate, and, subject to the approval of the Ontario municipal board with respect to capital expenditures, will be responsible for local financing of education within its area of jurisdiction.

Education tax bills will be distinct from those issued for other municipal services. The tax bill will indicate clearly the mill rates for public and secondary school purposes, the amount of tax in each case and the total amount of tax for education. Every ratepayer will be able to understand clearly the amount he is contributing for education purposes.

To avoid unnecessary duplication of costly equipment and procedures, all tax bills will be calculated, printed, and issued by the municipalities concerned as in the past. The education taxes will be collected by the municipalities and transferred to the board of education. The tax payment or instalment payments for education may be due and payable at times distinct from those for municipal purposes at the discretion of the local municipal council.

Since the new boards of education will have jurisdiction in several municipalities, provision will be made in the legislation for each board of education to engage its own licensed auditor to audit its accounts and transactions. In this way the auditor will be responsible directly to the board.

Because of the disparity of assets and liabilities which may occur between the former boards, determined at the time of the formation of the new boards of education, provision will be made to take these factors into account and to make any necessary adjustments, as has been the case in the past. In order that sufficient time may be given for the consideration of the assets and liabilities, it is proposed that the report of the arbitration board will not be required until the latter part of 1969, and it is unlikely that any adjustment to the mill rate, due to the adjustment of assets and liabilities, will occur in 1969.

The net cost of education, after taking into account legislative grants and other revenue, will be apportioned by the board among all of the municipalities in the division on the basis of provincial equalized assessment.

In this legislation, Mr. Speaker, and I want to emphasize this, we are setting the jurisdictional boundaries of school divisions.

We are not setting the attendance areas of schools. This is now, and will remain, a duty of the school board or school boards concerned. Provisions have been made, however, to guarantee certain attendance rights and I should like to emphasize this point.

Where prior to January 1, 1969, students attended a school in a neighbouring county to the one in which they reside, these students are being guaranteed the right to continue to attend the same school. Similar provision is being made for northern Ontario.

In the future students residing in that portion of the new school division will also have the right to attend those schools in the neighbouring school division until such time as the boards of education concerned mutually agree to make other arrangements for their accommodation.

In the preparation of this legislation I have consulted with the various trustee organizations, the teachers' federation and other interested groups. I should like to indicate at this time my sincere appreciation to these organizations for their suggestions and the overall contribution which they have made in the development of this legislation.

I expect, of course, that in this as in any major undertaking, there may be some administrative problems in the transitional period. The planning which has gone on in the department in the past two years and the experience which has been gained at the local level and within The Department of Education in the establishment and operation of larger units of administration will reduce to a minimum the number of problems to be encountered.

The guides for the reorganization of school jurisdictions in the province of Ontario were provided for school boards and officials in order that they could study the plan and effectively prepare for the transition to the new board of education. In the guide, suggestions were made for the establishment of an interim school organization committee for each new division. Further assistance will be provided to the committees, to existing school boards and the new boards of education to facilitate the transition. In addition, at the suggestion of the trustee organizations it is proposed to hold a series of workshops and seminars to discuss the implications of and the possibilities inherent in the new organization.

The Ontario teachers' federation is appointing a committee of teachers in each school division to meet with the interim school organization committee to discuss matters of mutual interest. This action is in accordance with the suggestion contained in the guides.

Over the last few weeks we have had comments and suggestions relative to specific areas of the province. Opportunity will be afforded for study of these matters during the period when the legislation is under consideration by the education committee of the Legislature.

I might interject here, Mr. Speaker, we have made a list of these so that the committee will have full knowledge of the various areas which have asked for certain situations to be considered.

As was the case for the guides for the reorganization, I have made arrangements to distribute 20,000 copies of this statement and the first reading of the legislation to interested organizations and individuals.

When there has been an opportunity to review the legislation, there will undoubtedly be comments and suggestions which trustees, teachers, and other groups will wish to make. I would be pleased to have any constructive ideas that may be helpful in the achievement of the objective to offer to every child in this province the opportunities enjoyed by those students who attend schools in our most favoured educational jurisdictions.

The officials of The Department of Education and I are prepared, insofar as time will permit, to visit any part of the province to meet with groups who may wish to review the proposals for larger units. I think I can state very fairly that a considerable number of meetings for this purpose have been held already with trustees, teachers and other interested groups.

Insofar as the application of larger units of administration to the separate schools is concerned—and I recognize it is not in the legislation but I think it is important to be mentioned—I should like to point out that there are significant legal problems to be resolved. The trustee organizations concerned and The Department of Education have had discussions about these matters and it is my hope that the difficulties can be overcome so that provision for larger units can be extended to the separate schools as well.

Mr. Speaker, it is my sincere conviction that the changes which are being proposed in this legislation will result in an educational system designed to provide for each and every child in this province an educational heritage that will permit him to take his rightful place in our society in this province and in this country in the remaining third of the twentieth cen-

tury. It is also my conviction that this legislation will be considered a milestone of the greatest significance in the history of education in this province. There is an opportunity for all of us to make our contribution to the attainment of the goal which I am certain we all desire on both sides of the House and that is the greatest possible opportunity for our children and our children's children. To this end I solicit and welcome—as I am sure I will receive on second reading of this bill—your comments and constructive suggestions. It was a great educator who once said: "What the wisest and best parent desires for his child, that should every parent want for his child."

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, could I ask the Minister if he intends to leave the order on the order paper for a considerable length of time while his statement and the bill that is now before us are considered by interested citizens across the province?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I intend to leave it on the order paper for a period of time. We are going to make the distribution immediately, and quite frankly I think the interested organizations already have some suggestions and some understanding of what is being proposed. I would like to get it to the education committee as soon as possible because I think this would be the proper place to have the interested groups come in and make their observations and suggestions to the members. I envisage a much longer period of time than has been the case in the past for the education committee to consider the legislation.

I am quite prepared to leave it on the order paper for a period of time but not too long because I think really it is in the education committee where we can come to grips with some of the practical problems that we face and which we should consider.

Mr. W. G. Pitman (Peterborough): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could ask the Minister whether he intends to bring in the teacher organizations and the trustee organizations or is he going to allow individual municipalities to be represented? I understand that there was some discussion on this at Tavistock last week, and the Minister indicated at that time, that possibly some individual municipalities might be able to come before the education committee.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I think that really this is something that the committee itself should determine. From my standpoint, we want as much discussed as possible. I think it should also be pointed out that there are some 1,500 to 1,600 school boards. There is an even greater number of municipalities and perhaps it might be best to do it on the basis of say the interim committees. But I think this is something that the committee itself can determine at the beginning of its considerations.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might have clarification on two points. If I heard correctly, and perhaps I did not on one reading, the bill does not encompass the unique situation in Ottawa. What is the government's intention to cope with that?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, this particular legislation does not refer to the unique situation in Ottawa. The same general principles will prevail. That is, there will be a board of education for the city of Ottawa to include Eastview and Rockcliffe, and there will be a board of education, of course, in the county of Carleton. The question of election and so on will be dealt with in the legislation to be introduced by the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. McKeough) but the same general principles will maintain with respect to that area.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, a second question, if I might, on which I would like clarification.

Earlier, members from the Opposition side of the House sought to have the Minister's approval for using the standing committee as a forum for objections to this whole proposal. The Minister did not agree to that proposition. As an alternative, he said when the bill comes down we will have a full opportunity, and he has indicated fairly extensively this morning that there will be a full opportunity in advance of second reading here and at the standing committee. I wonder if the Minister would consider working out a timetable so that some time in advance we would know when this bill is going to be going to the standing committee.

I felt obligated, quite frankly, in response to the flood of letters that have come to me, saying that they wanted some opportunity to express a view, to reply that the Minister has assured us there will be a full opportunity for presentation of views at the standing committee. I think that to individuals, to local boards and to provincial organizations, we should provide that opportunity. Therefore I am wondering if the Minister would work out a timetable—maybe it cannot be done

immediately—so that for some week or ten days in advance, people will know that is coming before the standing committee at such and such a time and that therefore this will be the opportunity for expressing whatever remaining beefs they have.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, very frankly I envisage a continuing consideration by the education committee that would go beyond say a day or two or even three or four. I think really that it will be up to the chairman and members of the committee to, shall we say, timetable the various organizations and groups who wish to make representation to the committee. I think there can be very ample notice but I do not anticipate everybody will arrive at the same time or it is conceivable we might not have the room which could properly accommodate them—

Mr. MacDonald: The Minister's fears are justified.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —also perhaps to get any meaningful type of discussion. I can assure the hon. member we will try and develop procedures that will accommodate them in this regard, although I should point out one thing. I think it is very appropriate that we have the discussions here in the House on second reading prior to the invitation to other groups to make their views known to us.

Mr. G. Bukator (Niagara Falls): Mr. Speaker, the Minister mentioned 20,000 copies of this particular statement that he made this morning were going to be distributed to interested groups and others. I wonder whether we could fit into the category of others and get ours this morning.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I am not sure that I can get the hon. member his copy this morning but I shall undertake to do so certanly by Monday.

Mr. Bukator: The press have copies.

Mr. Speaker: Introduction of bills.

THE AGE DISCRIMINATION ACT, 1966

Hon. D. A. Bales (Minister of Labour) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Age Discrimination Act, 1966.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Speaker, The Age Discrimination Act prohibits discrimination, in connection with employment against the older worker solely on grounds of age. Since the Act came into operation almost two years ago, we have found that many advertisements for employees have continued to ask for persons in specific age groups and these are invariably the younger age groups.

Not only has this been a violation of the spirit of the Act, but it has also had the practical effect of defeating its purpose. The age specification in the advertisements tended to make the older worker disqualify himself from seeking the advertised employment, even though legally there could be no bar to him on grounds of age alone.

Efforts have been made to secure the co-operation of publications throughout the province in discouraging this practice and they have been most helpful. But it is not fair to them to expect them to police this situation purely on a voluntary basis. It must be clothed with the specific support of the law.

Thus, the bill will prohibit advertising which expresses a limitation or specification based on age. The provision is similar to that already contained in the human rights code in connection with discrimination based on race, colour or creed.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Agriculture and Food.

Is the government considering court action against the Canada and Dominion Sugar Company, in view of its irresponsibility involving breach of faith regarding assurances concerning beet production over the next few years?

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): Mr. Speaker, the Canada and Dominion Sugar Company managing director, Mr. Saxon Tate, frankly admitted that he had verbally advised the federal Deputy Minister of Agriculture that the company would operate if 20,000 acres of beets were grown.

Mr. MacDonald: Right!

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Now, I understand that there was no contract, there was no letter confirming this commitment given, there were no papers signed, it was purely and simply a verbal commitment.

Mr. MacDonald: It was not worth the paper it was written on.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, there was no paper, as a matter of fact. The company now, after having admitted all that, say they have

reviewed their position and for economic reasons have decided to close the plant.

I understand that the Ontario farmers union called a meeting in Chatham, collected reportedly a sizeable sum of money for the purpose of launching a civil action against the company, challenging the company on their decision now to close the plant after having given this verbal commitment to keep it operating.

This civil action, Mr. Speaker, would appear to me to be between the farmers and the company, where, in my opinion, it rightfully belongs.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question.

Will the Minister consider assisting financially in this civil action, since (a) he agrees that there was a breach of verbal contract, and secondly, he himself was very vigorous yesterday in denouncing the irresponsibility of the company. Does he feel that the farmers have to carry the whole load and no obligation rests on the government to make the company live up to its word?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: We have done everything we possibly can to get the company to live up to their word. I would feel that with the evidence before us that there was little ground for us to become involved at this stage, because it is obviously a verbal commitment. There is no contract or anything else that is signed.

Mr. MacDonald: No honour among corporate thieves!

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, this may be. We quite deplore the action of the company. I make no defence of them whatever.

Mr. MacDonald: Just the fact that it is going on!

Hon. Mr. Stewart: We make no defence of the company at all in the action that they so precipitously took which I think, greatly and adversely affects the agricultural community. Here, I think, the matter has to rest.

Mr. MacDonald: The Minister has an obligation in this.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Health.

In view of the fact that the city of Windsor council took action at its March 11, 1968, meeting to file an objection with the Detroit common council regarding the proposed construction of an $18 million incinerator plant on the Detroit River, is the Minister prepared to join with the city in registering the objection of the government of Ontario to this construction, with a view to preventing another source of pollution that may have an adverse and harmful effect on the residents of Windsor?

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, as already advised in this House, a representative of the air pollution control branch of my department did attend a meeting and made the following statement, and I quote:

> Because of the possibility of atmospheric condition from the proposed incinerator having an adverse effect on the citizens of Ontario, and the lack of time to study this proposal, I would request adequate time to study the proposal in detail in order that comments may be made. We would be very pleased to work with Mr. Sterling of the bureau of air pollution of the city of Detroit in this analysis.

This statement represents the views of the department already publicly expressed. However, I must point out that our opposition will have to be transmitted through the international joint commission, whose responsibility it is.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Speaker, if I may ask a supplementary question of the Minister?

The Minister did not state that he would join with the city of Windsor in registering objection. We would prefer to see the province get right behind the city and show that—

Mr. Speaker: Order! The member will ask a supplementary question and not state his views.

Mr. B. Newman: Will the Minister then advise his representative to join with the city of Windsor in simply saying that the province of Ontario joins with the city in registering this objection?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: No, I am not in a position to state that I will make my opposition known in this form, Mr. Speaker. We will make our opposition very clearly and undeniably known.

Mr. Speaker: I believe the Minister of Economics and Development still has some answers.

Hon. S. J. Randøl (Minister of Economics and Development): Mr. Speaker, I have an

answer to the question asked by the hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville yesterday.

From time to time, tenants in rental housing administered directly by, or on behalf of Ontario housing corporation, who are members of trade unions, have been involved in strike action with a consequent reduction in their income during the period of the strike. In such cases, it has always been a requirement that the rent be paid in the amount and on the date stipulated under the terms of the lease. It is considered that a tenant on strike should not be afforded special consideration, as a reduction in income due to strike action is a matter strictly between the tenant and his union.

The union involved has always been advised of our willingness to accept an undertaking that it will guarantee the ultimate payment of any arrears, and to date neither bailiff nor eviction proceedings have ever been instituted against a striking tenant. In many instances mutually satisfactory arrangements have been made with individual tenants to accept something less than the normal monthly rent, with an undertaking that any accumulated arrears will be made up by the tenant when he returns to work, or the union involved has guaranteed the ultimate payment of the arrears from its welfare funds.

Mr. M. Makarchuk (Brantford): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Agriculture and Food.

Will any compensation be paid to Ontario sugar beet growers in view of the fact that special equipment for sugar beets is unsuitable for other farming operations, and that fertilizer put into soil last fall cannot be used to advantage for other crops?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, I have been previously assured by the company, and was again assured as late as this morning, because I have not given up on the pursuit of this matter as far as the company is concerned, that they have offered not only to buy harvesting equipment—which they had advised the farmers they would purchase from them when they announced the closing of the plant, I believe on January 29—but they have also said they will purchase thinning equipment, that is power-driven thinning equipment which is not suitable for other crops. We have assurance they will purchase this equipment at depreciated prices.

As far as fertilizer is concerned, the company takes the position, and I do not think it is an unreasonable position, that the fertilizer, planted in some instances last fall and ploughed down in anticipation of the crop, will be there for the benefit of other crops. There is no question about this. In my opinion, I think anyone who would recognize the value of fertilizer would know it is there for the benefit of the crops that would be planted.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Cochrane South I believe has another question.

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Energy and Resources Management.

Is the Ontario Northland Railway seeking to cancel passenger service on the Nipissing Central Railway from Swastika to Noranda? If so, why?

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. member would place that question on the order paper? I would like to consult with the commission before I give an answer one way or the other.

Mr. Speaker: I believe that the routine now is for the Clerk of the House to make a record of it and it will go automatically to the order paper if the Minister so requests.

The member for Peterborough has a question.

Mr. Pitman: Mr. Speaker, might I direct a question to the Minister of University Affairs?

Would the Minister indicate why duplicate student award cheques have been issued at Osgoode Hall?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, some few weeks ago a survey was conducted to ensure that all requisition cheques had in fact been made payable to the students; we were anxious to get the funds to them. Apparently there were a limited number of students who had not made the proper record with respect to Osgoode Hall. I believe there were two students involved only, and the students have been asked to return these cheques to the institution and they in turn will be returned to the department.

Mr. Pitman: A supplementary question: Could the Minister give any idea when will be the final date when all these cheques will be given out and the whole thing be finished?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, this will all depend. There were some students who applied, as the hon. member well knows, as recently as February, and the final date will be determined by the date of the application.

To date, I think over 38,000 cheques have been sent out to the students. The vast majority went out some many weeks ago, but there will still be a few, depending on the date they made application. I shall have more to say about this and perhaps future procedure here in the debate on the estimates.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Brantford has a question?

Mr. Makarchuk: I have asked my question.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Energy and Resources Management.

1. By what authority does the firm of Queenston Motors, Cochrane and Queenston Roads, Hamilton, carry on business on land of Ontario Hydro right-of-way? 2. On what conditions does the firm continue to occupy such right-of-way? 3. What rent is being paid for the use of that right-of-way?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Speaker, in answer to the hon. member's question—the first part of his question: under lease which commenced January 1, 1956; the second part: this lease is subject to cancellation at any time on one month's notice; the third part: the present rental is $1,400 per annum.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): Mr. Speaker, I had a question directed to the Minister of Health yesterday. I understood he was going to answer it today.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, the question which came to me from the hon. member yesterday read:

> In the recent announcements of the increased rates of the Ontario hospital services commission, is it the intention that the new rates and benefits become effective July 1 and payable with the April payment, or are the payments to begin in July for the benefit month of October?

The new rates will apply to the benefit month beginning July, sir, but the premium notices which will go out very shortly for payment in April cover the benefit period July, August and September, and therefore the new rates will be shown on the premium notices shortly going out.

Mr. Ruston: Mr. Speaker, would the Minister accept a supplementary question? Due to the confusion and variance in reports in the news media as to when these rates are to take effect, would the Minister consider releasing to the news media the actual date the new rates are to be collected?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The 1st order, resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the amendment to the motion for an address in reply to the Speech of the Honourable, the Lieutenant-Governor at the opening of the session.

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): Mr. Speaker, when we adjourned late last night I had been discussing the housing crisis in the province of Ontario. I did want to take a few minutes in summing up, with a few suggestions of what I think should be done. I used as an example of that crisis in this particular area the fact we had 10,247 applications for public housing here in Metropolitan Toronto and despite the efforts of the Ontario housing corporation the applications had increased by 690 in the last three months of 1967. It was just a sample that we are not beginning to meet the housing crisis here in this province.

Mr. Speaker, in dealing with any remedies of this problem, I know that I could go into great detail and at this time I do not intend to do so, but I would like to give a summation of what I think are some of the key solutions. And the keystone to a vigorous housing policy is the role of the provincial government. Constitutionally, Mr. Speaker, the province is virtually supreme in the housing field. It has the power to initiate and control planning, to control urban and rural development and the assembly of land. I am well aware that the federal government has an important part to play, and I have been one of the critics of the federal government. I feel that despite the work under The National Housing Act the federal government has not done enough. In fact, when they had the federal-provincial conference on housing last December in Ottawa, judging from the newspapers I wondered why in the world did the federal government call the conference? Nothing worthwhile seemed to come out of it. It got a very bad press.

Mr. Speaker, when I started to read statements that had been made at that conference and to read some of the background papers, I realized that the federal government has come up with some pretty concrete suggestions. I admit quite frankly that I have not been a fan or much of a supporter of the Hon. John R. Nicholson, the man who at

that time was in charge of housing. I have been one of his critics, I have even suggested publicly that he should resign. But when you go through his statement that he made—his general opening statement, a 33-page statement—the federal government has come up with a lot of concrete suggestions. Certainly when it went into the importance of rural development and low-cost housing, the federal government is not without suggestions and ideas and definite promises that they will do something.

But when you compare what the federal government has offered and what we as a province have offered, we in this province are certainly sadly lacking. When I examined the statements made by the representatives of the province of Ontario, we simply were not with it, and even though we can justly criticize the federal government for a lack of direction or a lack of energy in the particular field of housing, we on our side must contribute far more than we have done in the past. To read the statements, and compare what was done and said by the federal government at that conference and what was done and said by this government at that federal-provincial conference on housing, it is obvious that we as a province and as a government do not know where we are going or what we want to do. The hon. Premier of this province (Mr. Robarts), in his statement, said at the conference that the federal government should help CMHC to keep the federal funds flowing. He also made this statement:

> Necessarily, and in our view quite properly, we look to private enterprise to produce and finance the bulk of this expanded housing output.

Well, we are going to have to look to private enterprise for a lot of help. But, Mr. Speaker, when a provincial government is inefficient and does not keep its own financial house in order, I just want to give you some idea of how it affects the housing situation not only in Ontario but in Canada.

Not so long ago the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Wishart) was responsible for the overseeing of the securities commission. It now falls into another department, into The Department of Financial and Commercial Affairs. Those two gentlemen might say, what in the world have we got to do with the housing shortage? If we bear in mind that we need private capital for housing and if we are to read the hon. Premier's statement that he is going to depend on private financing for the bulk of the housing, we can just see what happens when the provincial government, through its various agencies, particularly security companies, allows a financial mess to occur, just what the reaction is in the housing field.

For example, Mr. Speaker, following the Atlantic Acceptance and British Mortgage and Trust fiascoes there was a decline of the flow of savings to some groups of lending institutions which customarily invest heavily in mortgages, which resulted in very marked cutbacks in new mortgage commitments. Trust companies reduced mortgage loan approvals by 48 per cent in 1966 and loan companies reduced mortgage loan approvals by 32 per cent. Life insurance companies reduced mortgage loan approvals by 31 per cent, and for all the lending institutions there was a decline of 37 per cent in value of mortgages approved.

Some may argue that back in 1966 this was a result of world conditions; put the experts in this field tell me, and tell many others, it stemmed directly from the uncertainty, and literally in some respects the financial chaos from the collapse of the British Mortgage and Trust Company and from Atlantic Acceptance Company. Decline was particularly marked for conventional loans for apartments, the largest component of institutional lending for new housing. These loans declined by 44 per cent. Under NHA, institutional loans declined by 39 per cent for apartments and by 50 per cent for single detached dwellings.

What we in this province have to bear in mind, Mr. Speaker, is that what we do in this government not only affects Ontario, it affects all of Canada, because particularly the Toronto area is the financial heart of Canada. People from Montreal might disagree with that, but since the crash of 1929 Toronto has become the financial heart of Canada. So when we in this province allow a particular group of the financial community like the trust companies or the insurance companies to get out of hand this can have a disastrous effect on, just for example, the housing starts.

We have had interest trouble for some few years in regard to finding mortgage money for houses, and to cope with the immediate problem The National Housing Act rates were increased and The Bank Act amended to increase—and it began as of January 1, 1968—the interest rate on bank loans to 7.25 per cent and to permit banks to end on conventional mortgages. The result was an improvement in the number of approvals of NHA loans and by conventional lenders. There has been a

proposal by Mr. Benson, the Minister in Ottawa who is now in charge of The National Housing Act, that perhaps the lid might be taken off the interest charge for NHA loans and the market allowed to find its own level. If this is done, and if found necessary, I feel that the lender should only have to pay 6 per cent; if it goes up above that, the interest rates will have to be subsidized. Otherwise it will be utterly hopeless for the average person or the average family to obtain a home. This would be at best a temporary expedient to subsidize any interest rates. The main answer is to increase the available stock of housing and this will solve your rental, and it will solve this matter of interest rates.

There is one other approach we might bear in mind and it is worthy of examination because during the 1966 decline of institutional loans we were held literally at the mercy of some of these large institutions; for example, the trust companies cut back 48 per cent; the life insurance companies cut back 31 per cent in mortgage loans. We were utterly at their mercy. It might be worthwhile for us to consider, Mr. Speaker, using a stick instead of a carrot in requiring these companies to invest a stated portion of their investment money in NHA mortgages. To ensure the liquidity of the mortgage market the CMHC could be in a position to buy mortgages from these lending institutions. CMHC would literally become—like the Bank of Canada—they become a central banker. We certainly need to examine new ideas and not just sit back and allow our people to become utterly at the mercy of any particular financial group.

I want to emphasize that the province is the keystone of the housing problem. Bear in mind that the municipalities are the creatures of the province and it provides them with their privileges, their rights and their obligations. We must have in this province and in this ministry, Mr. Speaker, a department of housing that concentrates upon urban and rural development. Ontario housing corporation, now in The Department of Economics and Development, the community planning branch of The Department of Municipal Affairs, and the Ontario water resources commission should be under the control of the Department of Housing because all these items are utterly essential to proper planning.

One thing that could be done immediately if the government had any drive and interest, Mr. Speaker, is for the government to cut the red tape that is hampering the approval of projects planned by the private developers in the province of Ontario. Endless zoning by-laws, planning boards, councils, committees of all shapes and sizes, crush the plans of even the most able and determined of developers and builders. Regional government, as recommended in the Smith report, is essential.

For example, Metropolitan Toronto is such an area that requires regional government. In Metro Toronto, instead of six building codes there should be one. Imagine—in this Metro area we have six building codes. Scarborough and Etobicoke would no longer be able to refuse medium-density housing. Why should one particular section of this community be able to refuse this much needed type of housing?

Third, Mr. Speaker, in this province we must greatly increase our stock of public housing, which is currently needed in all our large urban centres in Ontario. Metro Toronto today has 11,000 units. This is peanuts compared to the demand, and in the near future we are going to need at least 50,000 units. Acquiring large tracts of land for the purpose of creating satellite cities and servicing such large tracts with trunk sewer systems under the facilities of the Ontario water resources commission and providing the necessary transportation are needed.

There are all kinds of good plans available now that can be put into practice. All you have to do, Mr. Speaker, to read many practical suggestions from our federal government, is to read the background papers and the speeches of the housing conference in December, 1967. The federal government has indicated they are willing to help in a very substantial manner.

We need again, Mr. Speaker, a vast increase in housing for middle income families by constructing maisonettes, row houses and apartments. We have had all kinds of announcements from this provincial Minister whose department is in charge of housing, but where are the houses that are being built? They have bought a lot but they have not added to the stock, certainly in the Metropolitan Toronto area. And where in some areas they have added to the housing stock, it does not begin to touch the demand.

Mr. Speaker, just to give you an example of how row housing can, in many ways, help cut the cost of housing—here in Metro Toronto a 50-foot lot costs between $10,000 and $12,000; it is hard to believe that land can cost that much, but it costs between $10,000 and $12,000 for a 50-foot lot. If you put two semi-detached houses on a 60-foot lot, it cuts the cost to around $7,000 to $7,500 per unit of housing. If you put in 12 row houses

on one acre—and mind you, you usually put in about on an average four and a half to five houses on an acre—but if you put 12 row houses on one acre, it cuts the cost of land to $4,000 per unit. In other words we are down from about $10,000 to $12,000 per unit to $4,000, and if we put maisonettes on an acre of land—20 maisonettes cost about $2,000 for land per unit. These are practical suggestions. When I quote these figures I emphasize, Mr. Speaker, they come from people who are well experienced in the business. But today they are so hampered by just getting their plans approved that they cannot get under way.

Sixth, government should provide second mortgages for older homes that are structurally sound. I know that this province was in the second mortgage business before CMHC came into being. It was found to be a good, practical scheme, and some of the old areas of our larger centres can be well helped by second mortgages at decent rates. Many people can find the money for the down payment, but then they need to raise more money, and they are thrown to the hands of the loan sharks. Despite all the protections that we have tried to bring about for people, they are still paying far too much for second mortgages. This is a practical solution that the government can do now. Governments have done it before, and they have worked before; there is no reason why they cannot work again today and right now.

The final point, and what may well be the most important one, is the shifting of the burden of the cost of education. We have discussed this on many occasions before but this is vital. The home owner should pay a far smaller portion of the cost of education than he is paying today. Now, I have made some suggestions that I feel are certain and practical. They could be done now and we do not need any more committees; we do not need any more analizing because there are practical men in the business who could go to work today if this government had some sense of determination and sense of direction.

But there is one thing that I would like to suggest for the larger view of the housing problem. The housing problem and the needs of housing are going to change tremendously; there are probably more housing units going to be built in Canada by the year 2000 than we have built in our entire history. With the growth of population and the backlog of new housing, the replacement of the old houses that are no longer structurally sound there is going to be tremendous growth.

We should look into this problem of how we are going to grow. What are the social demands for housing? I would say to the government through you, Mr. Speaker, that if we do have select committees as we have had in the past in this House, that I would recommend that such a select committee be set up to look into the future of housing. I say that with one reservation. I would not, in making that suggestion, say: "This is just another committee, let us shelve our immediate problems on to a committee."

This is not what I have in mind at all. I am thinking of the tremendous changes that can take place in the future. We can still build houses the same way they were being built 100 years ago. And yet, there must be new ways that should be examined and should be tried.

And how should we disperse our population? Should we segregate senior citizens away out in the fields, as we are doing, where the land is cheap? Or should we keep them in the community? I think the answer is obvious that we should keep them in the community, but a lot of people in government, the way they are carrying on, do not seem to think so.

These things in the future of planning, should be examined by a select committee, Mr. Speaker, and I heartily recommend this to the government.

In closing, I have one very brief remark to make on a subject which I have always spoken on. In fact, the first speech I ever made in this House was on the problems of mental health, and I want to centre my remarks on one particular building in the city of Toronto.

For years and years, we have been promised that this government would remove 999 Queen Street and put up a proper community hospital to serve that area. It is a building far older than Confederation, 120 years. I have spoken on this on many occasions, but I would urge the new members of the House to make a point of asking to be taken through 999 Queen Street and see how we treat our mentally ill, to see under what conditions we ask our trained psychiatrists to work.

The government will tell you they have plans on the planning board for a new building down at 999 Queen. The plans have been there for years, but not a shovel goes into the ground and nothing new takes place. Again, I urge every member in this House, whether they have been here for years, or just for a

few months, to go and to see how shamefully we treat the mentally ill.

And go to a hospital for adult retarded persons up in Aurora where they are in beds crammed into rooms, and the beds are about the breadth of your hand apart.

These things are still going on, and I would urge the members of this House, no matter what their party, to see to it that we start treating our mentally ill, and those people who are retarded, in a proper manner, because the situation, despite all the announcements that we have had and despite some improvements, it is still shocking in the province of Ontario.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Mr. Speaker, I have taken note of the clock, and I had some rather lengthy notes on the consolidation bill which was introduced this morning. But in view of the time I have decided to withhold those comments to second reading of the bill, so I hope that I can get my comments in within the confines of the next ten or 15 minutes.

This last month has been a real revelation to me as I sat back and listened to speeches of the new members on the government side of the House, and the new members on the NDP side of the House participating in the Throne debate for the first time. You know, when one sits back, it becomes rather obvious that the new members on the government side of the House have become much more right wing. It is also obvious that the new members in the party to the left of us here, have become even more left wing.

This has left the Liberal Party as the only reasonable alternative for the vast majority of people. We are the only reasonable alternative for the vast majority of the people living in the province of Ontario. We intend to pursue our role with vigour and enthusiasm, so that in 1961 it will we who are sitting across there instead of the Tories.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Better get ready to move!

Mr. Gaunt: In 1971, that is! Indeed, that will be a welcome change. We know where we stand. Everything is in order as far as we are concerned. In 1971, may I just say to the Premier through you, Mr. Speaker, in 1971, and I just underline it again, we will be over there and he will be over here.

I would like to extend to you, sir, my congratulations. I admire the very effective way in which you handle the business of the House. It is not an easy job, and I think that you do very well in your capacity as Speaker. May I also extend my congratulations to the mover (Mr. J. R. Smith) and seconder (Mr. Meen) of the Speech from the Throne, and to those people on the opposite side of the House who have joined the Cabinet ranks within the last few months. Also, may I congratulate the new members who have been elected to this House for the first time. I am sure that they will find the experience unique, if not, exhilarating.

I want to make a few comments in respect to the sugar beet problem in southern Ontario, with particular reference to the Minister's statement yesterday.

As the Minister suggested, the sugar beet marketing board, the federation of agriculture and the farmers union had recommended that the province place the plant in trusteeship and operate it on an indefinite basis.

Yesterday, the Minister kept referring to forceful taking. Well, as I understand it, all that would have been required would have been for the province to bring in a bill placing the plant under trusteeship, and to compensate the company on the basis of 1 per cent on its invested capital which is what the company now says it makes. My guess is that, under those circumstances the company would have been back in the business of producing sugar very fast.

Since the province has decided to do nothing this means that $2 million of federal money is lost to the industry in the form of a federal subsidy.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Where is the Minister now?

Mr. Gaunt: The Minister's statement yesterday, in effect, signed the death certificate of the industry in southern Ontario.

The Minister literally put his hands in the farmers' pockets and snitched $2 million away from the beet farmers of southern Ontario, which would have been theirs had the normal course of the plant in Chatham continued.

The Minister intimated that the industry was not really vital in supplying our sugar needs. He said something to the effect that we have many, many world sources and so our industry here in southern Ontario was not really that vital. I do not agree. I think an industry that is worth $10 million to the economy in the area, in addition to supplying 3 per cent of the sugar needs in this country, is a vital industry. After all, we do consume a tremendous amount of sugar in this country and it seems to me that we

should be encouraging at least 20 per cent of our requirements to be produced here.

What does all this mean? It means that when the going gets tough, when the important decision has to be made, when this government has to meet a crisis in agriculture head on, it buckles under and says that it just cannot do it. It has neither the courage nor the fortitude to meet the problem.

Mr. Sargent: Farmer's friend.

Mr. Gaunt: The financial implications are too great, says the government. Yet, two days previously, the Budget indicated that the government intends turning over $1.8 million this year to the Ontario racing commission to promote a sport.

Mr. Sargent: That is different.

Mr. Gaunt: What a weird sense of priority! Mr. Speaker, I can only say that the Minister's statement yesterday will only add to the dissatisfaction and unrest which is presently growing in the country.

I want to turn to another subject, that being OMSIP. In many ways I am reluctant to do so, but in retrospect, OMSIP problems have occupied more of my time than perhaps any other single matter in this last eight to 10 to 12 months. To be frank, I have been flooded with requests for help in this regard. There is never a week-end that I do not come back here with at least three cases for Monday morning. Before I go any further I must say that the Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond) has been very helpful and has shown an abiding interest and concern in this connection. I have also had excellent co-operation from two officials of HIRB—Mr. Delaney and his secretary, Mrs. Ellison—and I want to stress that my remarks in no way reflect upon their ability and their concern in this regard.

I must say this past month or so there have been rays of hope that the administration of OMSIP is finally being streamlined. Before that, however, it can be described as nothing short of chaotic. I realize the people operating the machines, as well as all the other people connected with OMSIP, have to attain a certain degree of sophistication and this takes time. After all, these things cannot be learned overnight. However, having said that, I point out that OMSIP has been operating in this province since July 1, 1966, ample time for the staff to become adjusted, in my opinion.

Couple with this the fact that many mistakes were made in the original applications, as well as the fact that the staff got bogged down in the systems, and you have an administration that was almost impossible. When this started to happen, the decks should have have been cleared and the few administrative cuts taken to avoid the terrific backlog which resulted. However, this was not done and I feel it culminated in a big administrative flop—perhaps the biggest administrative flop of the century, Mr. Speaker. Let me give you a few examples. I will use the initials of the people involved to avoid embarrassment.

Mr. J. N. of Wingham in August, 1967, got in touch with me and suggested he was being billed for the full amount when he should have been receiving partial assistance. I acknowledged that perhaps the mistake was his initially in filling out the application. I immediately got in touch with OMSIP and they got him to fill out another form indicating his taxable income for the previous year. He did this and then he was sent a regular billing notice presumably to bring him up to date. Then, in a letter dated October 6, 1967, OMSIP says: "Thank you for your payment which provides coverage for six months to March 6, 1968". This was fine. Presumably the overpayment was being applied to his partial premium. Then, in a letter dated November 15, 1967, it said:

> Please be advised that your contract has been changed to partial assistance effective July 1, 1967. Your contract is paid to January, 1968.

Needless to say this was confusing, but very little thought was given to it until the doctor's bills totalling $70 were received on December 15, 1967, with the notation that the contract had been cancelled.

Ever since that time, I have been trying to straighten the problem out, with little success, until I wrote to the Minister under letter dated February 23, in which I explained the situation to the Minister in respect to the claim as well as 24 other claims of a somewhat similar nature. Within the past two weeks I have received word that Mr. N's contract is now in order and the doctor should resubmit his bill. I understand the doctor has not done so as yet and so the real test is yet to come.

I give you another example. Mrs. S's husband died early last fall. She wrote to OMSIP and asked them to change the contract for a family to a single contract. Nothing happened. She wrote again and nothing happened. Finally, her son-in-law wrote, and on November 15 he received a form card from OMSIP saying that they were sorry

they could not deal with the matter at this time. "We will do so as soon as possible." The son-in-law again wrote in another week and on November 27 he got exactly the same form back again saying "We cannot deal with it, we will do so as soon as possible." In a frustrated frame of mind he called me and I took the matter up with OMSIP.

This was a fully subsidized contract. The lady's concern was that the change had not been made from the family to the single contract and she wanted to have assurance that the contract was still in force because she was awaiting entry to the hospital for a fairly serious operation. I still do not know to this day whether she is covered or not, although I have the verbal assurance from an official of HIRB that she will be covered. Since she has gone into the hospital to have her operation, OMSIP will presumably take care of it. At the moment that is the verbal assurance and I have had nothing in writing to that effect.

The last one, Mr. Speaker, is a Mrs. F, who went to her doctor on July 18, 1966, and discovered she had lost her OMSIP number. You see, she and her husband had made the mistake of filling out separate application forms and so they had two separate numbers. OMSIP, in response to her request for another number, said that they had no record of it. She contacted me and I suggested she should be covered by the same number as her husband. OMSIP was advised of this and they wrote her asking for her age, her full name and birth date, and so on, all the vital information, and she subsequently sent this in. The doctor waited six weeks in order for the necessary changes to be made before submitting his bills, but the bills had continued to be returned. They now total $102.80 and the amount continues to remain outstanding.

There are many more cases I could cite to the House, but I think I have pointed out the difficulties in many of these areas and any further recitation would serve no useful purpose. The point is that all of this adds up to a great deal of frustration on the part of the patient and the doctor, and in many cases anxiety as well.

The very people that OMSIP was designed to help the most are the people who are being harassed the most, and are having the most difficulty.

If I may offer a suggestion, I think the application forms should be simpler and more direct. I also feel that the total taxable income is a confusing term to many, even though it is fully explained in the brochure. Many people put down their total income rather than their total taxable income. This is particularly confusing, I suggest, to older people.

Perhaps these difficulties will lessen as experience is gained by the public generally in filling out these forms. In the meantime, they do cause considerable difficulty.

Well Mr. Speaker, I have already overrun my time, and I think I should conclude my remarks at this time.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the member would move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. Gaunt: Mr. Speaker, I cannot be here on Monday. I have another commitment.

Mr. R. G. Hodgson (Victoria-Haliburton) moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

NOTICE OF MOTION

Clerk of the House: Private member's motion No. 2 by Mr. T. P. Reid.

RESOLUTION:

That this government investigate the extent of the shortage of doctors, dentists and nurses in northwestern Ontario, and provide a comprehensive plan to ameliorate this shortage in order to ensure that the people of northwestern Ontario receive the health care they deserve.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Port Arthur (Mr. Knight), the resolution standing in my name.

Mr. Speaker, this motion that I have on the floor is one of vital and great importance to the people of northwestern Ontario. It has become especially important because of the recent announcement by the federal Minister of Health, Mr. MacEachen that Indian and Eskimo services are to be cut.

In an article in today's *Globe and Mail*, the reasons for this are set out and Mr. MacEachen also states that he said, and I quote: "He said other agencies such as Indian bands and provincial governments also had a role in assisting with Indian health problems."

Mr. Speaker, my motion concerns not only the Indian and Eskimo people of northwestern Ontario, but all the people of northwestern Ontario. May I quote from the Royal commission on health services:

> Returning to the thin southern strip of Canada where most of us live, we are sadly

> aware of the fact that our country cannot achieve its full destiny as long as its unique, but distant parts remain unknown and undeveloped.

This is a quotation by the Right Hon. Georges Vanier in a foreword to "The Unbelievable Land." Mr. Vanier was speaking more specifically of the Northwest Territories and of the Yukon, but I suggest, sir, that this applies also to northern and northwestern Ontario.

My motion reads, Mr. Speaker, only northwestern Ontario, and that is for a specific reason. Obviously we have the problem in all of northern Ontario, but in the Royal commission on the health services, one of the strongest recommendations was a regional administrative pattern for the organized community health services. I suggest that for this reason, I have confined my resolution to only northwestern Ontario.

This problem of health services and the lack of doctors, dentists and nurses has a two- or three-fold problem here. One of course is the fact that these people are not having their health needs looked after adequately. The people in northwestern Ontario are human beings like anybody else, and they deserve the best medical care that is possible.

In the northern regions of the province we have the trappers, the Indians, the Eskimos, the people who work in communications and so on, the people in the northern mining communities, the northern lumber communities, who have not, and are not being provided with essential medical care because of the deficiency or lack of personnel to service them.

Now apart from the humanitarian aspect, the very basic aspect that these people deserve this care is the economic problem, and this is two-fold.

First of all, if a person is sick, ailing and cannot receive either medical or dental care, then obviously he cannot work, or he cannot work to the best and fullest capacity. Therefore, his economic output is slowed down or perhaps done away with until such time as he can receive medical care, and this in many cases involves travelling long distances, hundreds of miles, possibly by plane or dog sled in the winter, or canoe to receive medical help.

The second problem, Mr. Speaker, is that we find ourselves chasing ourselves around by the tail in northwestern Ontario. We are trying to develop this part of the country, but people will not come up to northern or northwestern Ontario unless they are assured that they are going to receive proper and adequate medical and dental services.

This is a prerequisite for the development of northwestern Ontario. Unless we can assure people that we can provide them with the essential needs, as far as doctors and dentists and hospital care is concerned, then we are not going to be able to attract the people to this area to develop the resources that we have there.

Obviously, we have the problem in the north of a small population widely scattered over large territories, but again I must remind you, Mr. Speaker, these people are human beings. Down in the southern part of the province, there are a great many doctors and dentists and nurses.

In 1961, in Canada, the physician-to-population ratio was one to 857 people. In Ontario this ratio was one to 776 people.

In northwestern Ontario, these figures must go right out the window, because we have no ratio of that kind at all. One dentist, for instance, in the town of Atikokan is trying to service some 6,000 or 7,000 or 8,000 people, with the result that he cannot keep up. Therefore, the people are forced to drive to the Lakehead, 140 miles away, and this, of course, leads to loss of work time, an increas- in financial burden on those people who are forced to travel and so on. The problems, Mr. Speaker, I suggest are obvious.

The dental ratio in Ontario was one to 251. As I have already mentioned, we have one dentist for some 8,000, which triples the normal ratio for dentist-patients.

The obvious and most basic problem is to secure the required personnel, doctors, dentists and nurses, and to supply the related equipment and facilities. The second problem is to make these resources physically available when and where they are needed. The government has taken one step in this direction, Mr. Speaker, with their resolution in the Throne Speech that they are going to provide air ambulance service for the north. I suggest that this is long overdue, but perhaps this will ameliorate the problem to some extent.

A further solution might be a complete organized flying health circuit that would tour northwestern Ontario providing nursing, medical and dental care. This proposal has been made, of course, in the Royal commission on health services. I suggest the provincial government take a long look at this.

Another solution, perhaps a very basic solution and one that has a great deal of merit I believe, especially for the most north-

ern part of northwestern Ontario, is to train the native population, especially young Indian girls, train them as nursing assistants, give them some kind of basic education and basic hygiene so that they can return to their homes where they are indigenous to this kind of country and where they feel most at home, to serve the people from which they come.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that we should appeal to the enthusiasm and the idealism of those young people who are now graduating or in the process of graduating from our medical and dental colleges—appeal to them as a company of young Canadians perhaps, something of this order, Mr. Speaker—so that they would devote possibly the first or second year of their lives as doctors or dentists to helping the people who need it most and who are not receiving it, those people who live in northern and northwestern Ontario.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that some of the recommendations of the Royal commission on health be adopted by this government in providing these basic services. One of the recommendations was that medical schools, in selecting students, should give special consideration to those from rural areas and the provincial government should offer scholarships to such students under the condition that the recipients would commit themselves to practise medicine for a specified period of time in indicated rural and northern areas.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that today we subsidize education, in the medical fraternity and dental fraternity in particular, to a large extent. Perhaps grants could be made to needy students who would like to take these courses if they would commit themselves to serving even one or two years in the north. Further, Mr. Speaker, provincial and municipal governments should subsidize physicians' income in northern areas because of the lower economic status of some of these areas as compared with urban centres. Or the provincial government should directly employ physicians and assign men to specified areas at agreed salaries.

Mr. Speaker, I believe all of these things that I am talking about are pretty self-evident. We have heard a number of speakers from the north, from the left and from the right on this side say, and I believe even some of the hon. members on the other side are in agreement with this, that we lack the medical and dental facilities that we need in northwestern Ontario. I would suggest the problem is obvious and I would urge that the government do something about this. I would urge that they co-operate with the federal government in the services that the federal government is now providing to the Indian population of northwestern Ontario and I would urge that something be done about this immediately.

It would not require that much effort on the part of the Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond) to find out just what the doctor-population ratio is in northwestern Ontario or the dentist-population ratio is, and to come to the conclusion that these services are needed and must be expanded in northern and northwestern Ontario on the humanitarian ground and on the economic ground, and that these services should be implemented immediately.

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): Mr. Speaker, this resolution calls for an investigation to be made. An investigation may give a more accurate and up-to-date description of the situation as it actually exists. But really an investigation is not necessary to point out that there is an acute shortage of medical personnel and services throughout the whole of northern Ontario. Therefore, although the resolution refers specifically to northwestern Ontario, I believe that the problem is general to the north as a whole. One can discuss either the northeast or the northwest and still be talking much about the same thing.

At present we do have knowledge of the doctor and dental situation in northeastern Ontario. In this area, the ratio of doctors to population, as pointed out in the 1966 economic review, is one doctor to every 1,103 persons, while in the province as a whole the ratio is one to every 776 persons. The ratio of dentists to population is one to every 4,478 persons in the north while in the whole of the province the ratio is one to every 2,463. This points out that less than 40 per cent of the medical services and almost 100 per cent less dental service is available in northeastern Ontario than there is in the rest of the province. And the hon. member for Rainy River has pointed out the facts are very much the same for northwestern Ontario.

The hon. member for Nipissing (Mr. R. S. Smith) in his 1967 Throne debate speech, on pages 509 and 510 in *Hansard*, pointed out these facts to the Legislature:

> There are no public convalescent hospitals, or hospitals for the chronically ill, in the whole of the northeastern region. There are also no private chronic care hospitals. Some general hospitals provide an inadequate number of beds for the chronically ill but in some large areas none are available whatsoever. The Ontario Hospital in North Bay is continually overcrowded with little opportunity for private treatment.

The new psychiatric hospital at Porcupine is completed or nearing completion but I understand the problem remains as to where staff will be found to open it. Most areas have no private psychiatric treatment available at all.

Over a year ago, when the hon. member made his speech, he understood that the northeastern Ontario psychiatric hospital was reaching completion. In a speech to the Timmins branch of the Canadian mental health association last February, the director of the mental hospitals branch of The Department of Health said that the northeastern Ontario psychiatric hospital would be open by Christmas of 1967, with at least 20 patients under treatment.

In January, 1968, one of our office staff called the director of the mental hospitals branch, who said that it would be open by March 1. However, when I asked the hon. Minister of Health in this House when it would be opened, he would not give a date, although he did state to another of my questions that there is a psychiatrist now appointed. Certainly professional staff shortage in this area is a problem, but I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this hospital could have been open for service last fall. But because this government did not plan ahead sufficiently, by its ineptness, bungling and miscalculation on this matter, this hospital is still not open.

The Department of Health is moving at a snail's pace in this matter and is not giving serious enough consideration to the mental health needs of the people in our section of the province. Good planning could have had these services available at least six months ago. They have spent millions of dollars in constructing this hospital, now for goodness sake let us put it to use.

There is no doubt about it, there is an acute shortage of medical personnel and services available in the north. May I also say with some emphasis that there is an extreme shortage of French-speaking doctors in northeastern Ontario. If the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) is serious, Mr. Speaker, about having justice done to the French-speaking population of our province, and especially in our northern area, he will make a special effort to ensure that more French-speaking doctors are made available to serve the French of this province. It is one of the most basic things that he can do, to help the French feel at home in this province.

What is the effect of the doctor shortage and the medical personnel shortage? Well, the doctors themselves are grossly overworked. Some of them break down under the impossible burden they are called to bear while a few others become careless or cavalier about their practice. But what about the population as a whole? Where doctors are available, the waiting period before you can see the doctor is often so long that you are either better from your complaint before you do see him, or it has worsened to the stage where it becomes chronic and it takes considerable time to recover from it. Emergency services under such conditions are often intolerable.

One child in Timmins had a badly cut hand and was rushed to the emergency department of the hospital for attention. The delay in treatment was so long for this child and so much blood was lost that the child had to be hospitalized for the night to receive blood transfusions. The hospital in Timmins informed the town council that a two-hour wait from the time of admission until the time of treatment is the average time it takes in emergency cases, but I am aware of other times when the period between admission and treatment is up to five or six hours. Last spring near Matheson there was a serious car accident. One of the seriously injured parties was rushed by ambulance to the Matheson hospital but the only doctor was not there and treatment could not be rendered, nor the patient admitted. The injured man was rushed some 20 or so miles to the hospital in Iroquois Falls but when he reached there he was dead. This points out the fact that there is need for an additional doctor in a little community like Matheson, and many other communities in the north.

But perhaps we should not complain so much in our area since there are at least some doctors available. There are other communities like Hanmer with a population of 8,100 in which there is no resident doctor. Medical services are available 15 miles away in Sudbury but this poses a hardship and inconvenience for a lot of families. There are other rather isolated communities that have no medical services. Foleyet, some 48 miles or so from Timmins, has no doctor. My colleague, the hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Jackson), pointed out in his maiden speech on Tuesday that there are isolated communities in his riding that are 50 or 100 miles away from a hospital and doctor, and these communities do not have even so much as a nurse or a trained first aid man in them. He mentioned Matachewan, which is 50 miles away, and Gowganda, which is 100 miles away from a hospital. Can you imagine, Mr. Speaker, the uncertainty one lives under

with the thought always in the back of the mind: "What will I do if my family suddenly becomes seriously ill, or gets involved in an accident"? It is not a very pleasant prospect.

I lived in Mattawa for four years and served that community and environs as a minister. There was no dentist in that town during all the time that I was there, and I doubt if there is one there now. I was terribly shocked after coming from Toronto where dental services were always available and used to see so very, very many children with rotten teeth, and so many young adults with false teeth. There was no other reason for this than the unavailability of a resident dentist, and the fact that most people found it difficult to drive 40 miles either to Timiskaming, Quebec, or to North Bay for dental treatment.

And how many more little, and not so little communities in the north there are that lack dentists or dental services. Perhaps The Department of Health should employ travelling dentists to spend time on a regular basis in some of these little communities, and supply dental services, at least, to the children so that they will not have false teeth at a very early age in life.

This government, Mr. Speaker, offers to the people of this province a hospitalization plan and a medical plan, both by way of premium for those who can afford to pay and pre-paid for those who are in special need. If the government is going to offer these plans to the people, then they have a moral obligation to see that policy holders can receive the services available under these plans. Therefore, the responsibility lies squarely on their shoulders, and they must take steps to rectify this situation.

But how may the problem be solved? Obviously no easy answers can be given. Surely the government must continue, and even step up its programme of recruiting doctors from the United Kingdom, France and elsewhere. Then there are doctors who come to Canada from lands whose medical qualifications are not on a par with our own.

Surely a realistic solution can be found where such doctors can be paid by the government a suitable wage while they intern or upgrade their qualifications so that they may be licensed to practise in this province. The rider can be attached that upon receiving their licence they must practise in a northern community, or one where there is no doctor at present, for a specified period of time, perhaps two or three years.

The programme to provide additional medical schools must be stepped up. I am aware that qualified instructors are hard to come by, and that the cost of such schools is tremendously high. Yet the cost to our people in northern Ontario in inadequate medical services is tremendously high and calls for drastic action.

There are more and more young people entering our universities every year, and many of these would take medicine if such courses were readily available. It is encouraging to hear that McMaster University has definite plans to open a medical school. Surely this government should be planning ahead to open another medical school in this province, preferably in northern Ontario—either in connection with Laurentian University or the Lakehead University. With such a school in the north the likelihood of our young people who graduate in medicine leaving the north would be surely lessened, and greater services could be provided.

Other suggestions to increase the supply of doctors in this province have been made. During the war, one year of the medical course was cut off in order to get as many doctors available as possible. I understand that the hon. member for High Park (Mr. Shulman) is a product of this course, and it has not affected his competency or that of his classmates.

Surely the present shortage could be alleviated if again a year of the pre-medical course could be done away with, or else a suggestion that medical schools operate all year round rather than recess for a long summer holiday as they do at present has merit.

It would pay the government and the people of this province, and especially in the north, in the long run if the government paid the medical students sufficient money at least to compare with what they make at summer jobs to enable them to study all year round. This policy as well could knock off a year in the time it takes to graduate medical students.

There is no doubt in my mind, Mr. Speaker, that there is a real shortage of nurses in northern Ontario. I can remember how Mattawa hospital had such a shortage of nurses that only one graduate would be available for the whole hospital during a shift. Nurses aides and assistants had to do work and accept responsibility that properly belonged to a graduate nurse. In all our communities there are openings for more nurses than there are nurses available. Even though married women work on a part-time basis to

help meet this crisis, the shortage of nurses still exists.

There are, no doubt, many reasons for the shortage of nurses but one reason I suggest is the fact that nurses are grossly underpaid. According to the registered nurses association of Ontario the salary scale for general duty nurses in this province ranges from a minimum of $445 a month to a maximum of $535. This latter figure is reached only if one works at the same hospital for five years. These figures are arrived at in this way: The Toronto council of hospitals meets and decides among its members what will be a fair increase for nurses' salaries each year. After its decision is reached the rates are published in the *Canadian Hospital Administrators Magazine.* The administrators would generally adopt this scale, as does the Ontario hospital services commission which make grants to the hospital on the basis of this salary scale. The nurses are never consulted, cannot bargain except in places where they are organized, and do not have any say about this salary scale. If a nurse works for the provincial government, her starting salary is $5,500 a year.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that one of the major reasons for a shortage of nurses in both south and north is a very low and unrealistic salary schedule. Compared with the responsibility they carry and the important vital work they do for the wellbeing of sick people they are terribly underpaid. Something has got to be done to raise their standard of wages, commensurate with the heavy duties they carry out. If a girl sees she can get a decent wage she will be more likely to sacrifice for two or three years of training rather than be sidetracked into a higher paid job with little training required. If nurses will see that adequate wages are there, I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that more will be available. In addition, more married graduates will be encouraged to get out and work if they are given adequate remuneration for their services. As far as northern Ontario is concerned, there are a few small communities who are paying about $15 a month extra to the basic figures —isolation pay—but the large centres in the north are still slavishly sticking to the set schedule.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that special training could be given to nurses who are prepared to go into the isolated northern communities so that they may give more medical services than is normally carried out by a nurse. Such specifically trained nurses should be paid a much higher salary than other nurses receive. If necessary, the provincial government could subsidize such nurses, but I imagine the companies that are in those districts would pick up most of the tab. For instance, Adams Mine consider it so important to have a safety man on their staff that they pay him $9,000 a year and they are not very far away from hospitals and doctors.

If this does not work then I believe that men trained like the medical corps men in the army could very well be trained in special courses, and have a period of internship to carry out certain basic medical procedures, which would equip them to give services to people in these isolated areas of the north that presently have no medical services of any kind. Such a person would of necessity be under supervision by a doctor and hospital. But he could be of immense help to the people. He could be given a licence to carry out his services in these isolated communities unserviced by any medical personnel, but his licence need not apply to areas where doctors are available.

The shortage of medical personnel in the northern part of this province is acute. Drastic action is called for. This government must take realistic steps to begin to remedy this dangerous situation, which could easily have disastrous effects involving a lot of people's health and life if it is allowed to go on indefinitely as it is at the present moment.

Mr. W. Newman (Ontario South): Mr. Speaker, I am substituting in this debate for the hon. member for Fort William (Mr. Jessiman) who is unable to be present with us here this morning.

Before attempting to deal with the problem in any detail I want to make a few general points on this resolution before us. The first point is that doctors, nurses and dentists, in fact the whole range of medical service professionals, are in short supply, not only in northwestern Ontario but throughout the province, throughout Canada as a whole, and in fact throughout the world. Let me quote to you from *U.S. News and World Report* of February 26 of this year regarding the situation in that country. I quote:

> The latest survey by The Department of Health, Education and Welfare reports "an unmet need for some 20,000 practicing physicians" in the United States. Hospitals are reported to need 10,000 interns and residents just to fill vacancies. At least 5,000 more dentists are reportedly required for adequate care. The scarcity of competent nurses is listed as the worst shortage of all by some authorities. Official estimates show a need for 79,000 additional nurses in hos-

pitals, plus 6,000 more in nursing homes, if best care is to be given.

This, Mr. Speaker, is the present situation in the United States, where in spite of their advanced technology their higher wages and their less severe climate, and so on, serious shortages of personnel exist in every category mentioned in this letter.

In case my hon. friend from Rainy River feels there are no shortages in this particular part of Ontario, let me refer him to a headline in the Toronto *Telegram* of January 24, 1968, which reads as follows. I quote: "Half New Hospital's Beds Empty, No Staff, Scarborough Reveals." In that article we are told that more than half of the 525 beds at Scarborough's new Centenary hospital are empty because the hospital cannot hire nursing staff. One of the reasons given for this shortage was that the hospital is difficult to reach by public transportation—a small factor, a minor problem in comparison with the situation which exists in less urbanized areas.

So my first point, Mr. Speaker, is that the shortage is province-wide, and no investigation is really necessary to determine this. It is also known and recognized that the shortage is more acute in the remoter areas, here in Canada as it is in the United States. Indeed in the Soviet Union, which is more like Canada in climate and topography, they have the same problem.

The next point I would like to make concerns responsibilities. From most of the criticism and suggestions coming from the Opposition benches one would conclude that our provincial government is entirely responsible for all that is wrong within the province, and further that we in this chamber have the power to put everything in order, to rectify every situation, to remedy every ill.

In this instance there are at least three different levels of responsibility, and it is worth pausing for a moment to consider them. First there is the responsibility of the individual doctor, dentist, and to a lesser extent, nurse.

This province heavily subsidizes the training of every doctor and dentist as each of us knows. In return, these professional men have an obligation on graduation to serve where they are most needed, and not necessarily where the most lucrative practice can be found. The fact that there are towns in this province without the services of a physician does not reflect credit upon the profession, in view of the amount of public funds which have been spent on their training.

Second, a heavy responsibility for the provision of adequate health services rests upon the municipalities of this province. I will mention later, if time permits, a few of the things they can do to improve the unsatisfactory state of affairs.

Third, there is the province's responsibility. Our responsibility here in this Legislature, and I would like to speak about this for a moment.

Basically, I suggest it is the province's task to provide the facilities necessary throughout the province to produce the highly qualified doctors, dentists and nurses in the numbers required. Here I would like to quote a few lines, Mr. Speaker, from the Budget statement of 1968 to indicate what our government is doing in this field. And I quote:

> We have placed major emphasis in this Budget on our programmes in the field of health. In particular, we have allocated more funds for health sciences, education and research. In order to avert a serious bottleneck in the supply of health manpower, we are continuing to build up our facilities for teaching and training doctors, dentists, nurses and health personnel. This Budget provides $30 million for such health sciences teaching facilities, half of which will eventually be repaid out of the health resources fund. We also propose to increase our grants for the construction of teaching hospitals and for schools to educate hospital personnel. We are again raising the amount of bursary funds available to medical and dental students and other personnel.

In that connection, Mr. Speaker, this government is now providing bursaries to medical and dental students of $1,500 per year for each year that they are prepared to practise on graduation in a designated area. In other words, if a student agrees to practise for four years after graduation in a designated area he will receive $1,500 per year for each of his four years at medical school.

Finally, there is the federal government's responsibility, of which the sponsor of this resolution is fully aware since I understand his brother is a representative in the federal Parliament.

Just how seriously the federal Liberal government takes its responsibility is evident from the recent announcement when health grants for Indians and Eskimos in the north are being substantially reduced this year.

Unlike our socialist friends opposite, Mr. Speaker, we have no intention of forcing any of these professionals to practise where they do not want to—just as we have no intention of forcing industry to locate in specific areas.

May I suggest to the hon. leader of the unofficial Opposition (Mr. MacDonald) that he did not write this. I obtained this material from the gentleman who had to leave this morning on urgent business, and I worked it out myself. May I suggest to you, sir,

through Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that I am speaking across the floor. Mr. Speaker the hon. member for York Centre, I did not hear him.

Mr. N. L. Olde (Middlesex South): It does not matter; it is of no importance.

Mr. W. Newman: The answer to this problem must be found in attracting people to these areas by providing the best facilities possible for their work, their living and their recreation. It is here that the municipalities must play an important role, and there is much that can be done. Individual municipalities can offer inducements to doctors and dentists by providing assistance with housing initially and equally important with office facilities and equipment.

They can supplement the provincial bursary programme by providing loans to students in return for a guarantee of a specified period of practice in the area on graduation.

But like so many other current difficulties which arise from the high degree of specialization today, the final solution will be found on a regional basis. Here again the municipalities must co-operate with the province to bring these plans to fruition.

The medical facilities within this region will be organized probably along the following lines:

At the local level, one will find the doctor's office—the medical inspection room in medical terms. The next step in the service will be a health centre designed to house a group of professional people with varied skills, working together as a team in the prevention of illness, the early detection of individuals with physical or mental ill health and the speedy restoration of the sick to good health. The health centre should be equipped with a limited number of beds for those less serious cases which do not require evacuation to the nearest community hospital at the district level.

Beyond that at the regional level will be the base hospital and health science education and research centre, serving the entire region.

I would like to mention one other area in which the provincial government can assist with the particular problem facing these professionals in remote areas.

I refer to the medium of educational television. In the system which this province is now setting up, consideration should be given to employing television, computers and microwave radio to bring rural doctors and hospitals into partnership with the medical schools and top-flight hospitals at the regional—or perhaps provincial level. The ultimate goal will be the provision of the best bedside care available to every patient in the province, wherever he may be located.

Initially our ETV network can be used to transmit films and lectures by specialists, and we would hope that those at the receiving end could question the lecturers by means of two-way radio-telephone circuits.

Mr. Speaker, I have not mentioned the shortage of nurses which is also world-wide, because I think the problem here is much simpler to resolve, though no less acute.

I believe the most important reasons for the shortage of nurses is that they are underpaid, and the profession has lost its prestige. Canadian nurses are either going into other occupations or being lured to the United States by the higher pay. In 1966 alone, 693 nurses left this province for 42 different states in the United States. In 1967 the figure rose to nearly 800!

The answer to this particular aspect of the problem, Mr. Speaker, seems obvious and urgent—better pay and better working conditions of our nurses everywhere.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Cochrane South was talking about mental health in his area, and I just want to quote from the Budget, which was handed down last Tuesday, under health:

> An additional $15 million is being provided for our mental health programme, including $3 million to expand our service for disturbed and mentally retarded children. This will bring our total outlay on mental health to $117 million.

I understand from the hon. member for Simcoe East (Mr. G. E. Smith), when he spoke yesterday, or the other night, and I will just mention this, and I will re-emphasize this:

> There are three mobile mental health clinics working in northern Ontario.

I think this is a step forward by our government. I have a few figures here, Mr. Speaker, from northwestern Ontario, and I am going to quote from the figures that were given to me this morning:

> At the Fort William McKellar hospital, a 400-bed hospital, in the past three years they have graduated between 40 and 50 nurses per year. At the Port Arthur and St. Joseph hospitals they have a combined bed capacity of approximately 490 beds, and between them they have graduated between 50 and 60 nurses per year. The Lakehead University will be starting the

regional school of nursing in September, 1968, and will graduate approximately 50 nurses per year.

At the same time, McKellar hospital will continue nursing graduations on what is called the two plus one system, namely the first year university academic subjects of nursing, and the second year bedside theoretical training. To the third year—all bedside nursing care—nurses will be paid $275 per month while they are in training.

The Ontario hospital association will allow only 4.5 hours per day for patients for nursing care, and with the Lakehead hospitals turning out 110 to 130 nurses per year, they simply cannot absorb them all. The group of nurses graduating from the Lakehead hospitals is well in line and ahead of the provincial average for nurses graduating per 1,000 persons. The additional new course under the adult education programme will provide approximately 50 nurses aides every six months period from Port Arthur.

Now, one thing that we forget about the nursing profession, and I think that it is very important. There are many problems, and we do have a great shortage of nurses. I do not know whether I have my figures right, but I understand that the hon. member for Rainy River is still single and still a bachelor.

My only question in closing my remarks is this, and the comment I will make first. These nurses do graduate, and due to the fact that we do have eligible bachelors around they do take them out of circulation. We are graduating a lot of nurses, but as many of you know, they do become married, and they do raise a family, they do drop out of circulation. You cannot blame them for this. I would just like the assurance of the hon. member for Rainy River that he will assure me that he will not take one of the nurses out of circulation for a little while.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. T. P. Reid: The hon. member has my assurance.

Mr. Speaker: It would seem proper that the next speaker should be from the official Opposition in appropriate order. I have not either name on my list.

Mr. R. H. Knight (Port Arthur): Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

I rise enthusiastically to support my colleague from Rainy River in this resolution. To me this is an extremely real problem. I had no idea of it eight years ago before I went up to the north country, but it became apparent to me very quickly, as I began reporting on the tragedies of people who live up there. They are residents of Ontario the same as we are, and if we down here think we are entitled to have the government help us to pay our doctor bills, surely to heaven they can consider themselves entitled to at least be able to call a doctor.

I would like to help you to really identify yourself with this problem. Let me do it this way. How many times, travelling with my family by car or otherwise through the vast stretches of the northwest, have I thought to myself: What will happen if my children fall sick, or we have an accident? What are our chances of a doctor getting to us, or of we getting to a hospital? Pretty slim."

The conclusion you have to draw is that travelling through northwestern Ontario means taking your life into your own hands. And I think this is what my hon. colleague from Rainy River was trying to get at when he pointed out to you that this is a very vital aspect of development of northwestern Ontario.

We are spending hundreds of thousands of dollars to get hunters and fishermen and tourists to come into northern Ontario, into any part of Ontario. Surely if we can do that, then we have got to bear the moral responsibility of providing these people with safe conduct to hospitals or medical care of some kind.

Obviously this is quite impractical at this particular stage. However we have here an 1868 calibre problem. But this is 1968, and fortunately in 1968 we do have rapid transit. We have ways of getting people here and there very, very quickly. So I would like to suggest that the hon. Minister of Health and his department, and Dr. McNally of his ambulance task force, give very serious consideration to the possibility of establishing helicopter ambulances at certain places in northwestern Ontario, because when a person is very seriously injured or sick, you have one or two alternatives. You either get the patient to the doctor, or you get the doctor to a patient.

My hon. friend from Rainy River suggested the possibility of young physicians coming up there. I think this would be quite a challenge for a young physician to come into the north and to become indeed a flying doctor. Let the young physicians who have that real zeal to help people to stay alive, come into the north and enter into this type of a service, whereby by helicopter possibly, or even by

regular aircraft, they might fly to some injured person.

I have got to remind members, as I did in my Throne Speech, that we at the Lakehead lie right at the crossroads of the airways, the waterways, the railways, and the roadways, which means that millions of people travel through our area in one way or another. Every single one of those millions of people could suddenly need the type of medical service that the people who live there year round need but do not have at this present time.

I notice the hon. Minister of Mines (Mr. A. F. Lawrence), and I admire him for it, said he was going to be coming into the north and travelling around and having a first-hand view of things. I hope as he is up there in some of those remote areas, he pauses for a moment and says to himself: "What is going to happen to me if I suddenly have an accident, or if I fall down?" Or perhaps he will be in a plane, so it will not be so bad for him. But then perhaps he may not be near a plane and then all of a sudden there will be big headlines, that something has happened to the hon. Minister and they have not been able to get him medical service quickly enough. Then the problem will become very real.

Is that hon. Minister really any more important than one of those Indian children who is now a statistic? Is the Indian infant mortality rate, which was put forward so beautifully by my hon. colleague from Thunder Bay (Mr. Stokes) here the other day, so high simply because there is a lack of medical care, and when a mother calls for a doctor and needs a doctor, she cannot get one? But what is even more important, perhaps she does not know enough to call a doctor if she lives in a remote area.

So I think there is something here that can be done along the lines of education and also along the lines of making a doctor available. I do not care how the government does it. I would not expect the government to make a doctor available in every single one of these little isolated communities, but if it could put a doctor in a central location, where he could be notified and he could board a helicopter or a fast plane and get to the victim as quickly as possible, then at least we would be on the way to solving this problem. I understand there are flying doctors in Australia, and other countries. We know of course of the helicopter rescue service that the coast guard in the U.S. uses along the coast and in other areas, and we belong to 1968. We are talking about a couple of billions of dollars in our Budget. Is there anything more important than keeping people alive? I cannot think of anything myself.

So I do not accuse the government of not feeling responsible for this problem. I do not think there is anyone in this room whose heart does not go out to these people who cannot get a doctor when they need one, of all things. But how long are these halls going to go on echoing with these arguments? I have a feeling they probably have been echoing with these arguments over the last 100 years. Somebody somewhere along the line is going to have enough courage and enough imagination to do something about it. I certainly hope it will be this group of gentlemen who are right here, and I would urge them to use the 1968 attack or approach to this thing. We are subsidizing rapid transit here around the Metro area and that is wonderful; let us subsidize some rapid transit for people who really, really need it. Thank you.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Mr. Speaker, in the few minutes that are available to me, I would like to associate myself with the remarks by the hon. members for Rainy River, Cochrane South and Port Arthur. I think they have explored this whole problem of dental and medical care in the north. I think it particularly significant that we did not have a member from northern Ontario representing the government enter into this debate. I am sure they would have agreed wholeheartedly with the remarks of the members I have just mentioned.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): It symbolizes the government's neglect.

Mr. Stokes: And it is particularly significant when there seems to be general agreement in the House that there is a vital need for this kind of service in northern Ontario, that the government has not long since brought in a plan whereby assurance could be given to the people of northern Ontario that this type of accommodation would be available, this kind of service would be available.

To refer to some specific instances, Mr. Speaker: In the town of Marathon with a population of 3,500, we have one doctor. He cannot perform even the minor operations, such as an appendectomy or a tonsillectomy, because he has not got a companion to administer the anaesthetic. So this necessitates travelling 180 miles during severe winter conditions to the Lakehead, in order to perform just a routine operation like this.

We have people in the town of Manitouwadge, a population of 3,500, and they have to travel anywhere from 60 to 240 miles to get a tooth extracted, or to get a filling, or any kind of dental care. It came to my attention just recently in the town of Beardmore that an individual suffering from a heart attack lay on the roadway for three hours before they could get a doctor to pronounce him dead and the provincial police could move him on. These are not just isolated instances; there are instances of this kind every day in northwestern Ontario, and I think it is high time that this government accepted some responsibility for providing this kind of care for our people in the north.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): I would just like to add one sentence, Mr. Speaker, in support of this resolution. I think, considering the seriousness of this, it might be well if we do our best to put the hon. Minister of Health back in full practice in the medical profession.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, on Monday we will resume the Throne Debate.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 1:05 o'clock, p.m.

No. 27



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

First Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Monday, March 18, 1968

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1968

5

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Monday, March 18, 1968

Family Benefits Act, 1966, bill to amend, Mr. Yaremko, first reading 861

General Welfare Assistance Act, bill to amend, Mr. Yaremko, first reading 861

Vocational Rehabilitation Services Act, 1966, bill to amend, Mr. Yaremko, first reading 861

Community Centres Act, bill to amend, Mr. Stewart, first reading 861

Statement re reconstruction of the Welland canal, Mr. Gomme 864

Question to Mr. Haskett re load limits for tandem trucks, Mr. Nixon 865

Questions to Mr. MacNaughton re the Ontario racing commission, Mr. MacDonald 865

Questions to Mr. Randall re rental housing, Mr. Trotter 865

Question to Mr. Randall re the Ontario housing corporation, Mr. J. Renwick 866

Questions to Mr. Yaremko re persons on welfare allowance, Mr. Braithwaite 866

Questions to Mr. Rowntree re consumers' protection conference, Mr. Innes 867

Questions to Mr. Stewart re the Townsend Air Service, Mr. Innes 867

Questions to Mr. Stewart re Ontario's sugar beet farmers, Mr. Makarchuk 868

Questions to Mr. Brunelle re use of aluminum powder in mines, Mr. Ferrier 868

Questions to Mr. Wishart re Viola and George MacMillan, Mr. T. P. Reid 868

Questions to Mr. Brunelle re forest unit study, Mr. T. P. Reid 869

Questions to Mr. Simonett re peak load calls on Hydro, Mr. Edighoffer 869

Questions to Mr. MacNaughton re tax on aviation fuel, Mr. Ruston 870

Questions to Mr. Stewart re the telephone service commission, Mr. Ruston 870

Question to Mr. Stewart re soybean marketing, Mr. Ruston 870

Questions to Mr. Bales re Mr. Henry Pinion, Mr. Stokes 871

Questions to Mr. Wishart and Mr. MacNaughton re gasoline sales, Mr. Martel 871

Questions to Mr. Wishart re Mr. Roland Eyes, Mr. Shulman 871

Resumption of the debate on the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Pilkey, Mr. Sopha 872

Recess, 6 o'clock 893

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

MONDAY, MARCH 18, 1968

The House met at 2:30 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: Today we have as visitors in the west gallery the University of Toronto school of nursing, Toronto, and the girl guides from St. Catharines. I am sure we welcome these youngsters here today.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

THE FAMILY BENEFITS ACT, 1966

Hon. J. Yaremko (Minister of Social and Family Services) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Family Benefits Act, 1966.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, this is one of three bills which I will be introducing, and I will save my explanation upon the introduction of all three.

THE GENERAL WELFARE ASSISTANCE ACT

Hon. Mr. Yaremko moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The General Welfare Assistance Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

THE VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION SERVICES ACT, 1966

Hon. Mr. Yaremko moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Vocational Rehabilitation Services Act, 1966.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, in respect of The Family Benefits Act, there are two amending sections to the Act.

One is to permit the delegation of powers given to the director. The other section, which pertains to all of the three Acts which I have introduced, is a most important one. It really will set the stage for pioneering in this field through the years to come. It is the one that sets up the manner of appointment of the board of review to be as an appointment by the Lieutenant-Governor in council for a specific term, and provides for an appeal to the court of appeal.

Mr. Speaker, you will recall that under the present Family Benefits Act, provision is made for the appointment of a board by the Minister. No appointments were made in view of the fact we had under consideration the extension of the jurisdiction of the board of review in order that other fields, for example fields under The General Welfare Assistance Act in respect of which I made a promise to this House a year ago, could be included.

We were also aware of the fact that Mr. McRuer would likely be making recommendations in respect of this matter and we took the position that it would be the wisest approach to set up the board in the light of his recommendations, and this we are doing.

The amendments to all three of these Acts are part of a package deal, and the same board of review which will be set up will function for all.

THE COMMUNITY CENTRES ACT

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Community Centres Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, in introducing these amendments to The Community Centres Act I think it would be useful to review briefly the purposes of this legislation and the degree to which it has been utilized in the public interest. The Community Centres Act became a part of the statutes of Ontario in 1948, when it replaced the former Community Halls Act.

The original and continuing intent of this Act was to encourage and provide a means whereby community centres and recreational

facilities would be established in all areas of this province. Under the legislation, grants are paid to municipalities, and in some cases to school boards, to assist in the building of community halls, skating arenas, outdoor skating rinks, athletic fields and swimming pools.

As a result of this programme, it is fair to say that hundreds of communities, many without sufficient local resources, have been able to enjoy the benefits of well planned and equipped recreation facilities and a community centre where meetings and other functions might be held. Since 1948, when the Act went into effect, until the end of our last fiscal year, March 31, 1967, The Department of Agriculture and Food has paid a total of $6,474,745 in grants to provide these community facilities. Two hundred and seventy-nine grants were made toward the cost of providing arenas, 169 grants on combined arenas and community halls, 1,397 on athletic fields, 270 on outdoor rinks, 776 on halls and 206 on swimming pools.

Both urban and rural municipalities, including Indian reserves, qualify for these grants, although the impact of the programme has been much greater in rural communities where, prior to the introduction of the Act, there existed few, if any, alternative facilities for recreation or other organized community activities. Under this programme most communities have been able to provide adequate housing for their fairs and exhibitions, their conferences and meetings, as well as their recreation activities. These centres have provided a home for our 4-H and junior farmer activities, meeting places for women's groups and local organizations, and facilities for seed fairs, livestock shows, purebred livestock sales, machinery demonstrations, trade fairs and a multitude of social activities. The fact that in most cases the facilities are in almost constant use, I believe, is evidence that this programme has served the province of Ontario extremely well.

Under the proposed amendments to The Community Centres Act, this legislation is being updated in line with the times. We are recognizing that there are increased costs involved in establishing these facilities. Whereas the grants in the past were based on 25 per cent or a maximum of $5,000 for any single project, we are intending to substantially increase these grants and to broaden the base upon which municipalities may participate.

The new grant system will provide for 25 per cent of the cost of a community hall, skating arena, athletic field, or outdoor skating rink, with a maximum grant of $10,000. In the case of an indoor or outdoor swimming pool the grant will be to the extent of 25 per cent of the cost, with a maximum grant of $15,000. If the grant is to be used for building a combined community hall and skating arena, it will be to the extent of 25 per cent of the cost, with a maximum of $20,000. In the case of a combined community hall and indoor swimming pool, the grant will be 25 per cent of the cost to a maximum of $25,000.

Another amendment to this Act, Mr. Speaker, is of great importance. It provides a means whereby municipalities may join together in providing a community centre, with each municipality eligible to receive grants. The combined grants will be limited to a maximum of 50 per cent of the cost of providing these facilities. In this case the amendments also provide for equal membership on the community centre board from each of the participating municipalities.

The grants will continue to be provided for the establishment of athletic fields, outdoor swimming pools, outdoor skating rinks, and, in unorganized municipalities, community halls in conjunction with schools, but the definition of a school board has been amended to bring it in line with the amendments being introduced by the Minister of Education (Mr. Davis) in The Schools Administration Act.

The amendments brought forward in this new Act clearly indicate the importance with which this government views the local community as a social, business, educational and recreational centre. By increasing the allowable grants toward the provision of these facilities, we are not only assisting the local communities to meet the rising costs of labour and materials, we are encouraging the residents, both young and old, to participate in community activities.

Mr. L. M. Reilly (Eglinton): Mr. Speaker, may I remind you that officially St. Patrick's day was celebrated yesterday, and if it is the wish of the Speaker and the members of this House I would like to pay a tribute to that saint. May I acquaint you, Mr. Speaker, that a short time ago I was at a meeting and a friend of mine was present. He could not be with us for St. Patrick's day as he was going out of town, and he gave me this hat that I perhaps could wear on St. Patrick's day.

Some of the members of the House have been asking me if it was my intention to sing on St. Patrick's day. I thought I should explain to them, Mr. Speaker, that this was

a response at the time when the previous Leader of the Opposition, Senator Andrew Thompson, was in the House.

In the gallery at that time were a number of ladies from his riding who were wearing very attractive hats. He made quite an appeal to them and the ladies presented him with a plant. It was not to be outdone by the Senator that I, of course, responded rather impulsively at the time and broke out in song.

You know the tradition in this House for St. Patrick's day has been for the hon. member for St. Patrick—Kelso Roberts at that time —to say something on St. Patrick's day. I am not sure, now that there is a change in the representative for St. Patrick's whether he is going to say anything or not. Perhaps it would be more fitting, if we left it to Abie's Irish Rose instead of to St. Patrick's day.

But a man does not have to be Irish in order to say something on Irishmen's day, Mr. Speaker.

Last year I remember that the hon. member for Renfrew (Mr. Yakabuski), said a few words on behalf of his constituents who were Irish and, of course, on an Irish day you will receive a lot of cards. I cannot read them all to you, Mr. Speaker, but may I say that being a married man and being accustomed to doing what I am told, it says here a sure-fire way to have fun on St. Patrick's day it to wear this, which I will do. It says: "Kiss me, I am Irish, happy St. Patrick's Day."

I have another card I received, in which the members will be interested. It says: "The luckiest Irish leprechaun that anyone ever met is bringing you a wish or two for your grandest St. Patrick's day yet." It is signed, love from your best girl. This was sent to me from my wife, who is away—

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Good story!

Mr. Reilly: —on a holiday, and in a true Irish style she thought I needed a vacation and she took one for me.

And another card I have reads: "Without you on St. Patrick's day even my shamrock is turning blue." It is from my daughter Lynne, with a P.S., "Happy days."

I have explained to the members of this House, Mr. Speaker, that I come from a very large Irish family. One of the things that was very obvious was when we were youngsters together, some 16 of us including one adopted —I should explain to my wife that my mother was always very fond of children, and there were 16 in the family. I was number 13. It was not unusual in those days to prepare a peck of potatoes for dinner.

I had sent to me here a note in which it says, "a scotch on the rocks—that is scotch on the sham-rock." And it was pointed out that the agriculture department's plant protection division, which is headed by a Scot, is busy intercepting shamrocks sent from Ireland in time for St. Patrick's Day on Sunday. Dr. Donald MacLachlan, the division head, said yesterday the shamrocks, or most of them, have to be confiscated because the soil on the roots may contain two potato-attacking diseases.

Because of his name he has been often accused of being hard on the Irish, he says, but all he is doing is protecting the potato industry.

I want to tell the members of this House that even though a Scot is trying to protect us, I today am also going to protect the potato industry, and I have with me today some Irish potato candies for the members of this House. And with your permission, Mr. Speaker, I would ask the page boys if they would pass them on to the members of this House.

Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to say as far as I am concerned I would like to pay tribute today to one of the greatest and best Irish women I have ever known, my mother.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): Mr. Speaker, now that the other Irishman is through, may I say I am terribly sorry that I do not have a card from my wife. Today, when I asked her whether she thought it would be in order for me to bring greetings on St. Patrick's day as I usually did on St. Andrew's day when my riding was named after the patron saint of the Scots, she said: "Why don't you do everyone a favour in the House and for a change don't fight like an Irishman when you get there."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I cannot let the challenge of the hon. member who spoke previously go unanswered. Certainly I would not expect, nor would I hope that he would not think that I would have my constituents feel, have the Irish in my constituency feel that they are being neglected merely because they have as a representative one who is not of Irish descent. Let me say that while there are, unfortunately very few Irish and Scottish left in my riding, we treasure those who still remain in our riding. While it is probably the most, I suppose, cosmopolitan riding in Canada, nevertheless we have in our riding a great number of ethnic groups who get along

very well together. I often tell them that the reason for that is because of those who came before them—that great Irish immigration. Those people taught everyone how to live peacefully with each other. Mr. Speaker, I want to say to all of Irish ancestry in the province of Ontario, on behalf of the consituents of the riding of St. Andrew-St. Patrick, "the top of the mornin' to ye all."

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): Mr. Speaker, on this memorial day I would like to pay a few respects to our fellow Irishmen on the 17th. I have been born and raised around them. I might say I do not think I have in my background any blood relations but on the other hand you are never sure. That is a story I think I heard from my grandfather or father at one time.

But anyway I cannot but recall a few things that went on a few years ago in my own area when the Hon. Paul Martin started his campaigning in the Liberal Party in Essex East and there were some great arguments. I can remember Mr. Tom Fitzgerald and Mr. James Murphy used to argue going all the way down the road. You could hear them for half a mile arguing with one another about politics. Then, of course, some of the other younger fellows, when they imbibed a little, sometimes would come home the next day with the odd scrape and scratch but ready to go to work bright and early the next morning. We are all proud of this great people, and in my own area we call it Byrnedale, an all Irish settlement, with the Dunns, the Traceys, the Byrnes, the Mullins and the Murphys. In my own township where I have the privilege of being reeve, there is a grand lady there, Mrs. Thomas Shanahan, who I think is 80 years old and raised 13 children. You could not find a finer lady in Ontario than this one, so I think we should pay great respect to our Irish friends today.

Mr. Speaker: I think, perhaps, I should join the member for Eglinton in bringing a little sobriety to this particular gathering. All of us in the House have noticed the legislative attendants who usher our visitors to the gallery and look after things for Mr. Speaker. The dean of them all I think is a man who just missed being born on St. Patrick's day. I think the members would like to join me in acknowledging the 84th birthday today of Captain the Rev. L. B. McPherson, who looks after the press gallery. The Minister of Highways has a statement.

Hon. G. E. Gomme (Minister of Highways): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I should like to announce to the House an important development in respect to the reconstruction of the Welland canal.

Extensive negotiations have been carried out by the officials of my department and the St. Lawrence seaway authority for the construction of the two new tunnels on the section of the canal that is now being built. I am happy to report that we have now reached an agreement with the federal authority which will allow the work to be carried out under a revised federal-provincial cost sharing formula. The estimated cost of the two projects is in excess of $43 million. One project will be a combination highway and railway tunnel at Town Line Road, costing about $30 million. The other will be a four-lane highway tunnel costing about $13 million which will be located at the East Main Street, both in the city of Welland. Work on both projects is scheduled to begin in the spring of 1969 and plans call for their completion in the spring of 1971.

Under the new financial agreement the seaway authority will assume the cost of putting underground the lanes of existing highways feeding into the city, and The Department of Highways will assume the cost of any additional lanes incorporated in the tunnel to expand the road facility. In the case of the highway-railway tunnel at Town Line Road which will contain two lanes for vehicular traffic and tracks for a central crossing point for all railways traversing the canal, the entire cost will be borne by the seaway authority. The east main tunnel will contain four lanes for vehicular traffic and because this is an expanded facility, the cost will be shared equally by The Department of Highways and the seaway authority.

These installations will form part of a $110 million, 8.3 mile section of the canal that is being constructed to divert the seaway shipping from passing through the city of Welland. This new financial agreement is more favourable to the province than the financial arrangement covering the construction of the $24 million Thorold tunnel, in which the department pays two-thirds of the cost, and the seaway authority, one-third.

This four lane project, the first to be undertaken, is scheduled for completion this fall. The new agreement has a long term aspect with both parties accepting it as the formula to be adopted for financing any future tunnel project resulting from the Welland canal reconstruction programme. Any additional tunnel projects to be undertaken must await

disclosure of further plans of the seaway authority to complete its programme.

A similar announcement on the subject is being made to the House of Commons by the Hon. Judy LaMarsh on behalf of the federal Minister of Transport, the Hon. Paul Hellyer. I regret to inform the House that this announcement was released prematurely by federal sources who made it available to the Welland newspapers on Saturday.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Brant has a question.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Transport. Is the Minister considering raising the maximum load limit for tandem trucks beyond 42,000 pounds, especially in the regions where the transportation of pulpwood seems to indicate the economic necessity of such a change?

Hon. I. Haskett (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, section 52(2) of The Highway Traffic Act limits the gross weight for tandem axle trucks to 42,000 pounds. We have no plans at the present to raise this. Load limits are determined by highway engineers, having regard to the protection of the roads, and recently we have been having more reports than usual of excessive damage to the roads in areas where pulpwood is being hauled. The current Department of Highways studies will probably indicate that no significant changes are likely to be recommended in the maximum weight for this type of vehicle.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Brant has a further question?

Mr. Nixon: I had a question for the Premier (Mr. Robarts) and he is not in the House, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: I beg your pardon, that is the case.

The member for York South.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): My question, Mr. Speaker, is to the Provincial Treasurer. Has the Ontario racing commission authorized: (a) night thoroughbred racing; (b) Sunday racing, for the year 1968?

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Provincial Treasurer): Mr. Speaker, the categorical answer to both questions is "no", although I should maybe qualify them to say that if and when policy or legislation in either of these areas is to be considered, it will be first considered in the Legislature.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I am just trying to sort this out in my mind. By way of a supplementary question then, I take it, from the Provincial Treasurer, that this is a decision to be made here rather than by the racing commission itself?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Speaker, I think that is quite appropriate. The racing commission has no jurisdiction, of course, in the area of government policy, and it certainly has no jurisdiction in terms of legislation.

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Economics and Development.

In view of the representations made over the weekend by 100 Regent Park residents concerning the takeover of that housing area by Ontario housing corporation, what guarantees will the Minister give that the rents will not be raised and that residents will not be evicted after the takeover?

Hon. S. J. Randall (Minister of Economics and Development): The housing portfolio of the city of Toronto comprises Regent Park north, which is operated on a rent-geared-to-income basis, and a number of limited dividend projects in which rentals are fixed.

In the case of Regent Park north, the housing authority of Toronto recently announced that rentals will be based on the national rental scale, commencing May 1, 1968. This is the same rental scale used by Ontario housing corporation in all of its developments, therefore, there would be no change under OHC management.

In the limited dividend projects there is not only a fixed economic rental but also a maximum income of $5,100 for admission and a maximum of $5,950 for continued occupancy. In the event OHC is requested by the city to take over its housing units, and this is approved by the federal, provincial and Metro governments, these developments would be administered on the basis of the national geared-to-income rental scale. And there would be no maximum or minimum income qualifications as presently apply in the Toronto limited dividend projects.

From the figures which have been provided to OHC by the city, it would appear the average income in the limited dividend developments is in the order of $3,800 per annum. This would result in an average rental on the national scale of $77. The current average fixed rental in the limited dividend developments is $95 a month. Within these averages,

it must be appreciated that a small number of families may, on the basis of the national scale, be required to pay a slightly higher rent.

However, it is anticipated that the large majority of tenants will benefit from reduced rentals. This premise is borne out by the fact that of eight applications for Ontario housing units received from present tenants of Moss Park, rentals would drop by an average of approximately $16 per month.

In the mater of evictions, Ontario housing corporation does not evict tenants on the basis of income. The only reason why OHC does, from time to time, obtain possession of a dwelling unit is where there has been gross misuse of the property, anti-social behaviour resulting in disruption of the neighbourhood, or wilful non-payment of rent. In every such instance there is a thorough investigation of the matter by the board of directors of OHC, including contact with social agencies, before the decision is made.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Wilful non-payment of rent! Does the Minister mean if they have not got any money then it is wilful?

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Speaker, I was wondering if the Minister would permit a supplementary question?

In view of your statement that rents in some cases would be higher and, in many cases, evidently lower, is there going to be any means of communication set up to so inform the tenants? Because under the circumstances I think they are taking a lot of unnecessary criticism.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Unfortunately we, as I said last Thursday afternoon, have made a proposition to the city of Toronto which has not yet been accepted. I have not received the resolution of the city of Toronto. I think you can appreciate we are in no position to inform the tenants what is going to happen, until we have been invited formally to take the operation over. I think a lot of this criticism is something they just have to bear until people find out the facts.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Economics and Development.

Does the Ontario housing corporation own Munro Street in the Don Mount urban renewal area from Dundas Street south to Kintyre Avenue, and does Ontario housing corporation own the land on which the home of Mrs. Dorothy Graham at 60 Munro Street is located?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Speaker, in answering the hon. member for Riverdale, the Ontario housing corporation does not own Munro Street from Dundas Street to Kintyre Avenue. This is still the ownership of the city of Toronto.

The Ontario housing corporation does not own the land on which the home of Mrs. Dorothy Graham at 60 Munro Street is located.

Mr. L. A. Braithwaite (Etobicoke): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Social and Family Services.

On Friday last, Metro Toronto welfare commissioner, John Anderson, stated that the province is considering a plan to allow persons on welfare to do odd jobs without being penalized by welfare allowance reduction. Will the Minister indicate what progress has been made in connection with this suggestion?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, this question relates to the provision of an exemption on earnings as an incentive to encourage recipients of welfare to obtain employment on a part-time basis. The present general welfare assistance regulations do not allow such an exemption.

The provincial Family Benefits Act does provide for an exemption. This Act, you will recall, provides assistance to disabled, blind, aged and widowed people.

The particular question is a very broad one with many ramifications. The matter has been brought to the attention of the Minister of Labour (Mr. Bales) and the Minister of Economics and Development for their information and consideration, so this problem may be come to grips with from all angles.

Mr. Braithwaite: Will the Minister accept a supplementary question?

In the low rental projects, has the Minister given any thought to the setting up of machinery, or an office, for assistance in the securing of part-time employment, or supplementary employment, as far as welfare recipients are concerned?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: This has not been done.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Premier, and as he is absent, he could take it as notice.

Mr. Speaker: The arrangement has been that if a Minister is not present, the question will be withheld.

I would like to say today, for the benefit of several members who have questions for the Minister of Education, that this is a week when the Minister of Education is going to be coming and going, as we all know, and I have arranged with his office that questions may be asked and they will be taken as notice. The Minister will endeavour then to arrange to be in to give the answers. So those members who have questions for the Minister of Education can give them, whether he is in the House or not today.

Mr. Singer: What makes this week any different from any other for the Minister of Education?

Mr. Speaker: I am sure that the members know that this is the week when the great educational conventions are going on in this city, and they would not be effective without the presence of the Minister of Education.

An hon. member: Oh, I am sure they would not.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Oxford has the floor.

Mr. G. W. Innes (Oxford): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs.

In view of the recent provincially sponsored consumers' protection conference in Woodstock, will the Minister hold open conferences on this subject in the near future, and will the Minister have such conferences in the evening in order that the average wage earner can attend and present his views?

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Mr. Speaker, every effort was made to make the Woodstock conference as open as possible. Invitations went out to a broadly based cross-section of the population, including some 75 persons who were presumed to be consumers, and did not, as such, have a special affiliation with any specific group.

Special care was taken as well to invite people who were part of various community-conscious organizations. This was done in the hope that these people would be able to report back to their respective memberships and, in that manner, extend the intent of the conference.

Unfortunately, one of the worst snow storms in recent memory blanketed south-western Ontario on the eve of the conference and this had the effect of keeping many people away. Included in this group, were those consumers from outlying areas who otherwise might have attended.

I share the hon. member's interest in having the average wage earner attend these conferences. As indicated, we do attempt to involve average consumers by inviting a substantial number of persons who, we hope, will communicate with others and their families.

In addition to this overall approach, my department follows up consumer protection conferences with an offer to provide both speakers and written material on request. This, I suggest, makes it possible for any group of wage earners, having perhaps heard about our programme through the press, or a relative, or a friend who attended a conference, to schedule a meeting appropriate to the needs of the local organization concerned.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member will appreciate, I am sure, that the Woodstock conference was the second of four which will be held during the first half of this year. The first such conference took place at the Lakehead in early February. These initial conferences are in the nature of being pilot projects. Our hope is to learn from them and, using knowledge and experience as a basis, to improve on the efforts made to date to make the public aware of its consumer rights and responsibilities under the laws of Ontario.

Mr. Innes: Could I ask the Minister a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker?

Does the Minister not feel that the evenings would be more conductive to the working man to attend these conferences than the afternoon?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: I think the evenings would be ideal for a single one-speaker project or effort, yes.

Mr. Innes: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Agriculture and Food, notice of which has been given:

1. Would the Minister inform the House whether his department at any time contracted Townsend Air Service for the rental of an aircraft for the purposes of the business of his department?

2. If the answer to the foregoing is in the affirmative, did the Deputy Minister of The Department of Agriculture and Food, Mr. E. Biggs, operate the aircraft as a pilot?

3. On August 24, 1967, did Mr. Biggs rent an aircraft from Tonwsend Air Service and, if he did, was rental for the purposes connected with the business of the department?

4. On August 24, 1967, was Mr. Biggs involved in an accident with such aircraft? and,

5. If the aircraft was being used for purposes of the department, then what steps does the Minister intend to take to compensate Townsend Aircraft Service for the damages sustained to the aircraft on that day?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, in answer to the questions—first of all, one—the main part of the question—my deputy informs me that he did indeed engage an aircraft from Townsend Air Service for purposes of the department on that day.

The answer to the second question is yes; and to the third question is yes.

The answer to the matter of liability is that the department is not liable for compensation to the Townsend Air Service under the terms and conditions of the lease. Any damage to the aircraft was covered by insurance.

Mr. M. Makarchuk (Brantford): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Agriculture and Food.

Will some form of transitional assistance be provided to Ontario's sugar beet farmers?

The second question is, will the government be willing to act as an arbitrator in possible disputes that may develop between sugar producers and the company, as to the depreciated value of the sugar beet producing equipment?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, this matter of transition of sugar beet growers from the traditional crop of producing sugar beets, to that of producing another crop, goes back a great many years. As a matter of fact, only in what might be considered in the space of time a comparatively few years ago, there were something like 4,000 sugar beet growers in the province of Ontario.

In 1967, there were something like 900 representing, I believe, 800 families who were producing sugar beets. Now, it would seem to me that during that period of time, which involved the closing of the Wallaceburg plant and the greatly reduced acreage that was being provided for the Chatham sugar beet plant, that there were a great many farmers who decided that the transition could be made rather easily, and they did do this.

I cannot say what arrangements are being made between the producers and the Canada Dominion Sugar Company to take some of this harvesting equipment off the market. The company advised me, as I told the hon. member just last week that, in conversations we have had with the company, and the conversations that have been held between the company and the sugar beet producers marketing board, they had agreed to take off the hands of the producers, any harvesting and, I believe, any mechanical thinning equipment that was purchased in the last two years since they indicated that they would attempt to keep the sugar plant open at Chatham.

These prices would have to be negotiated between the growers and the company, with depreciation taken into consideration. However, I was advised by the company last week that, due to the legal action that has been entered into by one of the farm organizations against the company, they preferred to wait for the offer of these negotiations until they discovered the outcome of the legal action that has been reportedly brought against them.

Mr. Speaker: I would advise the member for Cochrane South that the Minister for Lands and Forests will accept and answer the question that is directed to the Minister of Mines.

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): My question is four-fold: 1. Why is aluminum powder used in some gold mines? 2. Does it have any harmful effects on the miners' health? 3. Does it affect, in any way, the chest X-ray of a miner? 4. If so, what are the effects?

Hon. R. Brunelle (Minister of Lands and Forests): Mr. Speaker, in answer to the hon. member for Cochrane South: 1. Aluminum powder is used as a prophylaxis in the prevention of silicosis. 2. It has been proved that in the quantity prescribed it is harmless to any person, whether he has started to develop silicosis or not. 3. Aluminum has no effect on X-ray film.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): I have a question for the Attorney-General. Will he indicate to the House what progress has been made at this stage concerning the charges against Mrs. MacMillan and her husband in connection with defrauding the public and fraudulently affecting the market shares of Windfall Mines?

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): Viola and George MacMillan had been charged and committed for trial on the

charge of defrauding the public, or the charge of fraud. I think that the member may be aware that Viola MacMillan was charged on a separate charge of wash trading, and perhaps he is also aware that this case after conviction and appeal was just concluded earlier this year. We felt it wise to have that case established as a conviction before proceeding on the charge which is a joint charge against Mr. and Mrs. MacMillan. Now, I should think that the charge against Mrs. MacMillan, having been completed, we can get on reasonably quickly to the charge against both Mr. and Mrs. MacMillan. I would say, however, and I would like to take the opportunity to tell the House, that counsel for George MacMillan has been engaged on perhaps the longest civil case—a very important civil case—in Ontario history.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Does the Minister know what the judges tell me? They tell me to get another lawyer.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Well, I may say that thought is not original with the judges.

Mr. Sopha: That is a job that John Robinette can do.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Yes, the member has mentioned his name now. Mr. Robinette has been engaged on that case, which is drawing to a close. It is in argument now.

Mr. Sopha: The Minister will have to install Mr. Justice Donnelly. He told me to get another lawyer.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: We have that thought as well, I might tell the hon. member. Progress is being made. I think that I have answered the hon. member's question.

Mr. T. P. Reid: I have another question for the Minister of Lands and Forests, notice of which has been given. Can the Minister advise when the forest unit study of his department will be completed and made available to members?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Speaker, in answer to the hon. member for Rainy River, I hope to table within the next ten days a condensed report of the forestry study.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Will the Minister accept a supplementary question? He said a condensed version. Will a full version be made available to members of the House?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Speaker, the full version of the report will be in the library. At this stage it is a very thick volume, and at this time I cannot say that it will be available to each member, but it will certainly be available in the legislative library.

Mr. H. Edighoffer (Perth): I have a question for the Minister of Energy and Resources Management. Can the Minister assure the House that all peak load calls upon Hydro will be met in the future?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Ontario Hydro continues to expand its resources, through its construction programme, with the objective of providing sufficient reserve to meet the electrical requirements of the province.

Mr. Edighoffer: I have a further question for the same Minister. Will he advise advertising agencies concerned that promotional announcements, including those to be included in the Barnum and Bailey and Ringling Bros. circus sponsored programmes on the CBC (TV) network tomorrow night, March 19, 1968, that such commercials should not promise to imply services that may not be available; that the text should be so written as not to encourage power demand during peak periods; and that graphic methods be used in institutional advertising to underline the heavy power use equipment—stoves, heaters, and so on, as distinct from the lighter demand of illumination—so that the people will know where effective power economies can be made?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: While Ontario Hydro has indicated that its margin of reserve capacity is presently less than normally carried on its system, one must bear in mind that the maximum winter peak exists only for a few minutes during a relatively few winter days, and for the remainder of the time, there are adequate resources and reserves to meet demand. In the early hours of the morning the demand for power is only about 55 per cent of that between five and six o'clock at night, and the peak in the summer is only about 75 per cent of the winter peak. One must also bear in mind that Ontario Hydro will be adding substantial resources to its system over the next two or three years. Its marketing programme, which demonstrates the merits of electric energy and places them effectively before the people, are maintained at this time to ensure that the resources being added to the system will be employed to full advantage to combat rising costs.

Furthermore, experience demonstrates that the cost of building distribution and service facilities is practically the same whether these

facilities carry much or little energy. If Ontario Hydro and the municipal utilities were to substantially reduce their promotional efforts for certain key loads and lose these loads for all time by default, they would quickly find themselves locked out of new subdivisions by their aggressive competitors, except for lighting, TV and small appliances. The key to combating costs and keeping rates low is to build load diversity into the system; in other words, to utilize the system to the greatest possible extent. In general, the more kilowatt-hours of energy Hydro sells, the lower the unit cost; the fewer kilowatt-hours of energy supplied, the higher the unit cost.

For these reasons, it is not the intention of my department to make representations of the type suggested.

Mr. Speaker: Does the member wish to ask a question of the Minister of Education? The member for Perth still has the floor.

Mr. Edighoffer: Mr. Speaker, a question for the hon. Minister of Education.

In view of the anti-smoking campaigns in Owen Sound and Lindsay and the impressive support of such campaigns by the tuberculosis association and the cancer society, will the Minister initiate an anti-smoking campaign throughout the schools of the province?

Mr. Ruston: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Provincial Treasurer.

Is there any consideration given, with the recent increase of airplane fuel tax to three cents a gallon, that the airlines may avoid refuelling the bulk of their planes in Ontario and have this carried out in the province of Quebec where the tax is only one cent per gallon?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Speaker, there is no reference to the Quebec tax in the question I received. However, I can say to the hon. member that, of course, this matter was taken into consideration, and it was felt that the nominal increase of one cent would not provide sufficient incentive for the refuelling that the hon. member makes reference to. It is my opinion, and we verified it this morning, that the tax in Quebec is presently two cents and in Manitoba two cents, so there is only one cent disparity between the other two jurisdictions and Ontario.

Mr. Ruston: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Agriculture and Food.

Is the Minister aware of any talks held by the Ontario telephone service commission with Bell Telephone Company of Canada with regards to Rochester municipal telephone system, prior to recommending to Rochester municipal telephone system that they contact Bell Telephone Company of Canada as to obtaining a price for the sale of their system, and if so, is it the usual manner for a government agency to recommend only one company for such information?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, the commission was contacted by the Rochester municipal telephone system of Essex county when that telephone system decided that, for economic reasons, it would be wise to consider the possibilities of sale of its system. The Ontario telephone services commission was contacted, in our department, and I am advised that the head of the commission advised the company, the Rochester municipal telephone system, that it should contact a number of companies for estimates. This, I believe, it did.

Several companies were contacted and I believe that the estimates that were given were of sufficient encouragement to the company that it decided to call for tenders and I believe having done this, it is now likely to open these tenders, and to make a decision as to whether it will sell the company. My information does not indicate, as is intended in the question, to mean that the Ontario telephone services commission advised them to contact one company only.

Mr. Ruston: Mr. Speaker, I just might say as a supplementary, that there was a letter to that effect.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, if I may, that there was a letter to that effect and in that letter as I recall, it suggested that they might contact several companies, for instance, the Bell. But, in a subsequent telephone conversation that was made by the Rochester telephone system to our commission, it was abundantly made clear to them that there were many other telephone companies who might be interested and he was given the names and addresses of those companies to contact.

Mr. Ruston: Mr. Speaker, another question for the hon. Minister of Agriculture and Food.

Has the Minister considered the matter of granting the power of price negotiations to the Ontario soybean marketing board?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, I can hardly comprehend this question, coming from a member who represents an area where soybeans are grown and have been grown for a great many years.

Mr. Sopha: That is not his fault.

Mr. Singer: And I say answer the question accordingly, without any moral diatribes.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: And I shall answer the question, because the question indicates that this power does not exist. It has existed for years.

An hon. member: Better consult the legal department.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order! Order! The member for Sandwich-Riverside has the floor.

Mr. F. A. Burr (Sandwich-Riverside): Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

Is the Minister now able to assure tenants that they will reap the full benefit from the shelter grant?

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, on Thursday last, the member asked the question on the same subject and the answer has not changed in that time.

Mr. Burr: Mr. Speaker, the question did not mention tenants on Thursday at all. However, I thank the Minister for the answer.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Labour.

Will the Minister prevail upon the Minister of Highways to assure Mr. Henry Pinion, of Schreiber, a former employee of the Minister of Highways' department, that he will be paid for 188 hours of overtime accumulated before leaving the employ of The Department of Highways?

Hon. D. A. Bales (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the Minister of Highways will be looking into the matter and I would think that the question should really be directed to the Minister of Highways.

Mr. Stokes: Mr. Speaker, will you permit a supplementary? This has already been dealt with by the Minister of Highways and I was wondering if your department would look into it from The Fair Employment Practices Act?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Speaker, I am not aware that it has been dealt with entirely by the Minister of Highways. I understand that there has been some correspondence, but I am not sure that it has been completed.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): Mr. Speaker, a question for the Attorney General. Does the jurisdiction of the Legislature of the province of Ontario extend to dealing with oil company pricing policy by legislation similar to The Gasoline Licensing Act of the province of Nova Scotia?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, in our opinion the province would have jurisdiction to control the price of oil, petroleum and petroleum products. This would be *intra vires* the jurisdiction of province in a similar way to the Nova Scotia legislation.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): That is useful to know; but has the Minister informed the Provincial Treasurer or the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs?

Mr. Martel: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Treasurer of Ontario. Will the Treasurer of Ontario table the agreement, or a copy of the agreement, between Her Majesty the Queen in right of the province of Ontario, represented by the Treasurer of Ontario, and the oil companies as collectors of the gasoline tax?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Speaker, the answer is yes, and I now table a copy of the standard agreement between the Treasurer of Ontario and the oil companies of the province.

Mr. Speaker: The member for High Park.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Attorney General. It is in five parts.

1. Is there any explanation for the fact that Roland Eyes, who died in Orangeville on March 21, 1967, was listed in the post mortem report as having upper natural teeth while in actuality he had false teeth?

2. Is there an explanation for the man being described as 176 pounds and black haired?

Mr. Speaker, I must say that part two of this question was much more detailed in light of the fact that this particular Minister complained of lack of detail in a previous question.

Mr. Speaker: Order! Will the member please place the question as it has been submitted to, and—

Mr. Shulman: But sir, I am making a complaint to you about the fact that this question has had a portion removed by your office.

Mr. Speaker: This is not the question. This is not the place to make the complaint. This is a place to ask a question and—

Mr. Shulman: But sir, this is before the orders of the day and I must dispute with you, sir, I think this is the time to make the complaint.

Mr. Speaker: Then I must refer the member to the rules of the House which state that a question shall not contain a statement of fact, and the second part of the question submitted to me this morning contained a statement purporting to be a fact and I ask that it be removed. The question is properly phrased as it is and the member will please proceed.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, I must point out to you that on a previous occasion this particular Minister complained that a similar question did not contain enough details or enough facts. I was trying to avoid that very situation here. However, I shall continue.

Mr. Speaker: I would call to the member's attention that in the future he will run into much less trouble if he will follow the rules of the House which do state that the question is to be a question and not a statement of fact.

Mr. Shulman: Sir, again I must point out to you that the Minister should not complain when the questions contain only the essential facts.

Mr. Speaker: Order! Order! Will the member place his question?

Mr. Shulman: 3. Was the new car involved in this death examined to determine whether mechanical defect was the cause of the accident?

4. Why did Mrs. Eyes' request to Dr. Cotnam for an inquest on May 24, 1967, not receive a reply?

5. Will the Attorney General order an inquest in this case?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, first of all I would like to say there is nothing in the question which I had submitted to me about whether the Attorney General would order an inquest—that seems to be added. I really do not mind that. The question calls for a lot of detail which will require some research. It was just received today and I would ask the hon. member to allow me to take it as notice and I will get the full answer for him.

Mr. Speaker: I would point out that the member read his question as submitted to my office and transmitted by telephone to the office of the Attorney General.

Mr. R. H. Knight (Port Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Education: With respect to the proposed changes in the organization of school boundaries in Ontario,

(a) has the Minister considered the failure of the New York state experience in this regard?

(b) has the Minister consulted the Ontario secondary school teachers' federation? Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: If the member who despatched a note to the Clerk, which was unsigned and illegible, would send another note printed and with his name signed, I am sure he would receive an answer.

Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The 1st order, resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the amendment to the motion for an address in reply to the Speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor at the opening of the session.

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

Mr. C. G. Pilkey (Oshawa): Mr. Speaker, may I take this opportunity to congratulate you and the other hon. members in their recent election to this Legislature? My election to this assembly resulted in the defeat of a friend of mine, but I want to say that I have a great deal of respect for the former member, Albert Walker, who represented Oshawa riding in a most capable manner. His honesty and integrity must have been an asset to this assembly.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Just the wrong party.

Mr. Pilkey: I wish Albert Walker and his wife Gladys the very best in the years that lie ahead.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that I have formulated a resolution; obviously, though,

I have not presented it to either the Conservative or Liberal Party. As a matter of fact, I have not even submitted it to my own caucus group, but I suspect very strongly that they would support this type of resolution. It says:

> Whereas the present Tory government suffers from a sense of complacency and adherence to the status quo and whereas the government is not fulfilling the basic needs of the people of this province, and whereas it lacks the social vision, the dynamic thrust, the crusading spirit that should characterize a modern, progressive provincial government, and whereas the people of this province need a government equal to the new challenges and the new opportunities of the twentieth century technological society, therefore be it resolved that the New Democratic Party, under the leadership of Donald MacDonald, speak out on fundamental issues and express openly our disagreement with the government when in the judgment of the New Democratic Party, members of this Legislature, its failures or inaction require such measures.
>
> And be it further resolved that the New Democratic Party continues to place programmes and policies for the consideration of this government that are essential to the establishment of an overall economic programme, aimed at achieving equity for the salaried and the hourly-wage earners, small businessmen and farmers of this province.

I said, Mr. Speaker, that I did not present this to either of the other parties, and I suspect very strongly the Liberals would not support it either.

The Oshawa riding that I have the privilege to represent is the fastest growing municipality in the province of Ontario and, in my opinion, is first in many other respects. In addition, Oshawa is known from coast to coast as the motor city, which houses the giant General Motors Corporation as well as the largest local union in Canada, namely, local 222, united automobile workers.

We, too, have many corporations and companies, and many other national and international unions. Through this diversity of industrial complexes and trade unions, our city has become one of the highest wage-earning areas in the province of Ontario, as well as one of the highest profit-making areas in Canada. A good place to live and work, and for industry to locate.

I want to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this progress was made in spite of this present government. With the problem—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Pilkey: Did the member not like that resolution? Though Oshawa has been described as an oasis of affluence, there are many current and complex problems. Municipal taxes are continuing to rise at an accelerated rate with little or no relief in sight. The basic shelters grant will give little relief to the distraught taxpayers and it appears that the present Tory government lacks the ability and the know-how to come to grips with this problem, and, at times, leaves me with the opinion that they are a disinterested group in this regard.

During the last election campaign, there was only one leader who understood the problem, and who projected any ideas as to the methods of providing the various municipalities with tax relief, and that was the leader of the New Democratic Party—who has been described as one of the great leaders in our time, and future events will prove this to be an absolute truth.

Mr. Speaker, we have reached a very critical period in our history where we have on one hand, created tremendous abundance and affluence through technological and scientific progress. We have the know-how to place man in orbit and we have created the most destructive weapons ever known to man.

Yet, on the other hand, we have not solved the problem of poverty and deprivation which exists in our own province. The minimum wage is a disgrace in a province which is regarded as the richest in Canada. The organized workers in this province have made a measure of progress, but what about the unorganized workers? Surely we must become their spokesmen, thus guaranteeing them their equity in terms of obtaining and maintaining a decent standard of living.

It is all right for those people in their ivory towers to say, "Let them use some initiative," or that they are too lazy to work. What an excuse to adopt a role of "do nothing" and irresponsible complacency by this or any other government. I suggest that the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Bales) step up to his responsibility in this regard, and may I remind him that one of the things most people do not need is pious platitudes.

Mr. Speaker, in regard to an economic policy, we must develop an income policy designed to achieve maximum economic growth and maximum employment, and to provide the workers of this province with the equity they are entitled to out of increased productivity and the increased profits of our

developing technology within the framework of a stable price structure.

In the area of stable price structure, Mr. Speaker, let me say that I support the idea of a price-wage review board procedure which will bring enlightened public opinion to bear on price and wage determinations without imposing government control. There must be protection for the consumer where prices are unnecessarily and excessively high. In addition, the wages and prices review must not be exclusively related to wages.

What I am saying, Mr. Speaker, is simply this. The corporations of this province must open their books and reveal their profits to public scrutiny as well. The terms of reference must be broad enough so that the general public see the whole question in its broadest perspective. Only through this method could you expect the labour movement to support such legislation.

This government denies free collective bargaining rights to a great number of people in this province, and has argued rather successfully that these workers cannot be allowed to resort to strike action because such action would endanger the health and safety of the general public. Whether this government is right or wrong in legislating in this area, is not open to argument at this point. The facts are, the legislation is there.

What is needed now, and should be implemented immediately, is a positive and constructive programme enabling workers in critical and vital industries, to achieve equity comparable with other workers. Compulsory arbitration is not the answer and will only result in these workers eventually falling further behind in terms of real wages, and will have no relationship to the economic facts or their overall needs.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take some time to explain labour's role in this province of ours. It is my opinoin that organized labour has made a greater contribution in the last 25 years to the economic and social well-being of a greater number of people in Ontario than any other organization, and that includes this government. From the very beginning it was a gigantic struggle—sometimes against the company, and at other times against the combined forces of the company and the government.

You had people like former Premier Mitchell Hepburn, who threatened to use force if the CIO attempted to enter Ontario. In spite of Mr. Hepburn, the CIO planted their banner firmly in the province and won the struggle for recognition. The province of Ontario has a history of labour's involvement in bringing about basic constructive social changes, so that human dignity and social justice could be made more universal and insuring the superiority of men over machines, and the priority of human rights over the priority of property rights. The labour movement in Ontario has made progress in the spirit of advancing the frontiers of human betterment and human brotherhood.

What has been accomplished in the past 25 years? In the beginning, it was understood that labour needed job protection, and seniority became a collective bargaining factor. The struggle for economic justice brought thousands of men and women together to find answers to their problems of gaining a decent standard of living, security in their old age, and dignity in their place of work.

In that struggle, there was no easy road. Nothing came on a gold-plated spoon. There were sacrifices for every single gain. The workers faced the most powerful and richest corporations in the world but, despite their power, the working people of this province have won a measure of economic justice and have demonstrated in a very practical way that no power can stop the forward progress of free men and women. In my opinion, this historic struggle will never end.

Men and women will search to build a better world; a world in which human progress becomes the essential end purpose for all human efforts. Mr. Speaker, I smile sometimes as I sit here, particularly when the interjections take place in the House and I hear such statements as, "Reuther has you in his back pocket" and my friend, John—the hon. member for London—says the union controls this party and the union controls the labour movement in Canada.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that some of the things that were said in the House on March 5 by the hon. Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Randall) were not exactly true. In addition to that, this Minister made the position very clear that this government had made great strides in providing a number of jobs in the province of Ontario. As a matter of fact if I quote him, he said, "Of the 13,000 manufacturers listed in this province, 8,000 employ 14 people or less". That was part of a statement that he made. Yet you find the hon. Minister of Labour for Ontario, when he was speaking to the Ontario federation of labour workmen's compensation seminar—what did he

say? This Minister hit at the small firm inefficiency. This is what he did. Yet we have the Minister of Economics and Development taking some bows in this House for bringing these small plants into Ontario.

What did the Minister of Labour say in regard to this? He said the inefficiency of many small employers explained why 23 per cent of Ontario's work force made no more than $3,000 in 1965, and 47 per cent made no more than $6,000. Yet the government would indicate that it has made great strides in providing employment. But I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that this is not the kind of employment necessary in the province of Ontario. It will not do the job of supplying the decent standards of living that are necessary.

Also during that discussion, the hon. member for York South and other members of our party talked about this question of the branch plant economy. They talked about foreign investments coming into Canada taking over the economic control of our nation, and they said that it naturally followed that they get political control. I want to say that back last April, the *Globe and Mail,* in an editorial, said that Walter Reuther threatened an invasion on Canada. He threatened an invasion because he said that the Canadian workers ought to receive parity with their American counterparts. He was accused in this editorial of infringement on the sovereign Canadian rights. In that very same paper they did not criticize this government of any infringement on the sovereign Canadian rights. In this very same paper it says, "Flow to Canada of United States capital may set record" and if this is not an infringement on the sovereign rights of Canadians, I would like to know what is.

Yet we find them editorializing when a leader in a trade union movement wants to place a standard of living, or a wage that is necessary in this Canadian industry. He is criticized with a statement, or a threatening of a United States invasion.

Mr. Speaker, this question of wage parity has a lot of implications in my city today, and it has, over the past month, got a number of headlines in the newspapers here in the province of Ontario—even, I suspect, right across the width and breadth of this nation. So I want to talk about this question for a little while. I want to put this question of wage parity in its proper perspective.

Wage parity, as defined by the demands of the UAW, and the auto companies, means an examination of each classification and rates of pay in the industry in Canada and an examination of its counterparts in the United States, with a view of makig the rates of pay equal. The recently negotiated parity agreement with Chrysler will accomplish this gradually during the next three years, and these rates of pay will be equalized by November 15, 1970.

Contrary to the belief of people who have expressed themselves on this subject, it also means parity in the fringe benefit area, as such fringe benefits relate to income for the worker on both sides of the international boundary line.

Parity in respect to fringe benefits does not mean a great deal, because it has already been achieved in most of these areas and has been in effect for some years. I refer to such fringe benefits as statutory holidays, pensions, prescription drug plans, hospital, medical and surgical plans, vacation pay, bereavement pay, shift premium, and jury duty.

In some of these areas the application to Canada is different because of different legislation. This is true in the case of pensions, hospital, medical and surgical plans, and our prescription drug plan, because prepaid services in these areas are more readily available in Canada than they are in the United States and, in some cases, the cost of Canadian plans is cheaper. The application of fringe benefits to the pensioners and their dependents is fairly uniform between our two countries.

Wage parity for auto workers is not an original demand because there are employees —and employers—in several industries in Canada who already have it. I refer to the woodworkers in British Columbia, who have had equality of wages with their counterparts in the United States for a number of years. The paper making industry has equality of rates between Canada and the United States. Our rock miners in Canada enjoy comparative parity with similar occupations in the United States, and the steel workers are quickly approaching this position.

Statements have been made about productivity differences between Canada and the United States, but no clear definition has been made of what is meant by these statements. Do these statements of lower productivity per worker in Canada, as compared to workers in the United States, mean only the workers in the bargaining units? This seems to be the manner in which this is dealt with in most statements, and it would appear on the surface to mean that the Canadian worker is not as hardworking as his counterpart in the

United States. Maybe the emphasis is directed in this fashion because the request for wage parity by the UAW is on behalf of the employees in those bargaining units only, rather than non-bargaining unit employees.

The theory of the difference in productivity put forward in this respect is purely assumption, and is not based on any figures regarding relative productivity that has been available to the people making such statements. The companies have refused to place their comparative productive figures on the table, have refused to divulge them to the government, and have refused to place them before the public.

These highly-educated, well-informed people, responsible for making these limited assumptions about extra costs, have not indicated how they arrived at the assumption except that they seem to believe it is because of a multiplicity of models, shorter runs and a smaller market. Surely they know there are plants in the United States whose productivity levels are less than the larger plants located here in Canada, but pay the same wages as the labour in United States plants under national collective bargaining agreements.

The Minister of Manpower, the Minister of Labour, the Minister of Industry and even the Secretary of State for External Affairs in the federal government have been asked to establish a tri-parte committee—with representation from government, management and labour—for the purpose of going into all aspects of the Canada-United States automotive trade agreement, including a charge that Canadian workers are less productive. This request, although widely publicized, has been turned down by this government.

Mr. Speaker, for the members who are not familiar with the modern methods of time and motion study used to determine the productivity of an individual or a group of employees, the automotive industry uses standard data. This is information gathered in dozens of plants where they are working under similar conditions, and this data is applied to the same classification in Canada. This relieves the companies of the necessity of timing each specific job, and standard data is deemed to be acceptable unless there is a grievance, in which case most contracts provide for a separate time study for the disputed operation.

However, regardless of the Ontario law regarding compulsory arbitration between contract dates, the automotive companies do not permit—are not empowered—to establish a standard. I do not know to what extent this system brings about productive parity, but I am quite sure that it is very helpful in this regard.

In summing up this part of my presentation, I submit that none of the statements you have read or heard, that Canadian auto workers are less productive than their United States counterparts, are based on fact, but solely on theory. I also submit that it is unfair and misleading to deal with one single cost factor of a product, without dealing with all of the cost factors.

Let us take a look at the public statements made by employers who are going to pay for parity. The following quoted statements appeared in the *Globe and Mail* on September 4, 1967, by Malcolm DeNuys, Ford vice-president in charge of labour relations:

> Malcolm DeNuys, Ford vice-president for labour relations said he did not believe wages should be based on productivity, adding that such figures were indefinite and have never been used as a basis for determining the rates of pay of the company's employees. Mr. DeNuys said any productivity figures would be meaningless because of the up and down fluctuation of the company's products.

Let us take a look at the Windsor *Star* dated November 11 reporting on an interview with Walter McCall, automotive writer for the *Star*, with Mr. Ron Todgham, president of Chrysler of Canada Limited, and Mr. K. P. Masurk, executive vice-president of the company. Mr. Masurk stated:

> I think it is important here to point out that the auto trade plan has brought about greater efficiency within the Canadian auto industry, and more opportunity for both the auto manufacturers and the suppliers. Canadian auto makers are now serving a market of 220 million not just 20 million.

Let us look at the representative economic council of Canada's second annual review, which includes a section on prices, productivity and employment. The following statement appears:

> It is apparent that the Canadian economy is able to support a limited number of parity situations. Moreover it need not be cause for undue alarm if parity sometimes figures as an argument in wage negotiations and in the publicity surrounding them.

Let us deal with some of the other cost factors that have been mentioned in public utterances of some of the politicians and knowledgeable press reporters, all of whom have comfortable incomes themselves, and

not having to match them with increased productivity. In the five year period of 1960 through 1966, which includes two years during which the automotive trade pact was just getting started, the average profit after taxes of all manufacturers in the United States was 11.5 per cent on the stockholders' investment. During this same period the Chrysler Corporation averaged 20.3 per cent on their investment; Ford Motor Company averaged 21.9 per cent; and the General Motors a staggering 24.5 per cent.

For every dollar in dividend paid out in 1947, the industry paid out $7.92 to the worker. But for every dollar for dividends paid out in 1966 the industry paid its workers $2.78 in wages. Production pay rolls have increased from $1,999 million in 1947 to $5,138 million in 1966—an increase of 169 per cent. Stockholders' dividends have risen from $241 million in 1947 to $1,847 million in 1966, an increase of 666 per cent, a cost feature without a productivity increase.

I am going to use Chrysler as an example in the following paragraphs because our parity agreement has been negotiated and accepted and also for the sake of brevity, but these examples apply equally to Ford and General Motors and more so to General Motors whose figures are more fantastic. An investor who bought 375 shares of Chrysler stock at a cost of $14,265 at the beginning of 1961 could have settled back in a deck chair for six years and without lifting a finger, his total gain from that investment would have been as much as the Chrysler worker was paid for the six years of hard work. How about his productivity? How about his contribution to inflation? Income with no work at all. In 1966, 47 Chrysler officers and directors paid themselves in salaries and bonuses $4,811,317, or an average of $102,-368 each. This $4.8 million of the 47 Chrysler executives is more than the people of the United States paid to 161 of their top leaders. I say to you: What about the public outcry about their productivity and how about their inflation?

In the past six years, including, two years of the Canada-U.S. automotive trade agreement, the salaries and bonuses of top Chrysler executives had increased up to six times as far as the pay of the average Chrysler worker. Did you hear any expert or press representative inquiring about their increase in productivity? Including overtime and shift premiums, the average Chrysler worker between 1961 and 1966 increased his pay 3.9 per cent per year. During the same period the salary and bonuses of Chrysler vice-president, F. W. Nish, increased at the rate of 15 per cent per year. Vice-president R. S. Wright, received increases of 18.4 per cent per year, and Lynn Townsend, received an average increase of 23 per cent per year. In 1966 the average Chrysler worker in the United States, who is employed 52 weeks a year, earned $7,593, including overtime. In the same year the president of Chrysler, Mr. Townsend, received a pay of $330,000. This was 44 times as much as the average hourly worker. I wonder how much these executives increased their productivity during this period or is the matter of productivity, as related to cost, only applied to the hourly rated worker in the plant because he dares to ask for equality, the cost of which when charged against the market of 220 million people is less than 2 cents an hour, and is reached over a period of three years.

It seems peculiar to me that the people who are worried about the effect of an increase in the standard of living of an hourly rated worker on our economy always seem to have a very comfortable income of their own without having to prove that they deserve it. I strongly resent those unfair comparisons when you consider the people who are responsible for them would probably have to walk to work if it were not for the hard work of the workers I am talking about. Hard and monotonous work by assembly workers sometimes doing their job 40 times per hour over a 20 and 30 year period.

Another matter that is not given any consideration in assessment of over-all costs, and has helped to account for the fantastic figures I have related above, is the effect of automation and technological change in our industry. Because Chrysler is the company where parity has been established, I am going to use it again as an example.

In 1956 Chrysler employed 94,466 workers in its United States plants, who manufactured 962,000 vehicles. In 1966, 94,539 workers produced 1,567,000 vehicles—605,000 more vehicles with only 73 additional workers. Is this not of sufficient public concern to stimulate some self-starter expert, or to cause an investigation or to make a skilled columnist write an article?

Another question which has been frequently posed is the fear that American investments would be curtailed as a result of the demand of the UAW for wage partiy, and the jobs would disappear. The Canada-United States automotive trade agreement contains a number of protective features that we feel will

continue in any reconstruction of its terms. In the first place, the auto manufacturer must continue to produce on the same ratio of vehicles sold in Canada as he had achieved during the base period of August 1, 1963, to July 31, 1964. In addition, he is required to maintain the proportion of Canadian value added to his Canadian vehicle production at least equal to that obtained during the same base period.

There have also been private assurances between the government and these companies that they would not only maintain their existing share of an expanding North American market, but by the 1968 model year and each year thereafter they would expand their total production in Canada from 4 to 7.5 of the market. It is estimated that by 1968 the value of such expansion in production of motor vehicles in Canada would be about 260 million per year.

A fear that has been stressed is that a wage parity programme would be inflationary. This fear is brought about by two assumptions: one, the lack of comparable productivity by the Canadian worker would result in increased prices to the consumer; two, that when wages are increased without comparable increase in productivity there is bound to be a price increase. I believe that the statements I have made in this presentation should take care of these fears, because these plants have expanded and have become as efficient as their United States counterpart and have eliminated the hazard of short-run and multiplicity of models. The companies have had three years to bring about these efficiencies and I believe they have done a pretty good job.

The comparative financial position of these companies with the rest of the manufacturers in the United States should indicate to everyone here that a price increase is not necessary. As a matter of fact, I firmly believe that the auto companies could afford to take a little less, pay wage parities, and still make far more on their investments than the average manufacturer in the United States and Canada. However, you need not rely upon my statement. The Windsor *Star*, dated November 11, had this headline: Todgham—No Peril in Parity".

In the first place he said he did not believe the parity agreement will affect production or employment in the company's plant. Second, when commenting on warnings from some quarters that the winning of wage parity for Canadian auto workers would be inflationary, Mr. Todgham said the historic pact is no more inflationary than any other thing around us in Canada.

In addition, the full impact of parity does not hit Chrysler for three years from November 15, 1967. During this period they do not pay the first payment towards base parity until June 1968 when they pay 10 per cent; in the case of a production worker, about 3 cents an hour. For each six months subsequent to June 1968 they pay 15-20-25-30 per cent respectively. Percentage-wise this looks like a considerable amount, but I do not believe the highest payment that will be made during this period will be more than 7 cents per hour if applied only against the Canadian section. If applied against the whole market it would be 0.8 cents per hour.

It has been said many times—and I repeat —that if these companies cannot achieve the kind of efficiency that will provide the Canadian consumer with comparative prices with the United States and the Canadian wage earner with comparative wages with the United States and continue to provide the kind of employment that has been provided during the past three years, then the purpose of the Canada-United States automotive trade agreement, sir, has not served the Canadian or the United States public, the Canadian or the United States consumer or the industry or the wage earner as it was designed to do.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to touch on a few other things that I think are essential to the well-being of the people of this province. I want to first talk about education. I say, Mr. Speaker, we must provide educational opportunities to facilitate maximum growth and development of Ontario's children and youth. Never in the history of our country has it been so necessary for young citizens to begin their working years equipped with adequate education. But hundreds of workers' children are losing out in the battle for higher education, and when they lose out so does Ontario.

Most people assume that any qualified high school graduate can go to university or get advanced vocational training if he or she is willing to work hard enough. This may have been true some years ago but is certainly not a fact today. The cost of higher education is going up and it is obvious that many workers simply cannot afford to send their children to university. With the workers and their families making up the greatest percentage of this province's population, I would hazard a guess, Mr. Speaker, that less than 25 per cent of the university students come from workers' families earning less than $7,000

per year and a much smaller percentage of students coming from families with incomes under $6,000 a year.

The denial of higher education has robbed Ontario of its best young minds and condemns them to lives of undeveloped potential and lower earnings. Mr. Speaker, the opponents to increased finances for education use the argument that it costs too much. But I say that provincial and federal funds for education are the best investment we could possibly make. Every provincial and federal dollar spent on education takes that much pressure off local property taxes, which bears most unfairly on wage earners.

It has been pointed out that the United States World War II veterans paid back the entire cost of their federally financed GI bill in less than 15 years, because college education increased their earnings and enabled them to pay more taxes. If this is to be a province of equal opportunity then this government ought to provide free university education or advanced vocational education for all students who can benefit from it, thus creating equal educational opportunities. We must never forget good schools and good education is a passport to a better future for Ontario's children and young people.

Mr. Speaker, I want to spend just a moment on the regional educational system as projected by the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Davis). I just want to make this comment. If his attempt to rationalize the educational system in Ontario is nothing more than a different distribution of the tax burden from one municipality to another, then I personally think he is wrong. In other words, if we take the city of Oshawa as an example, where it is obvious the shift to the Oshawa taxpayer be greater in terms of property tax for education, then I say the hon. Minister should reappraise his position. Whether it be Oshawa or any other municipality in Ontario, the tax on real property for educational costs should not increase and the province should absorb more of the increased costs.

Mr. Speaker, I think one of the most pressing crises affecting nearly every urban community in our province is the question of housing. This government should set a goal and set out to reach that objective. This goal should be defined as a decent home and a suitable living environment for every family in Ontario. The present government's present home plan is not giving any significant relief to the present situation. Though the government's intentions may have been good, the cloud of suspicion has been gathering to the extent that the programme has strictly a political one at the time of the recent last election.

Ontario's population growth will not be suspended while this government faces up to the task of providing decent housing. Thousands of new families will be formed in the next ten years and they will need housing. We will not have a crisis by then, rather we will have chaos as well as a catastrophic situation. Men and women and children who lack decent homes are not enjoying their rightful share of the wellbeing and dignity which should characterize every area of life in Ontario.

I am convinced that the shortage of housing cannot be found in the lack of ability to build homes, but rather in their inability to provide the resources. Homes today are priced out of the reach of the young people of the province and they simply cannot afford 30 to 40 per cent of their income to spend on housing payments. What we need is a huge public housing programme, and a lowering of interest rates to potential home owners.

This government should understand by now that this housing problem is not going to correct itself with the passage of time. You cannot sweep it under the rug. If it is there it is real, and it needs action now! The other part of the government's goal should be suitable living environments. Homes are parts of neighbourhoods; neighbourhoods are not only clusters of homes—they are streets, schools, libraries, hospitals, shopping centres, communities' facilities, access routes to other municipalities, and to places of employment.

I am suggesting to you that if we are going to face up to these matters we also need a Ministry of Housing and Urban Development and that the Minister should spend full time in finding a solution to this problem, and the increasing problem as it faces us today.

I want to spend a moment also on a problem that this government, I suspect, does not appreciate in its full implication. This is the recent announcement by the hon. Premier (Mr. Robarts) of the province that medicare would be opposed, and I would like to propose that this was really predictable. The hon. Premier was opposed to publicly operated universal medical programmes long before the bogeyman of the inflation threat was raised.

In 1965, when the hon. Premier decided to proceed with the development of an

Ontario medical care scheme, rather than wait for a federal plan, he left no doubt that the province would not be so committed to its own formula that it would be excluded from a superior federal plan. Now what happened to this flexibility? The hon. Mr. Sharp opened the door for opposition from the provinces by saying medicare could cost $1 billion per year. These figures have never been supported by Mr. Sharp, but it did have its effect on the editorial writers, panicked the provinces, and made the electorate somewhat wary.

Before the Minister threw out his unsupported cost of medicare, the annual cost of it was estimated to be from $820 million to $880 million. The largest part of this amount is already being financed by Canadians by paying doctors' bills and private insurance premiums.

In addition to some politicians, we have the insurance companies opposing medicare for a very obvious reason, to protect their very profitable insurance business. On the other hand, you have the medical associations in opposition which is rather difficult to rationalize. The Saskatchewan experience has resulted in more doctors, more money for the doctors, and no loss of the freedom that they keep talking about.

What possible difference can it make if the cheques for medical care come from the individual, the private company, or the government? Surely, if there is a more equitable and economical way to provide the financial burden imposed by illness, the doctors should support it. This government has been the outspoken opposition to medicare, sir. And the reasons most often advanced are that the government cannot afford medicare, and there are other more important priorities than people's health.

The government knows full well that the cost to Ontario citizens would be cheaper than any private plan available. It would not be necessary to discriminate in health care because of income limits. The Hall commission report in favour of government sponsored medical care has said that we can afford such a scheme, and every person of Ontario will be better off under a sound medicare programme. Let us stop this irrelevant nonsense echoed by some party politicians about a progressive social programme and get on with the job.

Mr. Speaker, in the midst of this affluence in Ontario, we spend, as individuals, about as much as a citizen in Chile to help our fellow man. To quote Galbraith, he said:

> We must find a way to remedy the poverty which affects us in public service, which is in such increasingly bizzare contrast with our affluence in private goods. Such balance is a matter of elementary common sense. To create the demand for new automobiles, we must continue elaborate and functionless changes each year and then subject the consumer to ruthless psychological pressure to persuade him of their importance.
>
> In the meantime, there are large, ready-made needs for schools, hospitals, slum clearance, and urban development, sanitation, parks, playgrounds and policemen, and a thousand other things. Of these needs, almost no one must be persuaded. They are unavailable only because, as public officials of all kind and rank, explain each day with practised skill, the money to provide them is unavailable, the economy is not geared to the most urgent of human wants.

In conclusion, I must say that our economy must be geared to the human needs of the people of this province. The basic questions still remain, how does a free society harness the tools of economic abundance that science and technology provide, and relate that abundance to the needs of the people? Really, it boils down to the basic principles of distribution. When some people get more than their fair share then we begin to feed the forces of imbalance into the economic system.

If we are to continue to grow and expand our economy, then we must achieve this balance between greater productivity power and greater purchasing power. If we have the desire and the will, we can move forward in the great task of translating the twentieth-century technological revolution into the twentieth-century revolution of human fulfillment.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Mr. Speaker, earlier today it was a perfectly proper question from a 25 year old, the youngest member of the House, who at that very youthful age probably has a considerable amount of idealism left in him that may have disappeared from the hearts of some of the more senior, if not, elderly members of this House. He asked the Attorney General (Mr. Wishart), very simply and very matter of fact, when the public of this province might expect that the charges would go forward and be heard against George and Viola MacMillan.

There were in this province—let me interpolate—unquestionably among his constituents in Rainy River there are, no doubt, several if not many more than several who suffered from the machinations in the rise and fall of Windfall Mines Limited during those July days, three or four years ago, I think it is now. My leader tells me 1964, four years ago.

Among the public of this province, there were a good many people, some of them editorial writers, in one case a former Minister —a member of the executive council of this province—who questioned the wisdom of granting such an early parole to Viola MacMillan. That, however, was a matter of government policy and no one outside the executive branch of government and the senior civil servants in the appropriate department will ever know the precise reasons why that early parole was granted.

However, when I heard him ask the question, as is my wont when I am affected personally and I think that the impact upon me might have some useful wider implication, I was moved to interject and I now mention it for the purpose of clearing up that interjection. I hoped the Attorney General would be here when I spoke and I see he has returned to his seat.

I turn to his answer to a question advanced to him on January 25 last year when he was asked whether there were outstanding charges against George and Viola MacMillan. His answer is to be found on page 35 of *Hansard*. I will not read it, but he refers to the nature of the charges. He refers specifically to the one against George MacMillan and then he informs the House that the charge of wash trading against George MacMillan was dismissed at the preliminary enquiry. He says that the charge against Viola MacMillan is to go forward on February 27, 1967, and then he makes this statement and I quote: "The other joint charge is to follow immediately thereafter."

Now it is approaching a year and two months since he made that statement. Still the charge has not been heard. Viola MacMillan has achieved her freedom. The nature of my interjection was to show a parallel with which the Attorney General and myself are familiar.

On September 5 last year, the Premier (Mr. Robarts) exercised the prerogative that is resident in him alone; he chose to call an election.

I had a case where three people were charged with rape—four were charged—I acted for three of them and it was called at Sault Ste. Marie before the hon. Mr. Justice Donnelly on September 11. I asked Mr. Terence Murphy, one of Her Majesty's counsel, learned in the law, to appear during the week of the 5th to importune—I am not certain that is the correct word: I will change that to ask—to ask Mr. Justice Donnelly, in view of the fact that the election had been called, to traverse the case to the next assize which would be in the month of January.

Mr. Justice Donnelly refused the request, made on my behalf by Mr. Murphy. On Friday of that week I journeyed to Sault Ste. Marie and asked for an opportunity to make my request to the learned judge in person. He granted that.

I pointed out to him that an election had suddenly been called, that I would be involved in the political context and that I did not feel that in justice to these accused I would be able to give my best in the defence of a very serious charge such as they faced. He declined to allow that as a valid ground for a traversal, though the traversal would be fore a period of three months at the most.

Subsequently the Attorney General, being the kind of man he is, at my request attended upon Mr. Justice Donnelly, and used the weight of his office to request an adjournment.

An hon. member: Very substantial.

Mr. Sopha: Yes, indeed, there are not many lawyers who are privileged to have a gentleman like the Attorney General intercede on his behalf. The Attorney General did so very graciously and very co-operatively. However, the plea of the Attorney General was itself rejected and Mr. Justice Donnelly said that the case must go forward.

Accordingly I felt there was sufficient time to brief other counsel, which I did, and I felt in my conscience that with my duty to my party I could not, even if I tried, attend my sole efforts to the defence of those people accused of serious crime.

In the result the case was not called because the time for the assizes ran out. There was a good deal of lawlessness in Sault Ste. Marie after about that time; there was a good deal of rape, because they had no fewer than five cases and in one of the cases they had five accused. I had four in mine.

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): It must be the northern air!

Mr. Sopha: Must be.

The case was not called. It went over to the next sittings which, in fact, were held in the month of February. The other counsel whom I had briefed attended upon that trial and it was complete. But I relate to those facts to show the vast difference—you see the vast difference—in treatment and in attitude accorded one counsel in the courts and that which is accorded the counsel that appears for George and Viola MacMillan.

George MacMillan and Viola MacMillan have been indicted for trial since the early part of 1967 and the Attorney General cannot get them to court. He cannot get them to court. I suspect that he is not bending sufficient weight, sufficient effort to get them to court to be tried upon the indictment outstanding against them. Justice delayed is justice denied, says one of the basic maxims of the body of our law.

You see, that cuts both ways; it might apply to George MacMillan also. George MacMillan is denied his trial because of this delay and George MacMillan might very well be acquitted as well might his wife on the joint indictment. We will not know until the evidence is presented and the jury determines. What I would suggest the Attorney General do in this case—

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): I wonder if the hon. member would permit. I think it only fair to point out since he stresses the word, "immediately", the one trial to follow the other immediately, in the question which I answered in this House today, I pointed out that in our approach to the charge against Mrs. MacMillan for wash trading we felt it wise to have the conviction in that case first—

Mr. Sopha: The Minister said that before.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: —and that was appealed —that was only settled earlier this year, I believe, toward the end of January of this year. So that when the hon. member says that one trial was to follow the other immediately I think it only fair to point out that immediately in a court procedure is perhaps a few weeks following that conviction and that was our approach. That was our action and I think we shall get on to trial.

Mr. Sopha: All right. Fine. There is no spirit of vengeance at all, but I say that George MacMillan has never been tried at any time, in any court, in respect to his involvement in the affairs of Windfall and that is the question that my young friend was asking. When will he be tried? I am going to wind it up by leaving this suggestion of how to get him to court, and I will give it to you for free.

Mr. Roderick Cormack QC, goes down to the county court house tomorrow and he sees the chief judge of the county of York and he says, give me a date two months hence.

Then he comes back up here and he writes a letter to Messrs. McCarthy and McCarthy, attention Mr. Robinette, and he says His Honour Judge Martin has fixed Thursday, May 19 for the trial of this action. And if Mr. Robinette is not there on May 19, somebody else will be there on his behalf and the young man from Rainy River will be satisfied, as well as will a good many people in this province.

An hon. member: Good advice!

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Speaker, the great Canadian historian—that is a double entendre—a great Canadian and a great student of the history of Canada, Arthur R. M. Lower, has written that it is not the drums and the trumpets, nor Agincourt nor Elgar that makes English history valuable, but the dull legal documents written down as a compromise between mighty opposites.

The charter of Henry I, the constitutions of Charingdon, Magna Carta, the prerogative writs, the assizes, and the statutes, those are the essential items of English history that have given the character of the modern free world and have shown the genius of British parliamentary institutions and the common law.

In the same vein, then, Trafalgar is nothing, but the growth of the office of the Speaker is everything. Freedom of conscience and speech in Parliament began, sir, when your illustrious predecessor, Coke, told the Tudor woman where to get off. Even to this day, you are still the protector of our ancient and sacred rights. On the first day of your ascension to the high office, you plead, on our behalf, our rights. I am not entirely satisfied that the Lieutenant-Governor knew what you were talking about, but I got the impression that it was okay with him.

May I first of all tender to you my felicitations on your rather unexpected elevation to the Speaker's chair? I say unexpected because it had been generally assumed that if the government were returned to office in October last, the member for Eglinton (Mr. Reilly), the singing troubador, would be

accorded the honour which has overtaken you. Apparently something went wrong, and instead of the orb and the sceptre, the member for Eglinton has been handed the whip and the goad, and charged with the melancholy responsibility of keeping the sheep on the government side within pasture limits.

In other words, his high hopes have been knocked into a cocked hat. I can only hope that having to don the attire of a shepherd boy instead of the rituals of your office, has not left him too disconsolate.

We all recognize that you are well qualified to fulfill the duties which fate has thrust upon you. Indeed you have already given convincing evidence of your talent for the task, and I might say your ingenuity. My keen eye detected it a day or so ago, that extra microphone—that you have at your starboard elbow—and I must conclude that there is a perfect analogy with the hero of the western saga who wore two guns. You have concluded that you need the extra mike if you are going to beat the member for Grey-Bruce (Mr. Sargent) to the draw.

Now it is true that in rendering the opening prayer, your voice does not have quite that stained glass quality of your predecessor, but rather the quality of the computer age, a sort of no-nonsense, crisp and efficient quality. Your delivery, if I may say so, is in keeping with the spirit of '99, and this, of course, only underlines the obsolescence of the prayers themselves.

As you are aware, sir, I have spoken on this matter on other occasions, and I have pointed out the utter absurdity of the words from the Tudor age to which we are obliged to listen in reverential silence and to the utter astonishment and boredom of the young Canadians who sit in the galleries from day to day.

Consider the line—"the only Ruler of Princes." Why, sir, have we forgotten Magna Carta, which compelled John Lachlan to accept the fact that he was accountable to law and to those who make the law—that is us; and that he was not an absolute ruler, that he had a master in the law, and that his prerogative was limited by principles more sacred than the wills of kings and princes.

Not even the most convinced and unregenerate monarchist would today argue that only a supreme being is the ruler of princes. The few remaining of the species, and may their tribe decrease, are responsible to the rule of the people and their fate, indeed their daily lives are dependent on the generosity of the civil list.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I think it rather absurd that you should be reading that line, oblivious to the great happening at Runnymede 753 years ago.

Then we have the words about the United Kingdom, Canada and other realms and territories. That too surely belongs to another age, the colonial age. Then the prayer says, "and herein more particularly for the Lieutenant-Governor."

What about the Robarts doctrine of ten co-equal entities? Why should one man be singled out for special or particular blessing?

I pass over the line about health and wealth, long to live and strengthen her that she may vanquish all her enemies, but I shudder at the thought of what might be involved in these words.

I leave my analysis of the words, sir. I am rather struck by the fact that the press is excluded during the period of our devotions as though they were not standing in the need of prayer. We lock them up for the Budget and lock them out for the prayer. In the latter case, it may be to their good fortune, for the present prayer period, in my view, is nothing more than an exercise in formal piety.

The words used have no relevance whatever for the day in which we live. The language is highly patronizing, pretentious and, I will add, presumptuous. It is highly chauvinistic in content and shuts us off from most of the human family of which we are a part. It is discriminatory. In a sense, it is in violation of the human rights code.

The first prayer is, above all, an exercise in conceit, in presuming that a benevolent providence would have the slightest interest in conferring some special blessing on one family, one set of officials and on one segment—a minor segment of humanity. That is us.

What then is the alternative? In my opinion, and I trust that the three clergymen —three and a half clergymen—I mean no disrespect, it is just that like us in the law, the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Gilbertson) has not been called.

I trust that they will agree the opening moments of our assembly might better be devoted in quiet meditation, during which we acknowledge our gratitude to a kindly providence for all of life's manifold blessings. We should acknowledge with humility, gratitude to all the dwellers upon earth who, by their toil, sustain us, who share with us a common ordeal and a common fate. We

should feel a deep and profound concern for that two-thirds of humanity which goes to bed hungry every night and who suffer because of our callous indifference.

We should be mindful of the great responsibility that rests upon us as elected representatives and servants of the people. We should realize that we have common faults as well as common virtues; that we all have our work to do and that each of us can, if we so desire, play a useful part in moving life forward along the path of social progress. We should rid our minds of any notion that any one part of the world, or, indeed, any one of us, is superior to the other and we should do always unto others as we would have them do unto us.

Mr. Speaker, would not a few moments of silent meditation on such thought do more for our spirits than rattling through the outdated and outmoded script of a bygone age? I think so, and I believe we would all derive rich benefit from that practice. At the last sessions of the 27th Parliament I found some support for my views on this subject. Indeed, the former member for Beaches, Mr. Harris, joined me in a discussion with your predecessor in which we asked to have the prayer brought into line with contemporary thinking.

I made it quite clear that I was not actuated by irreligious or anti-religious feelings. The best proof of that was my proposal that we invite Archbishop Pocock, Bishop Snell, Dr. Ernest Howse, Rabbi Plaut and other to draft a new invocation for us. I can only hope that my suggestion will receive your sympathetic consideration. For myself, I regret to say I find no meaning in the present ceremonial prayer and I have decided that until it is abandoned or changed, I shall sit in the quiet room off the chamber during the opening exercises.

May I also express the hope that you will see to it that the flag of Canada be restored to its rightful place to the right of your chair, instead of being obscured in the cluster above your head. Let me assure you that there is no intended slur on the flag of the United Kingdom. I respect it as the flag of a great land and a great people. I would, of course, accord the same respect to the flag of France, the United States, or any other country. But I do suggest that since we cannot find room for all of them we should be content to give precedence to that proud flag, sir, which is devoid of all chauvinistic symbols and which unites all Canadians regardless of race, creed, colour, nationality, ancestry or place of origin. It is, I think a reasonable request and I commend it to you.

Now, sir, may I just say a word or two about the ceremonial attending the opening of this first session of the twenty-eighth Legislature. First of all let me say that I was once more appalled by the spectacle of two elderly citizens being exposed in an open landau to the elements of high winter and the danger of pneumonia just in order to perpetuate a now totally meaningless pageantry. Perhaps comic opera would be a more appropriate term. May I quote again from a one-time highly respected member of the press gallery. I treasure this document, I really do, and I shall always keep it with my papers—the writing of this young fellow while he was still going straight; before he left us.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Before he moved to the Premier's office.

Mr. Sopha: Yes, before he moved to the Premier's office. Bill Rathbun—indeed one of the most talented members of the press gallery that I have ever seen in the eight years that I have been here. And I am happy to note today that in the interval between sessions not one of them deserted Valhalla up there—not one went to the government, and that is an achievement. At any moment, of course, there might be a flood of them because they are attracted to the greener pastures.

I have no idea about the methods used by the *Globe and Mail* or the Toronto *Star* or the *Telegram* in exacting obedience and ingenuity and energy from their employees—they might be the world's worst or the world's best employers. But I do say this, that if they leave those hallowed halls to go over and work in the public relations realm for some of these over there then certainly they are taking on a task far more arduous than anything they could get in the ivory tower of the newspaper, and I have a great sympathy for them. Rathbun, back in 1966, right after the opening of the session, had this to say:

> Like many Ontario residents I was full of anticipation last Tuesday when the Speech from the Thorne was read at Queen's Park. Each new session of the Legislature has its rituals. There are those hangovers from colonial days. The Throne Speech and the Lieutenant-Governor himself. There is the performance of the Opposition parties on the second day of the sitting crying out for parliamentary reform, objecting to government ramming laws down the throats of the people with-

out the elected representative having any say.

I listened to Liberal Leader Andrew Thompson and the New Democratic Party's chieftain, Donald MacDonald, and amid their grandstanding protests there was sense. Our benevolent parliamentarian, Premier John Robarts, should, indeed must, make some reforms to our parliamentary system. I would suggest first things first. A reform of the parliamentary system as practised in Ontario and other provinces should begin with the Lieutenant-Governor and the Speech from the Throne. Let's be bold. Out with them both.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Who said that?

Mr. Sopha: Bill Rathbun—he works in the Premier's office.

Mr. B. Newman: Oh, that is the place to be. He is in the right place then.

Mr. Sopha: I might as well say here there is good evidence, that may be put before people who can weigh evidence, that Bill Rathbun wrote the speech the Lieutenant-Governor read.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Surely not. Perish the thought.

Mr. B. Newman: He was writing himself out of a job.

Mr. Sopha: Yes, Bill Rathbun—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sopha: Who are they? Are they from Sudbury? I do not know them.

I just want to read one more passage so it will rest in the record for all time. Rathbun goes on:

Tuesday was bitterly cold but what did we have—a comic opera performance straight from Gilbert and Sullivan.

The hon. W. Earl Rowe, a valiant fighter for the Conservative Party cause for many years, rode regally up University Avenue to the Legislature buildings in a horse-drawn landau protected from the cold by a buffalo robe. The ride in the open landau demonstrated the courage of Mr. Rowe but what did it demonstrate for Ontario? Very little. As a matter of fact, the whole performance was ridiculous. Traffic on University Ave. was already restricted by the huge snowbanks left by last weekend's snow storm. The landau and its escort added to the confusion of the Gilbert and Sullivan scene.

Then came the performance in the red carpeted Legislature chamber. The members, all but seven of them, were in their seats. The Supreme Court justices in their robes were waiting. The guests, including Mr. Robarts' two children, were in their seats. The galleries were full, but perhaps significantly the younger generation was showing little interest in attending.

The Lieutenant-Governor entered the chamber to read the Speech. He was followed by enough bemedalled military aides to help solve the south Viet Nam problem. One had the job of seeing that Mr. Rowe's glasses were handy—others to see that no one got tea without shaking the Lieutenant-Governor's hand.

I could not put it better. Now I say, sir, that Mr. Rathbun's point was well taken and it is equally valid today. It is ironic indeed, I say, that those words should have been written by the alleged author of the Speech from the Throne read to us on opening day.

Let me say this to make myself perfectly clear on the basis upon which I protest these things. I say to you sincerely, Your Honour, it is not because I derive any enjoyment, but it is from a consciousness that outside—I say through you to my friend from Dufferin-Simcoe (Mr. Downer)—outside in the streets, in the homes, in the office buildings, every place where the people of this province can be found, where they go to their daily toil and earn their daily living and indulge in their recreation, things are happening. Things are happening!

The only thing we can be certain about in the modern world is that there will be change; change will be with us, we will never stand still again. And out there where things are happening myriads of people share my view about it, about the pageantry and about the attendance to customs of yesteryear and about the borrowing from another people 3,000 miles away, borrowing their cultural tradition instead of creating our own.

You see, any cursory reading of the history of this country demonstrates beyond peradventure, and in a manner that even the most obtuse can understand, that no British institution that our forefathers ever planted on the north half of the North American continent is the same as it was in Great Britain. They were changed to suit our own needs. They are not replicas, they are not carbon copies. So the imperative, I say to

the member for York-Forest Hill (Mr. Dunlop), the imperative, is to be ourselves, that is it, that captures it in one short phrase. Be ourselves; Canadians! In order to hasten the day when we reach that national and cultural integrity, when we achieve that identity that distinguishes us from all other people, let us recognize that we must stop the cultural borrowing.

It is perfectly proper from the social intercourse that I have outside this House that someone inside should speak out for those people. They should have a voice here urging us to shed off that artificial, meaningless pageantry with which we continue to surround ourselves. How can we expect, Mr. Speaker, how can we legitimately expect to retain the respect of young Canadians by this sort of make-believe? Do not misunderstand me. I accept Governor Simcoe as part of our history. He was in many respects a man of high quality, sound judgment and high patriotism. He was an appointee of his monarch to what was then a colony. But this is not the 1790's, this is 1968. Why perpetuate a myth?

The present Lieutenant-Governor—unlike John Graves Simcoe, whom the Premier albeit appointed a committee to go over once in a while to his grave, wherever it is, in England, to see if he is still there in the grave—oh, yes, there is a statute on the books if you do not believe it.

The present Lieutenant-Governor was not appointed by the Queen or, indeed, by the Governor-General, he was appointed by John George Deifenbaker from Prince Albert.

Do you remember him? It was a political appointment of a loyal party man, nothing more, nothing less. How utterly absurd for such an appointee to address this body as his servants and refer to the government as "my government". Then a few hours later the Prime Minister will refer to it as his government. Oh yes, I have heard him.

And the Provincial Secretary (Mr. Welch) will be waxing eloquent in some fruitbelt village referring to its as "your government" or "your Progressive Conservative government"—meaning his audience. Well, which is it? Whose government is it?

The best that can be said about it is that it is a government that a mere 42 per cent of the people of Ontario wanted and 58 per cent of the people of Ontario did not want. But the 58 per cent will have to live with this government until the next election or until it is defeated in this House as governments sometimes are.

It is not impossible that some fine day the member for London South (Mr. White) will turn up at the Premier's Grand Bend chalet and shout "Guess what?" So I express the hope that in my time—and may the Lord spare me long enough—that we put an early end to this obsolete institution. We shall dispense with this high comedy of a procession of brass and brave marching in with so much pomp and so little circumstance, finding us in a state of unreadiness and marching out again while we let on that we have not already picked the Speaker of the Legislature when in fact we have, we had already picked you.

And then the "Jordanian army" comes marching in again. With a straight face, His Honour reads the speech written by Mr. Rathbun. Well, I am not going to elaborate on it. If it were well done, the *Globe and Mail* would not have to write an editorial calling for a translation of the gobbledygook read to us on opening day.

Now I want to make note of the fresh faces we have with us and I want to say how impressed I am with their zest for the political life and the quality of their remarks. All my remarks in this regard are not going to be kind. I could not be kind and be honest at the same time. This is especially true, with some notable exceptions, of the northern members, with whom it is too early to tell. The fine young man from Port Arthur who defeated the Prucrustean, whose day had fled.

And I say to the hon. member for Fort William (Mr. Jessiman)—if he is not here someone will tell him—when a respectable and important organization from the Lakehead sent a telegram to the first citizen that the people of the area were "wringing their hands in anguish"—let me repeat that, the people of the Lakehead were wringing their hands in anguish about the lack of opportunity—then I certainly believe that the days were numbered for a member of the executive council who represented them, and who after more than ten years in the exalted position as a member of the Cabinet, had failed to produce anything tangible for his home area. There is nothing in a democracy, Your Honour, like the nemesis which attends the ballot box.

So if the man from Fort William gives us much more of the "God in His Heaven variety," then he had better not make many long-term arrangements 900 miles from home.

I have referred to the most youthful of them all, the member for Rainy River (Mr.

T. P. Reid). He replaced a good man, he replaced a man for whom we had a great deal of respect here. And I am proud to sit with the youth of about 25. He is exemplary of the great and growing consciousness about things that matter among his aged peer group. Youth will have its day, and already the Minister of Education (Mr. Davis) has had to retreat from the position that he and the first citizen took last year when they came in here and in effect said "Yes, we acknowledge"—who will ever forget it—"Yes, we will acknowledge"—one parroted the other—"that to be a member of the Legislature is an important role, but the committee of university presidents is a more important position than to be a member of the Legislature."

They reversed an important vote that had been carried by majority in the private bills committee and the university presidents had their day that day. But we saw down at the Ontario College of Art that he had to retreat in the short space of a year from that position he had taken. May he reflect in what he says, and does, the disenchantment of our young people with the old shibboleths and the methods and the postures which no longer suit the enlightened age of youth.

Et tout particulièrement, je voudrais féliciter et souhaiter la bienvenue au député de Comté Prescott-Russell. Le discours qu'il a prononcé la semaine dernière crée un précédent à la Législature d'Ontario. Pas moins de trois personnes portant le même nom de 'Bélanger' ont été députés dans ce Parlement, et tous trois ont représenté les Franco-Ontariens avec honneur et distinction.

Même si son séjour ici est de courte durée, je suis certain que le nouveau député de Prescott-Russell laissera sa marque et contribuera au 'fait français'.

(*Translation*): I would like to congratulate and welcome the member for the riding of Prescott-Russell. The speech, which he gave last week, creates a precedent in the Ontario Legislature. No fewer than three persons bearing the same name of 'Belanger' have been deputies in this Legislature, and all three have represented the Franco-Ontarians with honour and distinction. Even if his stay here is of short duration, I am certain that the new member for Prescott-Russell will leave his mark and will contribute to the 'French Fact'.

To continue: The young man from Windsor West (Mr. Peacock) deserves a comment. I have no doubt, that I shall be better informed from attending his dissertations and will receive from his elocution a good deal of knowledge, and especially when I remember Windsor West—I am correct am I not?—

An hon. member: Yes, very correct!

Mr. Sopha: When I remember the oppressive and tedious speeches of "the long distance runner", who used to occupy that seat.

Sir, there are many who will add much in thought and weight of argument. I am saddened to have to take note of at least one item of coarseness the other day on the part of the new member from Timiskaming (Mr. Jackson), when he threw the Budget address on the floor. I was especially saddened because that is my home town—he represents my home riding. The people of Timiskaming are not like him, and we well recall the gentlemen who represented them in this House at the last Parliament. The young man from Timiskaming, if he throws things around to show his distemper of the moment, will give a certain amount of credibility to Harold Laski's opinion—the great socialist intellectual—that the parliamentary institutions will break down, said Laski, as far back as 1930, when large numbers of socialists become elected. That has not happened, fortunately.

Quite a difference with the class and style, the erudition of the new members for Peterborough (Mr. Pitman) and Lakeshore (Mr. Lawlor). We may be satisfied, I think, that they will not allow the member for Scarborough West to lead them by the nose.

Which leads me to a broader subject. There is no doubt in my mind, as I have often said, in the great panorama of government, that the private member is a very unimportant cull, very unimportant indeed.

Those who support the government should never lose courage, however—they are in a better position than we are. They should never lose courage and optimism, because at any moment of time, any one of the 22 who sat in the executive council in the comfort of office, could go.

The Premier is a man with a great sense of humour; he must have a great sense of humour, or else he could not tolerate those about him.

I wish he were here, because now comes the time when I was going to give him, and I will not be protracted about this—

An hon. member: Annual re-organization of the Cabinet.

Mr. Sopha: No, I am not going to re-arrange the Cabinet, the pattern for defeat is there, and I am going to leave it.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Sopha: But I wanted to tell him, personally, my observations of that fateful Thursday night when he was absent. I wish he had been here to see the performance.

He should never leave the precincts of this House, however desirable the reason, he should never go beyond shouting distance from it, Your Honour.

Leaderless, rudderless they were; no one in charge, even the designated one, who sits on his right, even him—oh yes, the designated one, designated on radio station CFRB last year. Yes, designated; they asked, Gordon Sinclair and those other chaps said, who among your colleagues, who of the 22 or 25 stands head and shoulders above the rest, who do you single out?

A practised politician, Mackenzie King for example, would have evaded that one as being a snare; he would have said they are all good. But not honest John. He said Charlie MacNaughton—do you wonder? We would have thought that on the Thursday night, the Provincial Treasurer would have been in command, but how did it get started—sorry, he has left the House.

For weeks, months, before we had the election, the arrival of the fellow from the majors was heralded, was it not? Oh yes, they are sending down Casey, sending down the pro. His riding is being, what do you say, demolished, he is going to run in Ontario. No sooner had the harbinger of that news arrived, than we are told that he will go in the Cabinet — municipal affairs, Provincial Treasurer or Minister of Education, or all three.

Eventually the man from Grey South (Mr. Winkler) arrived, and what a let-down as he started to tangle with "Batman" over there—without the goods. He did not have the goods; he thought we were a group of amateurs and he could get up and take a few slings, but then somebody said you had better produce, you had better produce. When he uttered those fateful words, mistakenly we thought he was practised in Parliamentary procedure, coming from the big league. "I move the adjournment of the House," he said.

An hon. member: I adjourn the House.

Mr. Sopha: Yes. No one since 1945, that fateful night, when E. B. Jolliffe, standing right for the leader of the Opposition, who now sits in that seat, E. B. Jolliffe sought to wrest the prerogative of the head of the government by moving the adjournment of the House. Our friend from the "bush league" there lost, as soon as he uttered those words, any hopes of a Cabinet position that he might have harboured in the wildest flights of lisurgic acid or day-dreaming. They vanished out the window, so the rest of the hopefuls can breathe easy. He did himself in, that night, did himself in.

It was something to behold. Everybody had some advice—the Minister of Mines, the Minister of Municipal Affairs, the Attorney General, the fellow who might have given the custom of the precedent, custom and usages of the Crown, he sat fairly solemn.

At one point, the Treasurer blushed, like the other half of the Bobbsey Twins; the Minister from Scarborough was brought to silence when he sought to intervene, and it will be a long time until I regain confidence in the Minister of Health for attempting to do to us what he attempted to do that night when he got up and made that suggestion to the Speaker. I would not even repeat it, in case the press might have failed to note it. But which suggestion if adopted, I say to my friend, the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs, who was not here, would have descended this House into ridicule and contempt in this province.

I feel all the stronger about it, because we over here, that night, in those circumstances, regard what was going on was invective and calumny. It was abuse pouring back and forth across this chamber. We were innocent. Innocent of any complicity, and we stood in danger, in grave danger of that suggestion being adopted.

And so it went. I have spoken before about the amenities of the private members. By contrast, of course, what the private members have by the way of appointments are nothing as compared to those enjoyed by members of the executive council and the moonlighters in the back row. They, taken together, have more than the most powerful, half-spurred monarch ever had in conveniences and in the luxury of the accruments of their official suites.

I want to deny them nothing at all, but I want to find out that when you take away their numbers, the executive council and the moonlighters, you are left with some 90 private members engaged in responsibility for the spending of some $2.75 billions.

Few corporations control the spending of more from the executive suite. I advocate

simply this, and my friend from Glengarry (Mr. Villeneuve) always attends these things, Mr. Speaker, with great demotion, I advocate simply this—to my fellow members on all sides of the unwashed multitudes—that the very minimum for which we should settle—the very minimum, is a private office in the secretariat.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Sopha: We go about the length and breadth of this province into the executive offices of corporations, and I must say you can conclude that there is a lot of fat at the top. There is a lot of consideration for their own wellbeing and their own welfare. There is not any group of people in the province—no group, no matter where you search by night or by day, by candle or by searchlight—there is no comparable group of 117 people that equal us in importance in the life of this province. I am surprised that we have stood it so long.

But I do not have to elaborate the obvious, or distend the trivial among intelligent people. I just sound the call to arms. Let us become more insistent. Let us demand the minimum in this province. And if we have then a quiet place to work, a secretary to get our letters out, it means an environment in which to contemplate the many anxious problems which we have to face—other people's problems—and to men of conscience in public life, other people's problems can assume their own importance and, indeed, can keep you awake at night more than your own.

If we have that, just that, we would reduce the need for an ombudsman, that my friend from Downsview so courageously puts on the order paper every year and is prepared to dissert on it with intelligence and depth of understanding. We would reduce the need for an ombudsman, even if the ombudsman was the best we could possibly get—Dr. Morton Shulman!

Now I express the hope that, during this session, a day or two will be set aside for a debate on constitutional matters. I want to say very frankly that so far as I am concerned, I am completely in favour of a new Canadian constitution, so ably put by my hon. leader (Mr. Nixon) in his opening remarks in this debate, a new Canadian constitution proclaimed in the name of the sovereign people of Canada. Beautiful words, let me repeat them for my friend from York-Forest Hill, himself a great student on constitutional matters, "proclaimed in the name of the sovereign people of Canada."

As I have said on previous occasions, the sovereign power in this land is the people. It is from them and from no one else that Parliament derives its power. The British North America Act is essentially a colonial document, created in colonial conditions, which should simply wither away. It has never really been a constitution as nations understand the term, or constitutional lawyers, if we want to go into the realm of the expert, as they understand the term. It was simply a delineation of powers between two jurisdictions.

The men who drafted it could not possibly have foreseen the developments of the years ahead. But I am confident that if Macdonald and Brown and Galt and Cartier and any number of others were alive today; and if I understand their characters, their integrity, their vision, their qualities correctly from the great biographies that are extant about them—and I am confident I do—then Macdonald and Brown and their colleagues would be in the very forefront of the demand for reform.

That is what they were in the context of their own space and time; they would be demanding a modern, up-to-date Canadian constitution worthy of an independent people in search of a greater destiny. Frank Underhill, you know, in a phrase that he likes to repeat, and he has repeated it many times, "A nation," he says, "is a body of people who have done great things together in the past, and will do great things together in the future." Such are we destined.

The chief advocate of such a course today—that is an indigenous, made in Canada, stamped right on it, constitution—the chief advocate in this country, if my eyes and ears tell me correctly what I see on the telewaves, is Daniel Johnson, and I agree with him that he is also expressing the wishes of English-speaking Canadians. He makes so bold as to say that. He said he is also expressing the wishes of English-speaking Canadians and especially, he said, the youth of the country.

They say further that if Mr. Lesage were Prime Minister of Quebec today, he would be following the same course as Johnson had followed. Indeed, sir, it seems to be conveniently forgotten that the quiet revolution, and the quest for a stronger identity for French Canada—and I say to my friend from Stormont (Mr. Guindon)—for stronger ties with the international French community, began with Lesage and I ask what is wrong with it, what is wrong with stronger ties between those six millions who occupy one

whole province of this nation and a broad French Canadian community around the world?

I meant to leave later, but I am going to stop. I am going to tarry and I am going to say to my friend from Stormont who speaks on things for the government of this province, that he should be referred to the example of Gabon. All of our friends here are so capable, we are so capable, of working into a frenzy in this country. Recently, the government of Gabon, I do not need to repeat the past to hon. members, invited a delegation from Quebec to come join with them in some ceremonies and exercises, and we got into a great tizzy about it.

Canada threatened to sever diplomatic relations. It is very interesting, very interesting and I was very gratified to see, when I was preparing my remarks, in the Toronto *Telegram* of Friday, March 15 in a supplement which appears to be on education, the middle section, resplendent with photographs, this heading: Ontario's flag flies over the Virgin Islands in gesture of friendship.

There is a picture of Ontario's red ensign. Let me say to my friend from Stormont, I illustrate and underline the point I am making, that if it had been the fleur de lis of Quebec that was flying over there on those islands in the same circumstances, then the Minister of External Affairs, when some *Telegram* reporter had discovered that—he would have flown out of bed at 4:00 o'clock in the morning and said to one of his officials, "Find out where the Virgin Islands are", "Find out where they are and tell those Virgin Islanders that we are breaking diplomatic relations with them".

I have no doubt at all, no doubt, that every time French Canada, every time Quebec does something, the other nine provinces are so sensitive. Do I have to gild the lily? Do you remember, at the swearing in of Governor-General Michener, not one of the provincial Premiers were there, not one of the kin of them were there?

The headline in the Toronto *Star* and *Globe and Mail,* the heading not the headline, the heading in the news story said, "Premier Johnson does not attend swearing in of the Governor-General". Not one of the other nine were there, not Robarts from Ontario, not Bennett from B.C., but my point is simply this that when French Canada does it, we react quickly.

In 1945, George Drew, no I guess a little later than 1945, my leader will correct me as to the precise date, George Drew was using aircraft to bring immigrants from the old sod into Ontario, exercising powers in The British North America Act which said we could do so.

In 1947—thank you. Two months ago, the province of Quebec suggested that they exercise the same powers to bring French-speaking residents from other places in the French international community, and immediately a wave of protest swept this country. If in my efforts here I use my learning it is simply in the pleas that I make that I wish in English Canada that we would make an effort to be reasonable; to be reasonable, to be adult and not look upon everything that the province of Quebec does with a complete attitude of distress.

And I must go on. It pains me and perhaps it is dangerous for me, but it will not be dangerous in Sudbury. I speak for myself. I must go on out of conscience, and I must say to you, Mr. Speaker, that I was not one of those who got all worked up over the visit of General de Gaulle. I felt it perfectly natural that he should have received a warm and affectionate welcome in French Canada. He is a great Frenchman, the personification of his people, their language and their culture.

He was one of the heroic figures of the worldwide struggle against tyranny. He lifted his country out of the morass of fragmented politics and gave it new confidence and purpose. He had the good sense to disengage his country from brutal colonial war in Algeria, thus sparing tens of thousands of French and Algerian lives. Let others emulate his example in the modern world. He is a strong believer in the independence of peoples; surely such a man deserves to be honoured. Much has been said about his famous balcony speech and the words "Vive le Quebec, Vive le Quebec Libre." But I would remind you that weeks before the President of France arrived in Canada, television and radio commentators were busy creating a climate of hostility to him.

He was subjected to ridicule and coarse caricature from the press. And so when the words were spoken a wave of hysteria spread across the country. They were interpreted to mean a call for the dismemberment of Canada. To me that was errant nonsense. When the general was in the capital of the USSR he concluded his speech with the words "Vive le Moscow", "Vive la Russ"; no doubt that would make him a communist.

There was no question that the most casual observation revealed that a wave of hysteria

had swept across English Canada. I am going to prove it for you in a moment. Following the balcony speech, English Canadians demonstrated that they were ready to pounce upon French Canada behind the respectable guise of making an attack on General de Gaulle.

He was the focal point. The real intention was for English Canadians to get off their chest all those things that they wanted to say. Every nut and every hypocrite in this country, everybody with a pent-up irrationality about his French Canadian compatriots that has beset this country for 100 years had an opportunity. Get up to leave me—listen, the *Telegram*, a respectable Toronto newspaper, July 27. Here is what they printed. This is a letter to the editor and I quote:

> It has been said that God moves in a mysterious way.

Let me say there is nothing like starting off with God on your side. The writer goes on:

> Will someone explain why it is that a do-gooder like Christ was crucified—

Let me interupt there—I am not sure that this is not blasphemy—the phrase the "do-gooder". That is an invidious term, a term of *opprobium*, I believe. I will read that sentence again:

> Will someone explain why it is that a do-gooder like Christ was crucified, why Lincoln and Kennedy were assassinated and yet a rabble-rouser like De Gaulle has not been exterminated before now?

And there ends the letter. Kindness and charity prohibits me from putting the man's name on record. The must have been written by a person whom the man with the net would be appropriate to look after, to go and get him, to go and get such a man and take him away to a place of quiet retreat. It is not the man I wish to condemn, but I do wish to take note of the irresponsibility of the Toronto *Telegram* in printing such a letter. That letter advocates the propriety of the assassination of the President of France.

The Toronto *Star* was a little better. Same day, one writer says this:

> I hope Lester Pearson, the entire editorial board of the *Star* and all the other woolly-headed nitwits who have been apologizing for French Canada, are happy. Here we have this misfit of De Gaulle on our shores, coached by Daniel Johnson and the other hoodlums who run Quebec.

How dreadful, how dreadful. It goes on:

> Personally I am glad this representative of a has-been country and a dying language has indicated so clearly to overly tolerant Canadians the fact that bilingualism is a one-way street marked only by French signs. Why all the fuss about De Gaulle? He is probably just looking for a safe place to hide in case France is ever occupied again.

I sometimes wonder about our responsible press. I noted with a great deal of sorrow that the Prime Minister of Canada, the leader of the party to whose policy and principles and philosophy I subscribe, engaged in this misfortune in his rebuke of General de Gaulle. He reminded General de Gaulle, and I think those were his words, that Canadians had fought and died in two world wars for the freedom of France. General de Gaulle, quite appropriately before leaving our shores, forebore to remind the Prime Minister of Canada that in the same two world wars the people of France, the flower of its manhood, spilled its blood on the shores of its native country for the freedom of Canada.

Yes, we left a lot of our youth on the foreign shore but we managed to escape two world wars when there was no physical destruction of our country. Quite in contrast to the third republic. But General de Gaulle, you see, did not engage in the rudeness, the brutality of that remark of the Prime Minister of this country. There are no doubt those who disagree with me; they are entitled to their own opinion.

I want to complete this part of my remarks, and there is just time to do so, by reading into the record some agreement for my point of view. It sums it up succinctly and accurately, and that is a column of the same day in the *Telegram*; the same day but on the opposite page from where this lunacy is printed about the assassination of General de Gaulle. There was a column by Douglas Fisher and Harry Crowe. I am going to read without stopping so the record will be complete. Somebody in future years will read these things; I hope someday there is one Canadian who will so use his time. There can be no more important matter. After all, this is the fabric of our nation, the relations of English and French Canada. There is nothing more important to us if this country is to survive and go far and into a glorious second century. I will end this by putting on the record what Crowe and Fisher had to say; written right at the time when the man had just left our shores, and I quote:

> Let us ask ourselves, what is the difference between a President of the United States laying it on the line, inside our central institution of government, that Canada should get into the organization of American states, and a President of France, notorious for speaking in riddles, and prone to being carried away at emotional moments, saying "Long live free Quebec" in response to the enthusiasm of a crowd in Montreal?
>
> And what is the difference between a President of the United States demanding successfully of a Canadian Prime Minister that *Time* and *Reader's Digest* should be exempted from a Canadian law, and a president of France comparing the unquestioned exhilaration along his route to Montreal, to the exhilaration of the French people at the end of the war?

It is by no means clear that the intervention of one is more unacceptable than the intervention of the other. But the remarks of the French President touch upon the raw nerve of English-French relations. That, one must sadly conclude, is the difference.

Put another way, emotionally and psychologically, we are not one nation. So the reeve of Delta, British Columbia would say, "The last person who talked like that was Louis Riel, and you know what we did to him." Well, there is the whole point, there is the whole point and I must speak from personal experience. I was down when the hopefuls for the leadership spoke at our convention a few weeks ago, and I listened to them all, because 0.001 per cent of the population of Canada, we 28 among them, are going to select the Prime Minister of Canada, so the least you can do is to go down and listen to what they have to say.

Well, we did. One of them, and I will not name him, I will be merciful, to get the plaudits of the crowd, the cheap applause of the moment, one of them in his remarks, reaching a high state of elocutional exuberance, said: "We Canadians will do all that"—I say to my friend the hon. Minister for Lands and Forests (Mr. Brunelle)—"without the intervention of any other head of state." Oh, the hands hit as they cheered because there was nobody in the room—and there must have been about 3,000 of us, there was nobody in the room who was stupid enough not to know that he meant General de Gaulle.

And that brought the accolade of the crowd. It illustrates my point, perfectly. That man, he could get the crowd to condemn the intervention of General de Gaulle for one occasion on the balcony in the largest French city outside of France, the largest French city other than Paris in the world, but the same man would never raise his voice in protest at the daily intervention in the affairs of this country by the President of the United States.

The same man would be silent when a general, a senior high ranking general of the American air force came into our nation's capital, the capital of our nation on the eve of an election, and criticized the Prime Minister of Canada, and did what he could to lead to his defeat, the defeat of John George Diefenbaker. It was no accident that following those remarks by General Norstad in Ottawa that John Diefenbaker, in his next speech referred, to the annexation manifesto of 1848. No accident at all, a great historian is Mr. Diefenbaker, and he can see the parallels in it.

And that same man would not raise his voice in protest at the refusal of the American colossus to enable us to recognize Red China, as we have wanted to do these five years. If you do not believe me, take some time out and read on your own a little book that you can read in one evening, by George Grant, of McMaster University, and an Anglican minister and a Conservative. Read the book, *Lament for Canada,* I think that it is the name, either *Lament for Canada,* or *Lament for a Nation.*

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Your comments are a little simplistic at this point.

Mr. Sopha: A little what?

Mr. MacDonald: Simplistic.

Mr. Sopha: All right. I just have time to say that the one man in Canada who deserves great credit for following the path of restraint and reason during the wave of hysteria, was the Premier of Ontario. He cautioned the people of Canada and the people of Ontario to keep their cool, and not be diverted from their main purpose.

To keep Canada united, to stick to the main issue, and I have no doubt that in following that course, he did not necessarily agree with General de Gaulle. However, sir, I speak for myself, and I am a great student of these affairs. However, I am confident that Canada will survive these events, and I am confident that we are on the right course and that the exercise of reasoning and understanding will prevail.

A year ago, and I just have time to tell it, when I pointed to the nuts, the lunatic fringe, I used illustrations in pleading for reason and moderation and understanding and compromise—that is part of the genius of our history. My friend for South York said, "Do not pay attention to them, do not give them the publicity of acknowledging them".

The man who advocates the assassination of the president of France—I say in order to drive those louts into the ignominy that they deserve, you have to pay attention to them, and rebuke them and repudiate them.

Mr. MacDonald: Then why did the member criticize the free press for publishing their letters?

Mr. Sopha: You have got to pay attention to them. Now, I am confident that by the exercise of reason and understanding—that is a native commodity, let us never forget that. That is home grown, made in Canada, nurtured in the soil of this country. Reason and understanding and compromise will see us through, extending the hand of friendship to Quebec. Say to them:

Do not treat us as enemies, we are your friends. We cannot lessen the standard of living of the people of Ontario; we cannot do that, our responsibility is to raise the standards of the people of Ontario, but in everything that we can do, short of mitigating our own people's welfare, we hold out the hand of friendship to you. And we will assist you, and more than that we will try to be the broker of understanding with people at the fringes, at the end of the country.

Mr. Speaker, may I leave off there, and if some attend tonight, I can promise them an entertaining evening.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

It being 6:00 o'clock, the House took recess.

No. 28

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

First Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Monday, March 18, 1968

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1968

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Monday, March 18, 1968

Resumption of the debate on the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Sopha, Mrs. M. Renwick Mr. Dunlop 897

Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. B. Newman, agreed to 920

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Rowntree, agreed to 920

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

The House resumed at 8:00 o'clock, p.m.

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE
(Continued)

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Mr. Speaker, I take the time of the House to deal with what I conceive to be important matters in the life of our country, and the House, indeed, is very patient and tolerant with me.

I was reminding you, sir, at the supper hour adjournment, that the province of Quebec is no more and no less than a nation that has existed on this continent for upwards of 400 years, 360 of them as a permanent settlement from the day that the first settlement began in Quebec, founded by Samuel de Champlain.

I say, let those who would take pride in the success of the Confederation of tomorrow conference and the Ottawa conference, which followed close behind it, as I do. I would never criticize either of those conferences for purely partisan reasons as I firmly believe that the mere actuality that the leading politicians of this country were able to sit down in an atmosphere of harmony and discuss the problems that have beset us for 100 years, it is in itself a mark of progress.

There are those that nit-pick about the format of the conference and at the high admiration for Professor Underhill, well cognizant of the remarkable contribution that he has made to the life and history of this country. He is in the evening of his existence and he is a very old man, though youthful in ideas, but I think he is wrong when he reaches for some fancy phrases such as calling them the "pseudo conferences," and referring to the fact that none of the leaders of the nation, or the provinces, enunciated the position at either the Toronto conference or the Ottawa conference from which he said they could not retreat.

Let it be sufficient to the day that the Premier (Mr. Robarts) of this province was able to persuade his opposite members in the other nine provinces to come to the capital of this province to begin the process of self-determination. We have not arrived at that point yet—complete self-determination over our own affairs.

I ask you to remember your honour and, indeed, to be thankful for the fact that it was French Canada that was in the very forefront of bringing these great issues to the fore.

We can whisper sibiliant thanks, too, that French Canada is not the dropout in the Canadian family, but rather the active and dynamic force seeking a new accommodation which will enable French and English to embark upon a new path.

The Premier of this province is a man of remarkable insight, and as one of his speech tasters as I am, he frequently can sum up in the context of things and use words that indicate an awareness of what is going on. The Premier of the province was one of the first to note that the great dynamic and cultural revolution that was taking place in this country was nowhere excelled in the country beyond the place it had reached in the province of Quebec. You only have to go in the subway in Montreal to appreciate the significance of that observation.

Quebec is no longer static, but a creative society, and her industrial, intellectual and cultural progress, and her desire to be herself is a great asset to the Canada of the future.

Before leaving the matter, I should like to make just a brief reference to a recent address by the national vice-president of the NDP, and here is the point in my remarks, discursive as they are, that we part company in an address which puts him very much closer to my thinking than to those who speak for that party in this House. I well recall that when I dealt with the question of the monarchy last year, and the year before, the present ceremonial leader of the NDP interjected with the words: "Do you think that will win you many votes?" That was his summation.

While the results of October 17 in Sudbury speak for themselves—I trebled my plurality—and Mr. LaPierre, the gentleman I have been referring to, was brought in to campaign against me. Perhaps Mr. LaPierre's

recent speech indicates that he has drawn some conclusions from my position. Here I want to make it very clear that I speak only for myself, as the member for Sudbury, representing 40 ethnic groups. I have as many or more than the great defender of the ethnic minorities in this nation—the great champion of the multiplicity of tongues and cultures, the member for St. Patrick-St. Andrew.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): I thought the hon. member did not like us using that term.

Mr. Sopha: I want to quote you a few sentences from what Mr. LaPierre had to say. He made the same speech two nights in a row. He is somewhat like our friends here. He made it in Montreal, then he made it in Don Mills. Don Mills, right in the heart of Tory-land. Will you listen to me, as I quote what he had to say:

> Laurier LaPierre, national vice-president of the New Democratic Party yesterday became the first prominent NDP figure to advocate abolition of the monarchy. He said in a luncheon speech that the drafting of a completely new constitution will be the ideal opportunity to create a free and independent republic of Canada.
>
> The Montreal office of the NDP issued an official summary of the speech, indicating that the party's Quebec wing is joining the growing republican sentiment in the province.
>
> A party official said later that Mr. LaPierre's statement reflects the views of the NDP's Quebec council, that Canada should have a constitution that is 100 per cent Canadian, severing the historic connection with the British Crown. The NDP has avoided the debate over the monarchy in the past but the emotional issue is likely to loom large in the next federal election campaign in Quebec.
>
> He said Canadian politics has been characterized for too long by immobility, lack of communication with the people, and a feeling of eternity. The British North America Act of 1867 should be scrapped to make way for a new constitution embodying a bill of rights, and guaranteeing bilingualism in the government services across Canada.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Does the member disagree with this?

Mr. Sopha: I continue to quote:

> Mr. LaPierre, a history professor at McGill University, also called for reform of federal institutions, the Cabinet, the senate, the Supreme Court of Canada, to reflect the country's bicultural character. He ended his talk with the slogan "Vive le Canada libre."

That is the end of the quotation, but it serves to demonstrate, if nothing else, that Mr. LaPierre on a given night, that is any night Monday to Sunday, is capable of a wide compass and a wide ambit. He and the member for High Park (Mr. Shulman), ought to get along very well together.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): There are others of us who concur.

Mr. Sopha: Now, I should like to ask the member for Riverdale (Mr. Renwick)—the member for Riverdale is the national president—you see this is his lieutenant who is speaking—here is the national president of the NDP—if he agrees with his vice-president? That is a very pregnant question, met with a pregnant silence.

Mr. MacDonald: No labour pains.

Mr. Sopha: Does the member for York South agree with Mr. LaPierre? The way the new setup in the order of things in that party is, as I will show afterwards, the new setup is such that when I ask the member for York South, whom I term the ceremonial leader, if he agrees, he would have to ask the member for Riverdale if he agrees.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: A lot of pregnancy over there.

Mr. Sopha: Or does he simply say again, as he said to me last year, "it is not important"?

If that is the case, why does the national vice-president of that party, I ask, choose to deliver two major addresses two consecutive nights, one of them in Don Mills, on such an unimportant matter?

Now sir, in his address to this assembly some days ago the Prime Minister said—

An hon. member: When does the entertainment start?

Mr. Sopha: It is not my business to entertain. I am paid and sent here by the people of Sudbury to be very serious, and that is what I am being. If they had wanted somebody to entertain they would have elected Jimmy Durante.

Mr. MacDonald: Do not get overwhelmed by your seriousness.

Mr. Sopha: The Prime Minister had this to say about the subject, and I want to put it on record so we will have the whole context in which my remarks will go forward. He said first, and he will forgive me, I complained about him using up all this paper paid for by the public purse and now I am referring to it, but it is easier to read than the official *Hansard*. He said:

"Today it is no longer wise to shun a painstaking fundamental re-examination of our political system." Fundamental re-examination—note his phraseology. I take that to mean if it is a fundamental re-examination, it is top to bottom and you leave no parts out of it. He appears to give his imprimatur to an examination of our political system. Having said that—short of giving the licence, so to speak—a few pages later on he says this—now get ready to bang your desks in salute. He says this: "Nor do we intend to allow anyone to interfere with the basic concepts of our constitutional monarchy."

That is his view, but I cannot jibe the two —to speak on one page of a fundamental examination, and then hardly pausing to get his breath, he said some things are not going to change. The constitutional monarchy is one of them.

Well, that is a view, and no doubt very sincerely held, but I say to him right now that the future of the monarchy in this land is very much on the public agenda, and if the party he leads holds the view that the constitutional monarchy is to be witnessed for all time, if the party he leads and occupies by virtue of his leadership—

Mr. J. H. White (London South): What is the Liberal policy?

Mr. Sopha: —as the first citizen of this province and the party he leads holds that view, then I will wake you up because I want everybody to hear this.

Mr. Lewis: What politician?

Mr. MacDonald: This is one policy of the Liberal Party—

Mr. Sopha: These are my views, my views.

Mr. MacDonald: He confirms my suggestion.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sopha: If the party he leads holds to that view, if at all costs the constitutional monarchy is to be part and parcel of our way of life forever, then I say with conviction, with seriousness, I can see the end in sight of the role in office of that party.

Mr. White: What is the Liberal policy?

Mr. Sopha: I can see it. The role of the monarchy in this country is being very widely discussed. One of the most powerful newspapers in this province and in Canada has come out very strongly, indeed, unequivocally in favour of a republic of Canada, and in case anyone does not read that paper, that paper is the Toronto *Daily Star*. The largest circulation of any newspaper in Canada.

I have said before, and I will say it again, I know virtually nothing about the publishing world, but I treat it as a matter of axiom that no newspaper could maintain a position of leadership in its circulation if it did not have its finger on the pulse of public opinion. It could not do it, and indeed, the Toronto *Daily Star*, in my view, must be a little beyond public opinion and must be leading.

It has declared that the monarchy has no longer any relevance for this country, and speaking for myself, as I have said before, and underline it, I heartily agree. Even the *Telegram* has lost much of its monarchial flavour. I want to read into the record just so there will be no doubt that I do not stand here mouthing these things without seeking the solace of some support from outside this House.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Sopha: That is a good book, we are going to get to that book.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sopha: Dennis Braithwaite, January 30, 1968. Remember him? He used to write for the *Globe and Mail*, but he saw greener pastures no doubt and he migrated to the *Toronto Telegram*. He begins his column with this statement:

> Why not become a republic? The vital question is, how will English Canada meet the challenge from Quebec—the demand for a liberated autonomist nation, free for ever from its colonial chrysalis?
>
> Are we going to adopt the rigid stance of the NDP's David Lewis—that's father not son—who says the monarchy is not the real issue and must not be allowed to divide the country.

> Could we be more divided or shall we be stampeded by Lieutenant-Governor Earl Rowe's fear that a Canadian republic would become a puppet of the United States? Mr. Rowe is hardly a disinterested person, and he seems to regard independence from the Crown as a constitutional fate worse than death, judging from this remark to a *Telegram* reporter: "We would be much better off to join the United States than be one independent republic."
>
> That is what Lieutenant-Governor Rowe had to say.

Then Braithwaite concludes his column with these words:

> Or am I going too fast? I do not think so. I really believe the time has come for Canada to declare itself, or bedeck itself, in the existing symbols of republicanism if we really want to remain a nation.

Here is another one. We will put the Toronto *Telegram's* comments together.

You see, a generation ago, I say to my hon. friend, the Minister of Transport (Mr. Haskett) and indeed, my hon. friend, the member for Dufferin-Simcoe (Mr. Downer), both of whom are in the forefront of the defence of institutions such as this, a generation ago, of course the Toronto *Telegram* would have gone up in smoke if somebody had put pen to paper and written heresy such as this.

But as we live, as I said, the only thing we can predict is change, and that includes change in the Toronto *Telegram's* editorial policy.

Again on January 30, 1968, you see how recent these are—they say:

> For those in this country who have grown to adulthood since the war, the ties of monarchy mean less than they did to previous generations. One reason is that the relevance of the monarch is no longer the same.
>
> This has had a profound effect on Canadian thinking. Canadians have come to realize that this country's destiny is going to be affected increasingly by its own political attitudes and efforts, and that the chief external factor shaping this development has now become the United States and not the United Kingdom or the commonwealth.
>
> Canadians, while recognizing that local patriotism should be the open door to universal sympathy, are coming to understand, as never before, that we can do for our own people, and they can do for us what no other people can give to us or claim from us.

Those, to me, are very meaningful words and they chart the way of the future.

The Toronto *Daily Star* on February 1, 1968, had this to say. They quote the Lieutenant-Governor and that famous speech that he made, and I am wondering, you know, when I read what the Lieutenant-Governor has to say abroad in this land, I am wondering whether he has ever read the statute of Westminster, 1931, which puts in statutory form some restraints on him. However, that does not bother him, and I believe in free speech, even for the Lieutenant-Governor, if he wants to make a speech or two hereabouts.

I remember one night. Will we ever forget the night at a dinner, in the spirit of conviviality, he said we must never forget about governments, yet the moment they are elected to office they begin to die. Well, with this one it is just more apparent.

The title of the editorial in the Toronto *Daily Star* is "Does the monarchy help unite us?"

"I think we would be a puppet republic of the United States after a short time if we cut all ties with the commonwealth and joined the United States." That was the quote of the Lieutenant-Governor.

The editorial goes on to say:

> It is a succinct statement, and one of the main arguments of Canadian monarchists, that the monarchy is the safeguard of Canadian unity and independence.
>
> In our view it is precisely the opposite. It contributes to disunity in Canada and inhibits our sense of nationhood. Although we now use the title Queen of Canada, Her Majesty is essentially the Queen of Great Britain. Her court is in London and all the customs and traditions which surround the throne are a product of British, not Canadian history.

Well, to put forward more in support of the thesis I make would be merely to elaborate the obvious that unquestionably in this country, there is a development toward the true Canadian identity and independence. Those who hurl the words at me and say: "What is the Liberal policy?" I answer by saying that I am content, and my head will rest easier on the pillow tonight, if I feel that in this House in saying these things that I am in the forefront of change, that I am in the

vanguard. I know that 10 or 15 years hence I will look back on these words, when these things come about as they must come about, when we become a truly independent and free nation.

I will look back on those words and I will derive considerable comfort from them. To answer the Lieutenant-Governor that if we become independant there is a danger that we will be swallowed up by the giant to the south of us, I merely say that if we allow that to happen, we are not worth saving. We are not worth it.

It would not happen of course, because this country has survived 100 years, and it will survive another 100 after that. When all of us are gone, this country will survive.

I hope this matter will continue to be the subject of lively debate in our universities. It will not be here, I will speak alone on this, but in our universities, among the young people who are conscious of these things, and to whom the old shibboleths mean nothing; where strains of "Land of Hope and Glory" no longer stiffen the spine; where they have no desire to pursue purely Chauvinistic impulses, among our young people.

I have not met a young person in the last five years who was supporter of the monarchy.

Have I not said so in this House?

My friend from Parkdale (Mr. Trotter), the former member for Lakeshore, and one other, I forget who it was, went out to a high school in the city and spoke on behalf of their respective parties, and when they had finished speaking, they said they would answer questions. They were all very articulate, nice looking young men, maybe the former member for Lakeshore was a little better looking, and had a little more money than my friend from Parkdale. But when they finished, up jumped a young student, grade 12, and said: "I want to ask all of them, when are we going to abolish the monarchy?"

I urge that because of this desirable fundamental change in the structure of our society, when it happens, it must be a clear expression of the will of the people, as was the case with our flag, and our national anthem.

I want to make it perfectly clear, so that even the most obtuse will not fail to understand, that I speak out in no negative sense of being anti-monarchy. I think that the present Queen of Canada, and of England, is a fine one, and a highly moral one, a lovely personification of all that is good in family and community life, and I have nothing against her at all. I am for Canada, and if being for Canada means that I think that we have achieved an identity faster in severing the ties of monarchy, then I am ready, with Professor Conway, the Toronto *Star*, and many others, to do it!

Mr. White: Is it fair to ask the hon. member, and is it not fair that the citizens should know the Liberal policy on this matter?

Mr. Sopha: Before leaving this matter, I should like to make another brief reference to the Prime Minister's speech. I just brush you off, just brush you off. He is a little thick, a little thick, and it takes time to get things through. I said about six times that I speak as the member for Sudbury.

Hon. T. L. Wells (Minister without Portfolio): Not the member for Port Arthur (Mr. Knight), that is perfectly obvious; what does your party think of it?

Mr. Sopha: I want to make another reference to the speech of the Prime Minister. Yes, here it is, in the same speech he had this to say, I wish he were here, he is such an intelligent audience, such a contrast to his colleague from London South. He said this:

> It is a fact of life that Canada is a multi-cultural mosaic, and this is nowhere more apparent than in the province of Ontario.

What day did he make that speech? He made it about a week ago. He did not believe that three years ago, last night, or Saturday night, he did not believe that at that time—"a multi-cultural mosaic"—this is a new discovery.

He did not believe it on March 16, 1965, when he raised that colonial symbol to be the flag of Ontario. That is what I said that day, this province is multi-national, multicultural, it is a mosaic. He said in raising the symbol that only one group counts in this province, and if you are not Anglo-Saxon, you do not count. That flag has the cross of St. George on it twice, as if we didn't get the point in the first place.

I speak as one whose ancestry is not Anglo-Saxon and whose forebearers have been here since before 1750. But that is what that says to me. The flag of Canada, in contrast, is smothered between the two colonial symbols, and I say to my friend from Stormont (Mr. Guindon) that no group in this country can claim it as being their own.

A remarkable thing it is, and it bears repetition, that all through the debate in the House of Commons, when that flag was adopted as the flag of this nation, not one person from Quebec, not one, suggested at

any time, that the new flag of Canada contained any French Canadian symbols, but in Ontario you see, if you are not Anglo-Saxon, you are not with it.

That is what they mean to me. Now, about a year ago the Premier referred to Canada as consisting of a bi-national state. I looked in *Hansard* and those are his words, "a bi-national state". I took him to mean that it implies two nations. That is what Lord Durham saw in 1839, and as we know that is how the Montmorency conference saw it. A two nation state, but that is given away now. A year later, it has become multi-national, Canada has become multi-national. Well that is all right with me. I just want the logic to be accurate.

Regardless of how much the unregenerate Anglo-Saxons may object to it, French Canada is a nation. In a sociological sense, it has persisted for 400 years, and it is going to continue to persist. And I say with the greatest of affection, and the greatest of respect, that I am not going to tarry to argue with them, but I am going to make the point and pass on. I say to my colleague from Port Arthur, a man of great courage, who dared to speak on these things, and I merely say to him, when he starts speaking about every one talking one language in this country, then I merely remind him, that in 1841, that was tried.

Lord Durham's report, if you read it, says in the clearest terms that the greatest benefit that we can confer on the French Canadians is to anglicize them. That is a very wordy usage. We will eliminate the problem by anglicizing them. All the French Canadians, we will make them all speak English, and adopt English ways, and the problem will disappear. Go to the library and have a look at it, that is what he says.

So the union of the Canadas came about and the experiment was tried, but it failed, and by 1857, it was recognized that it was a tremendous failure. And they had to invent all sorts of parliamentary devices to take account of the differences, the double majority, for example. Really, the Confederation of Canada, and the severance of the two provinces, Canada West and Canada East, Quebec and Ontario, came about as a result of the failure, and now, I say to my friend from Port Arthur, in the historical sense, that it did not work then and it will not work now.

Because instead of diminishing, decreasing, and disappearing, the French have increased. They are now six million, whereas they were something like 10,000 shortly before the conquest. I apologize to my friend from Stormont for using that ugly word, they were a mere 10,000, plus the troops under Montcalm. Now there are six million and they are not going to disappear. If I am not mistaken, the proportion of the English community in Quebec is about the same proportion as the French community in Ontario, that is, about ten per cent.

In Quebec, for the past century, the English-speaking minority has had the unquestioned right not only to exist but to flourish. During the same period, the French in this province have been restricted and inhibited and this, of course, has contributed to the tensions between the two peoples. When the Premier announces all these accommodations to the French language, it means only that Ontario finally is going to catch up to Quebec, come to the same stage of rights that have been accorded to the English-speaking minority in Quebec for more than a century.

We are all gratified that in recent times we have moved away from old positions and have set aside old prejudices. Regulation 17 is dead. I hate to mention it. We have become more civilized and we have taken substantial steps to correct old injustices. The mark of progress, I say to my friend, the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs (Mr. Rowntree). We are really trying to correct old injustices but there are still those who do not want to move the cart forward, and I suspect that these forces have succeeded in bringing about that hesitancy which I noted in the speech of the Premier.

It seems to me we are going to permit the speaking of French in this chamber. I object to the word "permit." In my view, the French or the English members should have the clear right to speak in either language if they so choose and their speeches should appear in *Hansard* in the language in which they are delivered. That is the way it is in the Legislature in Quebec and that is the way it should be here.

Since this session opened, a number of speeches have been made in French but there is no record of them. Why not? When the Prime Minister wants one of his own speeches translated into French it is done with the utmost dispatch. I suppose he gets the hon. Minister from Stormont to help him. Why then are there not one or two bilingual stenographers on the *Hansard* staff? Let that be done at once and let us have many more bilingual people on the staff in this building.

I would have thought that the first thing the Premier would have done upon his return from Ottawa would be to order his Minister of Tourism and Information (Mr. Auld) to immediately put a bilingual girl on that desk downstairs at the front door, so that if somebody from the government of Quebec came in the front door and wished to converse in his native language they would not have to send up to Spadina Avenue to get a translator to determine that all the fellow wanted was to know where the men's washroom was.

Hon. F. Guindon (Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. For the information of the hon. member for Sudbury I would like to tell him we have one bilingual tourist guide downstairs.

Mr. Sopha: They have to get one for every shift.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sopha: All right, all right. I accept that, I have not met her yet. The hon. Minister is a man that gets around with more facility than I do.

But the real point I wanted to make in connection with the Premier's remark about the cultural mosaic is this, why did the Premier not take the view when he adopted a colonial pennant as the flag of Ontario? I am going to leave it at that point.

Our society is too cluttered up with symbols that have no meaning. When I see the red trucks racing around the streets bearing the sign, Royal mail, I ask myself why not Canada mail. When I pass the museum—that very fine museum just to the north of us—I ask why it cannot be the Ontario museum instead of the Royal Ontario museum. Similarly, with the conservatory of music, why must we be Royal; why can we not be Canadian—Canadians all?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sopha: I do hope, Mr. Speaker, that these observations will commend themselves to the government and I am sure they will.

It is a delight for me to take the opportunity to make a few post election observations on the government itself. I listened to the Premier on election night and heard him say something about going back to the old stand. He said something about business as usual at the same old stand. I followed them on television throughout the campaign, and by actual measurement I am sure no fewer than 793,867 people were prepared to testify in court about that illegal U-turn that he made in front of Union station. I wondered if he got a ticket for it. I watched that 15-minute programme, you know, and I wondered what Mrs. Robarts thought. I watched it with fascination—that 15 minute programme they brought back by popular demand after the election. I wondered what Mrs. Robarts thought about him following that girl with the nice legs down the street as he did for about five minutes. I wish he were here to tell it.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Sopha: Oh, no, oh, no! It might just show he is a man of taste.

Mr. S. Apps (Kingston and the Islands): Jealousy will get you nowhere.

Mr. Sopha: Well, that is what I wanted to say. We are back at the old stand. Here we are and we are looking at the same old familiar faces—a little grayer, a little duller and, if at all possible, a little deader.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: My wife is not going to like that.

Mr. MacDonald: She has got to face facts!

Mr. Sopha: Two new faces have been added, two new ones. With the first, the Duke of Kent we were not surprised. I wish he were here. One more voice added to the London-oriented power centre. He is Jackson's boy and a Bay Street foundling. He has matured a bit in the past year; the voice is deeper, more contralto than soprano. He has put on some physical weight and now presents something of a flannelette appearance, whether that is a reflection of domestic development I am not informed. In any case, we have in this Minister the Ontario equivalent of Ronald Reagan and his presence in the Ministry will, if nothing else, add strength to the government's reactionary wing.

Then we have the new Minister of Mines (Mr. A. F. Lawrence), and he is not here either, who for so long peered down from his back row perch and frequently emitted a puff of fresh air or a drawl into the stale government benches. His promotion to the Ministry is certainly not a reward for services rendered, but is rather an attempt to still one of the few voices of occasional dissent. We were all saddened by the news of his final capitulation. If I may again paraphrase the poet, just for a Cabinet post he has left us, just for a ribbon to stick on his coat—farewell

rebel of yester-year. May you rise again to disturb the ranks of conformity.

Mr. MacDonald: Maybe he is doing that inside the Cabinet.

Mr. Sopha: But he is not here either. We still have Lawrence secundus to carry the banner of revolt. Who will be next, who will be next? Well, I can only venture a guess. There sits the member for London South.

An hon. member: Lean and hungry!

Mr. Sopha: There he sits, scowling like a hungry seagull, ready to swoop down on some vacated ministerial perch. What will it be? Well, there are rumours; some say the Minister of Transport is headed for the dry docks. Others say we are in for a period of wholesale de-Frosting and others say that a strip is about to be torn from the two-ply Minister of Education and University Affairs (Mr. Davis). I can only say that if the member for London South takes the portfolio of University Affairs we should look for a wholesale revolt from the campuses of Ontario.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sopha: When all is said and done, if Jackson wills it so it will be, so let us prepare for the worse. Now, sir, before moving on to more important matters I should like to make just a few observations about the minor problems or perhaps I should say the major Pharisees, the smug minority.

First of all, may I recall the brave predictions made a year ago by the aging boy scout from York South. A year ago the member for York South was boasting up and down the land that it was going to be 67 in '67.

Mr. MacDonald: Now it is 71 in '71.

Mr. Sopha: And now here they sit, an even 20, two less than they had 20 years ago, and 14 less than they had 24 years ago. And yet my friend from York South calls it a great breakthrough. Master of the phrase, is he not? Great breakthrough. Well, even if they fall far short of their great expectations, they have certainly not lost anything in the quality of their smugness and their self-righteousness. It is still, 'we, of the NDP', spoken in the same tone of voice as those Pharisees of old —'Lord we thank thee that we are not as other men'.

And yet, sir, one has to take account—

Mr. MacDonald: You have become worse since you left our ranks.

Mr. Sopha: That is true. I did at one time, but when I became a man I put away childish things. We have to take note of some of the changes that have occurred since we last met. A moment ago I referred to the member for York South as the ceremonial leader, but I do so advisedly because it is quite clear that his present power in the group is about equal to that of the Lieutenant-Governor. The real authority, and basically he is a nice young man, the real authority is in the member for Scarborough West. He is the boss, the man who gives the orders, pulls the strings. You will note that he is chosen to sit behind the former leader.

Mr. MacDonald: Who is the real authority in the member's party?

Mr. Sopha: And I am told that the member for York South has equipped his bifocals with a mirror device, so that when the blow is about to fall, he will see it.

You will note, sir, that unlike an earlier period, the member for York South never make a decision of his own any more. He is constantly turning around to his boss for instructions. I shall be very much surprised if he does not develop a bad case of wryneck before the session is over.

Mr. MacDonald: The member does not know whether it is being written down there.

An hon. member: It will not do any good!

Mr. Sopha: Now, the second in command is, of course, the member for Riverdale, the successful corporation lawyer, who, like the member for High Park, began his political career in the Tory party.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): We also put aside childish things.

Mr. Sopha: They tell me—I did not see it, but they tell me the member for Riverdale wrote and article—he is an author—he wrote an article in the national publication of the NDP—

Mr. MacDonald: The member is wrong.

Mr. Sopha: —as to why the NDP at the federal level was not going to follow the other parties and change its leader.

Mr. MacDonald: He is wrong.

Mr. Sopha: You see, I cannot understand it. He ought to have been writing an article

about this party, which is about to change its leader.

Mr. MacDonald: The member does not even know what was published.

Mr. Sopha: I read a review of it and I predict soundly, upon evidence, that in due course the member for Riverdale will move into the top spot with the member for Scarborough West still holding the reins.

Mr. MacDonald: The member has leadership problems federally and provincially, what about them?

Mr. Sopha: This arrangement follows naturally in the wake of the national convention to which the member for Scarborough West, the member for Riverdale and Laurier LaPierre—what a triumvirate there, Laurier LaPierre, the weeping willow of Seven Days, do you remember—staged something of a coup d'état, a seizure of power.

It was a most interesting spectacle to watch and I was there. They do not know it, I was there. I doubt if it was ever equalled as an exercise in fence-fixing and wire pulling. Mr. Brocklebank, a faithful servant of the party for a quarter of a century, discovered to his sorrow that it is indeed a long road that has no ash can. The time has come, said the member for Scarborough West, to get rid of the cabbages and kings of bygone days and brighten up the image. So let us get rid of this old prairie schooner and give the presidency to a successful Toronto corporation lawyer, and the vice-presidency to the ubiquitous LaPierre.

No sooner said than done. The Lewis' will was the convention's command. But, Mr. Speaker, that was by no means the main event of the show. The big event—such drama, such stagemanship—was the unveiling of the Forest Hill village millionaire. The party's newest recruit, past president of the Parkdale Conservative association.

Mr. Shulman: I have never lived in Forest Hill.

Mr. Sopha: Yes. And what a sight that was. I was on my way to the convention hall gallery—I am glad I can make this factual report to you—I was on my way to the convention hall gallery when a Sudbury friend told me that something big was about to happen in a smoke-filled room just off the convention hall. So I decided to peek in the door. The room was jammed with reporters and TV cameras. Seated at the table was the member for York South—pacifier, I mean pipe in mouth, polluting the air with the MacDonald—in front of the member for Scarborough West. The impresario, in a speech of uncontrollable exultation, was heard to whisper, "This is the big moment."

Then my eyes beheld the prize. The member for High Park, looking as though he had been in the acid and was about to take off on the trip of trips. I expected to see some symbols of the sacrifice. I thought the present member for High Park would perhaps donate his art collection or King Farouk's launches to the party. No dice. He is not giving anything away.

The unveiling only took a few moments and the principals moved into the main hall. Previously arranged signals were given and the delegates rose on cue to give the conquering hero, not one but three standing ovations in a matter of two minutes. Then he went down the aisle, Renwick on one side, MacDonald on the other. I fully expected to hear a brass band break into the strains of "Hold the Fort," as in the days of old, when the Grits used to get out when Sir John A. was coming to town and join in unison and sing lustily, "Hail the conquering, hail the universal host Satan," with Satan leading off. The member for York South moved to the microphone and, almost unable to control his emotion, cried, "Fellow delegates"—actually you have to believe me, this happened—he runs to the microphone, he grabbed the microphone and he said "Fellow delegates, it is my great honour to present to you Moctor Dorton Shulman."

Mr. MacDonald: Jealousy will get the member nowhere.

Mr. Sopha: Then the entire convention came under the spell of Shulmania and there were cries of "Power now, power now," and that is how the new socialism came to Ontario. The Regina manifesto with all its idealism was duly consigned to the flame, and in its place the delegates were figuratively handed a copy of the "Great Thoughts of Morton Shulman," with the subtitle "Anyone Can Make a Million."

Mr. Speaker, after witnessing that cynical operation, I was not too surprised a few weeks later to watch and listen to a TV show upon which Mr. John David Hamilton interviewed the new national vice-president of the NDP. It went like this:

Mr. Hamilton: "Would it be true to say, Mr. LaPierre, that for the past 20 years or

so the CCF and the NDP have been generally regarded as the party of idealism in Canada?"

Mr. Lapierre, in a slightly French accented Oxfordese: "Yes, that is quite so but that all ended at our last convention."

Mr. Hamilton: "What do you mean by that, Mr. LaPierre?"

Mr. LaPierre: "It simply means this—from here on we are going out to sell the party the way you sell soap."

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is the way he said it.

Mr. Sopha: I am at least glad, Mr. Speaker, that he did not enlighten us as to whether the soap would be Lifebuoy or Fairy. If the member for High Park had his way, it will be either tar or carbolic. What a sad ending to that great movement of social and political reform launched by J. S. Woodsworth 25 years ago. May I suggest the toast which hereafter will be proposed at all future social functions of the party faithful—perhaps the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. MacNaughton) would join us: "Here's to we of the NDP, the party with principles aught, where Renwick takes orders from Lewis, and MacDonald hails Shulman as God."

Well, what about this much talked about book—*Anyone Can Make a Million.* I notice when *Time* magazine reviewed it, the first line said "It is not true, of course". The first thing that ought to be said about this book—no, I will put that second. The first thing I ought to say about this book is I do not own it; I borrowed it from a neighbour.

Twice have I borrowed a book from that neighbour and he is a very fine member of the community; he is a good neighbour, very useful adjunct to society. The only bad thing I know about him is that he owns that book.

Now the second thing that ought to be said about that book is that the title is entirely fraudulent—entirely, and the author of it knew prefectly well that it was not true when he put that title on it. It was chosen as the title for only one reason—to hoodwink and dupe the public. Many years ago someone asked the great Clarence Darrow the question "Can anyone become president of the United States?" He replied, "Of course, ask me, I have read the list."

I am going to refer to some passages in this book but first I want to say that our friends in the House have a great deal to say in the House about protecting the consumer against phoney products. The member for High Park has inveighed heavily against medical quacks. I ask the members of this House. "What about phoney titles on books"? What about literary quackery? Should we not protect the public against them? Should they, too, not be exposed? What would we say about a patent medicine company which tried to sell Punch Imlach or the member for Dufferin-Simcoe, or the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs, a product which was labelled "You too can have wavy blonde hair". Would that be any more preposterous than this?

I asked the member for Riverdale, who knows about such things, "What is the difference between that type of misleading title and the Prudential ads?" which he complained about so mightily. Well, let us come to the book. The book is not without its humour. The funniest thing in it is the foreword written by that other half of the gold dust twins—Charlie Templeton.

Mr. MacDonald: The member does not like him either, eh?

Mr. Sopha: Here is what he has to say in the foreword:

> You do not expect a coroner to breathe such excitement into his work that it leads a major TV network to the production of a weekly television series. You do not expect a medical doctor to state in public that members of his profession are sometimes selfish, incompetent and lacking in dedication. Nor do you expect a coroner to have exotic tastes—take off for Outer Mongolia for a three-week vacation, chiefly because he has not been there—and own a priceless collection of pocket watches; but that is Morton Shulman. Dr. Shulman is 41.

You see here are the things we did not know about. We owe a great debt to Charlie Templeton for telling us about these things.

> Dr. Shulman at 41 is slight of build, wears his black hair close cropped, has an almost handsome, youthful face, and wears carefully tailored conservative clothes. He is quiet, almost unobstrusive.

That fellow Templeton used to be a clergyman—

> Until his interest is stirred, then his face becomes alive and he seems to listen with his entire body. With a group of friends he prowls about the room never still, now sitting, slumped on his backbone, now

leaning forward intently, now moving from group to group, now seated cross-legged on the floor.

What is this—the foreword to "The Naked Ape"?

He is swiftly bored, and does not trouble to hide it. Abstract philosophical talk has no interest for him. It is unlikely he has spent more than five minutes of his lifetime in introspection. When he talks, his voice is quiet, gentle. When he laughs the sound would fill a football field.

Has anybody ever heard him laugh here?

He approached every task directly.

The Attorney General (Mr. Wishart) can tell you that.

The best attack is frontal. The pathway to an objective never leads around Robin Hood's barn. If there are problems to solve, get at them and do not waste time in contemplation. Morton Shulman is a to-hell-with-the-torpedoes, full-steam-ahead kind of guy.

Now I want to refer to another passage in the book and this in a more serious vein. The place where I take issue with the book is not so much its title but in these two passages that I want to read into the record to show the hon. members, through you, just how phoney the book really is. Page 154—hearken to the words used by the present member for High Park. In 1966 this book was written.

Alas the obvious is not always the truth. The fact is that except in unusual circumstances, such as were earlier described, one is better advised to buy U.S. securities. The reason is very simple. When buying a U.S. security, one has more security. With the greatest regret, I must say that "buy Canadian" is a great formula everywhere except in the stock market. There are exceptions where stocks are vastly underpriced but except for these uncommon securities it is better to avoid Canadian stocks. It is with difficulty that as a Canadian I must recommend, other factors being equal, "buy American".

Some hon. members: Shame, shame!

Mr. Sopha: Could anything be more ghastly that that?

Mr. Lewis: The hon. member does not care what his colleagues say—

Mr. Sopha: They have asked what Liberal policy is. Quite seriously, sincerely, I ask the member for Riverdale if he agrees with that quotation from that book. I ask the member for York South if he agrees with it. That advice, if taken, of course, would rip the economic guts out of this country.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sopha: I say to the member for High Park that no matter how they battle, they cannot get over the starkness of that quotation. That marks the member for High Park's interest in this country. That marks it forever.

Mr. MacDonald: To publish.

Mr. Sopha: Until he publishes another book. I say to the member for High Park who has made, and is still making a fortune out of the book, that he has a two-fold moral obligation. One, he should withdraw this book from circulation, and two, he should buy space in the newspapers and offer a refund to all those who were duped into buying it, at least the Canadians who bought it.

Mr. Shulman: I have letters from hundreds of Canadians who made money as a result of buying the book.

Mr. Sopha: I notice that it was for some time a best seller in the United States. Well, I do not complain about that, for as Barnum told us long ago, there is a sucker born every minute in the United States.

And speaking of P. T. Barnum, I recall that when he first opened his show in New York, it attracted enormous crowds. The fire marshal of the city became very alarmed and insisted on additional exits. When Barnum arrived on the scene he noticed several large signs bearing the word 'Egress'. Not being familiar with it, he asked its meaning and when told, he ordered new signs put up, which said: "This way to the mighty Egress —admission ten cents."

As might be expected the throng moved forward and found themselves enveloped in the blackness of night. Such will be the fate of those who are lured into buying that book. It is a swindle, plain and simple. I should not be at all surprised if some member of the press gallery decided to write a book with the title, "Morton Shulman—Toronto's Abominable Snowman".

Our friend puts ads in the paper. Before the House met, he had an ad in the paper that invited everyone who had trouble with auto insurance to write him a letter. Last

week he had an ad in the paper inviting everyone who had trouble with workmen's compensation to write him a letter. I am minded to put an ad in the paper. I feel like putting one in. Mine will say that I invite anyone who made $1 million as a result of buying that book to write to me and, on reasonable proof, I will give my certified cheque to the Red Cross for $500.

I ask you, Mr. Speaker, because I do not want the sense or impact of this to be lost, what would happen to Canada, to the people of Canada, if every Canadian took the advice of that piece of quackery? If every Canadian who holds bonds of his country, of his own province, exchanged them for those of the United States?

Mr. MacDonald: Unfortunately many do that every day.

Mr. Sopha: And this is the advice, that is the advice of a leading member of a party which pretends and professes to be opposed to American domination of Canada. Did you hear the member for Oshawa today? Did you hear him? That is the new socialism. John A. Macdonald would have called it the "Old treason."

To conclude this portion of my remarks, may I say a few words about another tycoon who has become the chief testimonialist of the NDP, Mr. Pierre DeMariny Berton—"The Comfortable Phew."

I hold in my hand the flossy publication issued by the NDP in the last election campaign. It has been called by many names.

Mr. MacDonald: Does the member know what they call it?

Mr. Sopha: The secret weapon and the myth gun. No more expensive piece of political advertising, I am sure, was ever published in the political history of this nation than this one.

As members can see, it is in livid colour. It has many pictures of the leading personalities of the NDP hierarchy and a more affluent, opulent collection of people you never saw. They would make a CMA convention look like a gathering of the proletariat in the October revolution.

On the cover we see the picture of Donald himself at the lectern, looking like the spitting image of LBJ announcing a hefty defence contract to a Texas war industry. He is described as six foot, 196-pound MacDonald and, on page 3, he is accompanied by LaPierre. On page 4, we have no less than three shots of our Donald—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Cult of the personality.

Mr. Sopha: —and mention is made of how the audiences are responding to his call for '67 in 1967. On page 5 we see him with Mayor Bill Dennison, who the other day called Frank Mahovlich the great golfer.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sopha: Page 6, a lovely picture of the very talented and charming Mrs. MacDonald and their family. At the top of page 7, who else but the brooding Heathcliffe of *Wuthering Heights*, alias Dr. Shulman. And underneath that, my friend and neighbour from Sudbury East (Mr. Martel).

The caption here is "A Winning Team" and it asks the question:

> What do the president of the Oshawa labour council, one of Toronto's most successful corporation lawyers, the president of one of Canada's largest construction firms and Dr. Morton Shulman have in common?

Get the question. You would think the answer was worth a six weeks' vacation in Australia, if you could figure that one out. It does not give the answer, except to say they are all NDP candidates and I expect firstly the first three would like to know how the poets made millions. So would all of us.

Now to pages 8 and 9, what a spread. We see the former member for Fort William, he was a nice guy, surrounded by the two Hamilton members literally oozing prosperity from every pregnant pore. Then we have the successful corporation lawyer—there he is—in the centre of the benign and beatific member for Yorkview (Mr. Young) and then, who else, but the head man himself. The member for Scarborough West, the teacher, the historian, and so on.

I forgot to mention—I do not want to be ungallant—at the bottom left we have a picture of the lovely new member for Scarborough Centre (Mrs. Renwick).

Now we have more pictures illustrating the fact that Ontario is indeed a place to stand and a place to grow. Here is a fine picture of a graduating class, perhaps the graduation picture for the member for Scarborough West.

And finally Mr. Speaker—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sopha: Finally we have a picture with a sign reading, "Warning, Polluted Water". Perhaps that is not too wide of the mark.

After the attractive pictorial review of our province, in seriousness, I turn back to page 2, to the testimonial by Saint Pierre Berton and what a familiar face it has come to be. You simply cannot escape him these days. You turn on your television set and he is there, you switch to radio and he is there, with or without the other of the Bobbsey Twins.

Mr. MacDonald: Jealousy will get the member nowhere.

Mr. Sopha: If you travel in the subway he is benignly smiling down at you. If you turn the pages of a newspaper, there he is in one of many tuxedos. What does he have to say about Ontario? Well, brace yourselves, here it is:

> Looking at my province in this centennial year, I can find precious little cause for celebration.

Does that not just stagger you?

An hon. member: It gets you right here.

Mr. Sopha: The man who is referred to in this issue of *Maclean's* magazine, March 1968, is referred to as the E. P. Taylor of Canadian journalism. Precious little cause to celebrate. The man who earned $100,000 a year even before he entered the publishing business, whose centennial library series alone sold nearly one million copies of eight titles at $2.95 and $3.95 each; the man who received $1.66 a word—$1.66 a word—for extracts from his recent books which, in the words of his publisher, Jack McClelland, contains nothing new; the man who appeared on an hour-long television show recently describing his eating habits and complaining bitterly that hors d'oeuvre of Toronto restaurants contained only five or six choices where he expected 15 to 20; the man who finds precious little to celebrate and the TV cameras actually went out to his Kleinburg chalet to photograph Pierre at work in his kitchen preparing exotic dishes.

At the end, we see the man clad in an oriental robe sipping mulled wine. I hope you saw that. I wonder what impression is left with the dispossessed of Ontario. And, yet we are asked to accept the proposition that Pierre Berton is the greatest thing that has happened to us since the advent of John 23rd. It has been said of the saintly Pope John that he brought about a qualitative change in human relations. Of Mr. Berton it could be said he brought about a quantitative change in the size of his own bank account. Where John put his arm around the heart of the world, Pierre Berton put his hand into just about everybody's pocket.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: State the point of order, please.

Mr. Shulman: Yes, I wish on a point of order, to point out to the hon. member for Sudbury that although it is not well known and has never been made public by Mr. Berton, he has used his wealth primarily to help others throughout this province. This is the truth. I happen to know this.

Mr. Speaker: Point of order.

Mr. Sopha: Make no mistake about it and he deserves this. Look, I will tell you why I do this, I will be very frank with you. When I read that during the campaign, when I saw that for the first time, oblivious of the years of grinding poverty, the frustrating experience of the perils, the back-breaking work that in 100 years of history had made this province and this nation great—oblivious of all that, this man could write those words that he had precious little to celebrate. I thought of my father.

Maybe, if it is not untimely, I say how I thought of my father who worked underground, one of the builders like tens of thousands of other people—tens of thousands of them, hundreds of thousands. My father worked underground with the Buffalo Mine 25 years before I was born and at the age of 68 in 1940, he went back to work to run a blast furnace at the Nipissing Mine because they could not get men and this phoney says, in 1967, that there is precious little to celebrate.

An hon. member: Read on, read on.

Mr. Sopha: Make no mistake about it; make no mistake about it. The taxpayers of this country subsidized the Berton climb to prominence.

Mr. Speaker, where else in all Canada can you find anyone who draws more sustenance from the ample bosom of the establishment than Mr. Berton?

Mr. MacDonald: Why do you not deal with some real issues instead of personalities?

Mr. Sopha: The hit-and-run reformer and the chief testimonialist of the NDP. Week after week for almost a decade; this hurts them, does it not?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sopha: Week after week, for almost a decade, Mr. Berton has appeared on our television screens as a panelist on "Front Page Challenge," presided over by Freddie the Earl of Du Maurier. At the appropriate moment—remember this is subsidized by the taxpayers of this country—at the appropriate moment, Freddie can be counted upon to say, "Well, Pierre have you written a new book?" This time on turkey dressing. "Yes, that is right, Fred," says the modest author. Thereupon the book is held up for all to see. And so with such a vast viewing audience, sales are bound to mount.

How many Canadian authors get a break like that? Just think of the vast amount of free, tax-supported publicity that has accompanied the new book *The Smug Minority*, which we see piled up in every cigar and drug store, together with *The Valley of the Dolls*—though I am told that the latter is doing much better than the former. I read one chapter of it; that was enough.

As George Bernard Shaw said a long time ago, if you see there is a rotten spot in an apple you do not have to eat the whole apple to prove it to yourself. One chapter was enough. But I could see in reading the one chapter that, by gad, the man does not even think we can read. He at least ought to do us the courtesy of acknowledging that some in this country would have read Ida Tarbell, Lincoln Stephens, Sinclair Lewis and Upton Sinclair. Upton Sinclair said all the same things 60 years ago, said them better and said them for less pay than Berton gets for saying them today.

The man who finds precious little to celebrate. I am dealing with a public statement in an election brochure.

An hon. member: Why does the hon. member not read it all?

Mr. Sopha: He can hardly complain about the size of his royalty cheques. I can only hope that he is sharing the loot with: "We of the NDP."

All right, I am glad I said it. I am glad I said it. I am glad that someone finally, in a public forum, poked that flatulent bladder of phoniness with the poignard of truth. That is borrowed from a socialist, Niron Babbett.

Mr. MacDonald: The hon. member borrows everything from the socialists.

Mr. Sopha: Now, they thought they were exercising, wait till you hear them in a few minutes. Early in the session the Prime Minister tabled the report of Mr. Justice Parker on the charges made by the former Metro chief coroner against a number of Ontario civil servants and other public officials. I shall not attempt to review those charges for they are well known to all hon. members and have been fully reported upon in the press and dealt with by other media.

I well recall that when the charges were first made, my own leader, the member for Brant (Mr. Nixon), was the very first to call for a public inquiry. He did so for two reasons.

First, because he felt that anyone who has knowledge of wrongdoing and seeks to expose it has a right to be heard. And secondly, and no less important, those who were charged with wrongdoing, in this case a number of distinguished civil servants of this province, had the right to clear their names. What more or less could we do when charges of the nature that were made were made by a man who occupied an important office under the Attorney General; he hurled these charges and hurled them into public print.

There are many of us in this House who know personally the people charged. Frank Wilson, Randall Dick, William Common. I do not want to embarrass him by referring to his presence. We know these men personally. About them I can say this from my personal knowledge—they would not know how to do the things that the member for High Park accused them of doing. Were the four or five decades of service to the people of this province of William B. Common to be sacrificed on the altar of headline gathering? No, there was nothing more or less to be done than to demand a public inquiry. I have many disagreements with the Attorney General, many of them, on matters of policy and methodology of doing things, but you would have to argue long into the night and produce very cogent evidence, to prove to me that the Minister of Justice and the Attorney General of this province would ever consciously support wrongdoing.

When Mr. Justice Parker was named to head the inquiry, I must say that the appointment was greeted with satisfaction on this side of the House. Those of us who belong

to the legal profession have appeared before him many times and hold him in high regard.

Mr. Justice Parker is a man of the highest integrity, the very highest integrity. What did the member for High Park think about him? Let me read it to you. What did he think about him at one stage? I want to show you and put into the record how this chameleon can change his attitude from day to day. Here is the May 12, 1967:

> *The Commissioner:* This hearing is reconvened as soon as possible to deal with a statement made by a news medium in which Dr. Shulman is quoted as making an allegation against my integrity.
>
> I understand, Mr. Willisten, that as counsel for Dr. Shulman you would like to make a statement?
>
> *Mr. Willisten:* Mr. Commissioner, on the television news broadcast on Tuesday night, my client is quoted as having made certain remarks concerning the commissioner.
>
> As soon as my client learned about the broadcast, he immediately telephoned CBC and told them that the remarks were not correct and asked that there be no re-broadcast. That request was honoured.
>
> The circumstances of making these remarks were that my client was telephoned and asked to give an interview on television to explain why he needed a lawyer. He told the person who called that he could not be interviewed by the press without seeing his lawyer.
>
> My client maintains that his remarks were misinterpreted. Certainly, under the circumstances, he had no idea that the remarks would be repeated.

Let me interpolate and tell members what the remarks were. They all know. He said that the commission was headed by a Conservative judge and that it was crooked. That is what he was quoted as saying and that is what they are apologizing about.

Now Mr. Willisten goes on:

> I do not wish to get into any dispute as to exactly what was said, but I want to make the record quite clear that my client does not, and never intended to, impute any dishonest motives to you or lack of integrity on your part.
>
> My client, with great sincerity, apologizes for the remarks which he did make and wishes to publicly reaffirm his belief in your integrity, sir.

Now, such professions are very shifting indeed, because no sooner had the report of Mr. Justice Parker been tabled in this Legislature, than the member for High Park was out in the lobby repeating allegations to the same effect, calling it whitewash.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sopha: So, here is where we are. And I want my friend, the member for Halton West (Mr. Kerr) to attend to me. Here is where we are. Very serious allegations were made, they were investigated by a judge of the highest integrity, and then he comes back and he says to us, he rushed in here after he had a time to digest it: "Scandalous, slanderous, whitewash, this judge is a dishonourable man." It is a funny thing, and I put it to you, Mr. Speaker, that this member has come up against two judges of the high court—Mr. Justice Parker and the chief justice of Ontario—and on both occasions, both of them have rebuked and repudiated him—on both occasions. So I say to my friend from Halton West—he and I practise in the courts—what are we left with? What are we left with? If they disagree with the member for High Park then as lawyers who must stake our faith and that of the community in the integrity of the judicial bench, we are asked to accept his word for it.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): What judge is supposed to have rebuked? He was conducting an inquiry.

Mr. Sopha: We are asked to accept his word for it.

Mr. Renwick: It was a commissioner, not a judge.

Mr. MacDonald: Besides, as the Prime Minister reminded the member last year, it was he who led the attack on the judiciary.

Mr. Sopha: It is coin that we cannot accept in exchange, we cannot accept it. Chief Justice Gale has served this province for many, many years on the trial bench, the court of appeal, as chief justice of the high court and now chief justice of Ontario.

Mr. Renwick: That is right.

Mr. Sopha: We cannot, nor can anyone in the life of this province or any citizen, accept this man's word in preference to the comments, the observations, the findings of Chief Justice Gale.

Mr. MacDonald: They said that about Landreville for a while.

Mr. Sopha: He called him glib. He called him glib. Have a look in the dictionary.

Mr. MacDonald: Has the hon. member forgotten? The hon. member said that about Landreville for a while.

Mr. Sopha: I never did. Have a look in the dictionary and see what the word "glib" means and then bear in mind the meaning when he gets up and hurls the track of innuendo that he hurls. Bear in mind what Chief Justice Gale said about him in the Posluns case. I can put it to you as a lawyer better than the member for Grey South (Mr. Winkler) can. The chief justice said:

> When his evidence conflicts with that of any other credible witness, I accept the evidence of such other witness.

Mr. Shulman: That is a misquote and a lie.

Mr. MacDonald: The trouble is the hon. member's leader cannot shut him up.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sopha: I sat in on a few sessions of the inquiry and I was deeply impressed by the solicitude shown by Mr. Justice Parker for the hon. member for High Park, who elected to appear without the benefit of counsel at the outset. Why, I do not know, I shall never know that. Oh yes, I think I do know. I will not tarry to give the explanation. He does not want to share the spotlight with anyone—it must be for him alone.

Certainly, he had lots of time to secure the best that money could buy. I could only assume that the member for High Park felt that the dramatic impact and publicity value of his appearance would be enhanced if he handled his own case. Then just about midway in the inquiry we heard on the air and television, we read in the press, that the member for High Park told Mr. Harrington, who represents the CBC in our press gallery, that the Parker inquiry was crooked. Not without—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sopha: —significance that. At that point Mr. Willisten withdrew from the case. I shall not attempt—

Mr. Shulman: That is not when Mr. Willisten withdrew. That is another lie.

Mr. Sopha: He can mouth all the amenities he wants but the fact remains. Mr. Willisten withdrew from the case.

Mr. Shulman: Is the member not ashamed to mistake the facts?

Mr. MacDonald: It is a half truth and the member proclaimed it as the whole truth.

Mr. Sopha: I did not read anywhere that Mr. Willisten broke his leg.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sopha: I did not read that. Well, I shall not attempt to follow the case from that point on. We now have the full report of the inquiry. We have the full report and every member of this House has had an opportunity to read it.

I must say that I am not one of those, the records will bear me out, that believes in the infallibility of judges. After all they are only human beings like ourselves and like us they are subject to error. But, sir, I say that we should show respect for our judiciary.

Mr. MacDonald: The member had no respect last year, so the Prime Minister scolded him.

Mr. Sopha: And we should hesitate before we question their findings.

Mr. MacDonald: How unctuous and self-righteous!

Mr. Sopha: The member for High Park is, of course, displeased, indeed angry, that his rather wild charges have not been sustained, and so again he charges political bias. He says Mr. Justice Parker was out to get him. That is a phrase he used. Why should Mr. Justice Parker—

Mr. Shulman: I did not use that phrase.

Mr. Sopha: Why should he be out to get him? In my view, speaking as a citizen who is able to read what Mr. Justice Parker said, I just could not comprehend it. In my view, the report shows clearly that it was the member for High Park who was out to get a number of his fellow civil servants and he did not succeed.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sopha: Just what would the member for High Park have felt was a fair inquiry—one presided over by David Lewis or by the member for Riverdale? Does he suggest that

Mr. Justice Parker should have said at the opening of the inquiry—"Gentlemen, Dr. Shulman is here with a large bundle of documents detailing his charges against Drs. Cotnam, Common, Wilson and others. Since we all recognize that Dr. Shulman is incapable of making an unsubstantiated charge, I suggest that we take his material as read and find those named guilty as charged".

That is what he would have had Mr. Justice Parker say. Nothing short of that, from his remarks since, would have satisfied him. That, I take it, is what would have been a fair inquiry in his view. Sir, I say only this: I am completely objective about this.

Mr. MacDonald: Self righteous!

Mr. Sopha: Here we have a man who used up four hours of the Legislature's time.

An hon. member: What has the hon. member been doing?

Mr. Sopha: Four hours of the Legislature's time—

Mr. MacDonald: When is the member going to get around to the basic issues?

Mr. Sopha: —rehashing things that have been talked about here for several years and nothing new, nothing new, came out of it. And he is the man who hit the low point in parliamentary life, and I do not exaggerate, when he read that editorial from the Orillia *Packet and Times.* His voice dripping with invective and innuendo as he read that editorial into the record.

Mr. MacDonald: Has the member ever listened to himself?

Mr. C. G. Pilkey (Oshawa): The member ought to play this back later.

Mr. Sopha: I tell him go the second volume of Skelton's *Life and Letters of Laurier*— Look for the name Foster and see what Mr. Foster put on the record in the House of Commons as far back as about 1910, about personal aspersions—see the technique used.

Mr. MacDonald: The member should have recognized himself.

Mr. Sopha: We should never have been dragged down to that low level to which he reduced the debate that day when he read that editorial.

Mr. MacDonald: You have two standards. One for yourself and one for everybody else.

Mr. Sopha: They do not have to bank on what I say. Two distinguished judges of the highest courts of judicature in this province—

Mr. Renwick: Just drop the word distinguished.

Mr. Sopha: —have had occasion to deal with the member for High Park in two separate and completely unrelated cases. They have reached identical conclusions as to his credibility and his reliability as a witness. And the four hour speech that the member for High Park delivered in this House lends strength and weight to those conclusions.

Mr. N. L. Olde (Middlesex South): This is black Monday for the NDP.

Mr. Sopha: Here is a man—

Mr. Pilkey: It is going to be a black day for the Tories.

Mr. Sopha: Here is a man who has projected himself onto a very wide stage indeed. He discusses with the pretense of knowledge, everything under the sun.

Mr. MacDonald: The member is jealous again.

Mr. Sopha: Now I—

Mr. MacDonald: What did the party think about the member when they denied the federal nomination?

An hon. member: That is getting through to him.

Mr. Sopha: I have great admiration for Dalton Camp, great admiration for him and if that allusion comes into focus here, Dalton Camp in many ways is my kind of guy. With him I am not one of those who believe that all the bad men sit on that side and all the pure and good guys sit on this side. That is what Dalton Camp said on the television one night. Theirs is a heavy burden who have the responsibility of power and in many ways it is a terrible responsibility. But our task, our task here, is to watch and criticize, to offer constructive alternatives, to pose alternative courses of action.

Mr. Renwick: The member has not offered one tonight.

Mr. Sopha: And never, in carrying out those responsibilities, ought we ever to descend to the level of personal innuendo. You see, I am

a man in public life and I have my responsibilities. The member for High Park wants us to believe nothing short of this. That everyone who opposes him on any matter great or small is motivated by caprice and dishonourable motives. Well, really, does not that go to a great many? Are we to accept that?

It gives me no satisfaction whatsoever to have to say this, for in the beginning I, like other members of the House and many other citizens of this province, had great respect for the member for High Park. I was proud that we had in office one who gave every appearance of protecting the public weal. But, sir, the present member for High Park has destroyed my confidence and I no longer accept his credibility.

Mr. MacDonald: That is a partisan comment.

Mr. Sopha: I can only hope that he will choose to draw the full conclusions from the public disfavour he has incurred by following such an irresponsible course.

Mr. Renwick: Public disfavour?

Mr. MacDonald: What public disfavour?

Mr. Sopha: That he will be big enough to acknowledge the unfairness of his actions towards these good people in the civil service of this province, and while there is yet still time that he will turn his talents to more constructive purposes.

Mr. Speaker, there is nothing new under the sun, nothing at all new under the sun, and there is abundant evidence in our history that those who seek political advancement by smearing the character of other men, themselves finally fade into political oblivion. Those who live by the smear simply cannot hold public respect in a civilized society.

Mrs. M. Renwick (Scarborough Centre): Before beginning my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I wish to add my congratulations to that of others on your election as Speaker of this assembly.

Even as a new member of this Legislature, I recognize the extreme importance of a Speaker in a partisan assembly to keep an even hand, and I know that you, Mr. Speaker, will do so.

In this assembly of 117 members, there are 41 new members. I would like to state, as one of the new members, my appreciation for the very courteous way I have been received here by members of all parties. In the allocation of caucus responsibility, I have been assigned, Mr. Speaker, the portfolio of social and family services, and am looking forward to dealing with the estimates in that department.

Approximately one-third of the riding I represent is made up of multiple housing units. Six thousand of the 17,000 families in Scarborough Centre live in apartments. While there are many other problems directed toward landlord-tenant relationship, I want to direct the attention of the government particularly to what is happening in my riding with rent increases.

We all know, Mr. Speaker, that with rising costs of land, interest rates and construction, that new apartment buildings may very well show valid rent increases. Where I wish to draw the government's attention today is to invalid, unjust rent increases which are forcing families out of eight, and ten-year-old buildings because the income and wages of a family cannot meet the new rent increases. They are ending up as applications on the files of the Ontario housing corporation.

There, even after a culling out recently through a questionnaire, the lists remain at a bare minimum of 5,000 families seeking better accommodation. Making allowance for the fact that an additional 3,000 replies did not come through the mail, while 1,600 were no longer at the same address, it is quite apparent that anything which can be done to alleviate this growth of application files at OHC is of real value to this government.

I have three examples of properties which in the past two years have changed hands hence ensued flagrant rent increases. Properties with little or no service to tenants. These buildings are in the Metro area in particular. Buildings changing hands from speculation, a very great contributor to today's housing dilemma, to say nothing of inflation.

In my mind, Mr. Speaker, a rental review board established now by this government is overdue. However, establishing it even now, before the peak of this crisis follows, is essential if we are going to deal effectively with the chaos that is already out there, and in the final analysis, ends up here as a responsibility of this government, adding burdens and increasing demands on OHC.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, may I point out clearly that a well operated apartment business showing rent increases, but not flagrant profiteering, can be, and from this kind of operation information, would not need to be

brought before a rental review board. The people operating in this kind of operation are seriously operating a business, rendering a service, and the rent increases are moderate, the services basically good. The increases are justifiable.

An example, Mr. Speaker, of such a building is the 774-suite complex, known as City Park apartments. For the benefit of the hon. members who do not attend the Village Green health club, may I say that the City Park apartments comprise a city block immediately behind the Westbury hotel, Yonge, Alexander to Church Street. Their rent increases have come about in this fashion:

1956-65—no change; 1966—$2.00 a month increase; 1967—$19 a month increase; 1968—$4 a month increase.

These went up in a very realistic understandable fashion, Mr. Speaker.

February '66, a family unit of two bedrooms, $173; July '66, $174; December '66, $175; February '67, $178, $183, $198. Regular, justifiable increases.

Now, may I draw the government's attention, Mr. Speaker, to buildings "A", "B", and "C".

Building "A", two bedroom family unit, water seepage, elevator does not work, heat problem. Rent increase, '66-67—$23; '67-68—$15. A total of $38 a month in a two-year period.

City Park apartments' actual increase in this time was $19, one-half of the inferior building.

Even if we include the future increases of a well run apartment development such as City Park, we then are dealing with a figure of a $23 month increase instead of $38 in the inferior dwelling.

Since most of us would want to consider the tax increase of the second rate building, taxes showed a total increase, 1965-1967 of less than $500. This building is eight to ten years old, it changed hands about two years ago. The total rent hike in '66—$5,000. The total rent hike in '67—$8,000. The tax hike in that period—$500. I repeat, a building with water seepage, an elevator not working properly and heat problems.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): A rental review board would look after that.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Next, apartment "B", two bedroom family occupied unit. In this building tenants cannot locate or speak to the owner. There is a specified play room area for the children, which is occupied by the superintendent who actually lives elsewhere. Finally, tenants got the name of the owner from the elevator licence issued by the hon. Minister of Labour's (Mr. Bale's) department, to find that the owner is expert in avoiding a confrontation by telephone or by any other means with his tenants.

The rent hike in apartment "B", $20 per month; the total annually $7,000. The total tax increase $1,113. Rent increase five times that of the increase in taxation.

Building "C": This is a one-bedroom, kitchen and living room over stores. No service, no lease. But, Mr. Speaker, the lady next door to this lady on the OHC file does have a lease. The rent in '65, $80 a month. The building changed hands, the rent increased to $85. April, '67, rent increased to $95. October, '67, rent increased to $120. A $40 a month rent hike in a two-year period.

The new owners did paint the walls and hall, this is the only change prior to the 26 months of stable rent in this building prior to it changing hands. A rent increase of 50 per cent, a tax increase of 15 per cent.

I would like to direct the next few remarks to the need of a public housing registry. I have dealt with Ontario housing corporation problems, and the impasse I have run into at OHC is not the fault of any individual person. I say this, Mr. Speaker, although I have had some very sharp words with a placement officer and the general manager of the Ontario housing corporation.

What is wrong are the procedures that are used in the allocation of Ontario housing, where the demand, Mr. Speaker, far exceeds the supply. I advocate a public housing registry where applicants can go and find out where they stand on the list.

I am not speaking about a symbol registry, Mr. Speaker, based on a chronological order of applications, but a sophisticated classification system, so that when a person's application is received it will be allocated based on the relative needs of the applicant. I realize they have a point system of assignment in force at the present time, but my main point is that an applicant should be able to go personally and inspect the registry, and that any applicant should be able to appeal the classification to which he has been assigned. And if he believes he should receive consideration within the classification over someone ahead of him in the classification, he should then, Mr. Speaker, be entitled to appeal.

I can appreciate that the immediate reaction or argument of the government will be that this is an intrusion into people's privacy, but there is no doubt in my mind that applicants must know that they are being dealt with fairly, and an open registry is the only way it can be accomplished.

As in all the areas where a person is dealing with the government, Mr. Speaker, we have to move from the position of the person being a suppliant to where the person has the feeling that he has rights that are fully recognized. To my mind this is a fundamental need.

As a member of this Legislature who receives many applications as do other members, for help in this field, I do not wish to be in the position that persons who come to me are receiving privileged treatment at OHC over others who do not happen to come to me. This is, in fact, what is happening. I would like to quote from Mr. Justice McRuer's inquiry into civil rights:

> We are not here concerned with the policies, neither are we concerned with the political or humanitarian basis for assistance. Our concern is with statutory rights and with the exercise of the power to determine the existence and extent of rights of individual cases.

Mr. Speaker, I turn to an event which, in all likelihood, I would have become involved in earlier had I not been fighting an election campaign when it first arose. I refer to the proposed separation for adoption purposes of Crown wards Peggy, age 5 and her sister Valerie, age 3, then foster children in the home of Mrs. Arthur Timbrell.

I find it quite shocking, Mr. Speaker, that no member of the bar practising in the legal profession in the immediate area of Kitchener, Preston and Waterloo, came foward to defend Mrs. Timbrell, whom, because she believed everything possible should have been done for those two children to adopt them into one family, not separating them for adoption, found herself the subject of a public inquiry.

She received protection from the legal profession only when a Toronto lawyer intervened and offered his services. Then we had the appointment of a judge with a long association with the children's aid society and because of that association there was an obvious bias.

The public did not need a Royal commission, Mr. Speaker, to find Judge Waisberg did not approve of the behaviour of Mrs. Timbrell, it was a foregone conclusion. A Royal commission, Mr. Speaker, should not be used to damage a citizen of this province who is endeavouring to question the decision, obviously having being made by the children's aid society, to separate the two sisters who were originally part of a family of five, for whom two separations had already taken place.

The point is a very simple one. Mrs. Timbrell found herself with no other way to draw attention to the separation of the sisters. She should not be castigated for bringing it forward. I have read the evidence and it is hard to believe, Mr. Speaker, that out of a transcript of this size, could come so little pertinent to the problem. It is evident from the transcript that Mrs. Timbrell provided a very acceptable foster home and that, from the judge's report, she is now punished and not able to be accepted as a home for foster care.

However, had she not raised the question of the separation of the children, she would, in fact, still be an acceptable foster home in this province. The judge did not deal with the point of the inquiry at all, while a very heavy price was paid by Mrs. Timbrell, who has, in fact, achieved her purpose because the two children are still together and quite obviously are not going to be separated.

The judge did not deal with the point of separation that was raised, the principle, this separation of siblings for adoption, and, in turn it raised once again unfortunately the question of Catholic and Protestant adoptions, But that was not the major problem, Mr. Speaker, separation of siblings, children from the same family, that was the problem. It is totally clear in the evidence that the children's aid of Waterloo did not really care whether the children were separated or not.

The initial report filled out by a case worker of the CAS referred to separation. This is the first report, proving the lack of concern, separating the children on paper right from the beginning. For anyone to say that it was specifically attempted to separate the children because it was a benefit to the children, a point which was raised later in the inquiry, simply is not true.

In dealing with this problem today, Mr. Speaker, I am not speaking of Mrs. Timbrell because she is a woman. I am dealing with her as a citizen and what happened to that citizen when something is wrong. I would like to refer to the comments of the late Professor Harold Innes, when he delivered the Cust foundation lecture at the University of Nottingham, May 21, 1948:

> As a result of its lack of prestige, political parties have been able to exploit the legal profession in a fashion which has been the subject of much discussion in legal literature. Members of the Supreme Court have been selected to act on Royal commissions on subjects in which the government finds itself in an embarrassing position.
>
> The use of the legal profession to whitewash political activities of the government is only possible in a country in which the profession has suffered in prestige. The Supreme Court ought not to be in a position in which the government can use it as a doormat on which to wipe its muddy feet.

Professor Harold Innis was head of the department of political economy, University of Toronto. He died in 1952 and it is well recognized that, at the time of his death, he had an international reputation equalled by no other Canadian scholar.

I turn now, Mr. Speaker, to the policy of an international standard setting organization, the child welfare league of America, this small but valuable booklet of 193 points of policy, administration and recommended legislation. These standards were set out June 6, 1958, by the board of directors of the child welfare league of America. The standards are the work of members of the committee on standards for adoption service, selected because of their expertness in the field of adoption.

In its present form, the statement of standards incorporated suggestions received from more than 100 member agencies, state departments of welfare and other national organizations, league staff board members, attorneys, clergymen and psychiatrists who reviewed the draft.

These standards are reviewed and updated every five years, because, as research provides more facts about child behaviour, they become out of date almost as written. I quote their standards of sibling separation for adoptive purposes, section 413, child welfare league of America standards:

> Brothers and sisters, but not necessarily newborn infants who have had a relationship with one another should be placed together, unless it would be more beneficial to them to be placed in separate homes. Children should not be separated, only because it may be difficult to find a home for them together. Where it is not possible to place them in the same home, the value of the permanent home must be weighed against the loss to each of his brothers and sisters.

There was no weighing, Mr. Speaker, of pros and cons in the case of Peggy and Valerie. It was assumed from the initial interview and, in fact, written that they could be separated. Continuing the quote:

> When siblings are placed in separate homes and it is considered advisable for them to maintain contact with each other.

And I say, Mr. Speaker, remember these were two of five children:

> Adoptive families should be selected to make this possible. It cannot be expected that older children will give up ties and relationships.

And the ties and relationships, Mr. Speaker, in small children can be formed as young as a year and a year and a half, because to each of those two children, the other is the "familiar", no matter how many foster homes they may be moved to.

A widely respected gentleman in the field of adoptive and foster care in this city has assured me that the application of standards of such care varies in our province to such a degree that it is possible that a child or children may be carefully prepared for a transfer from one foster home to another in one part of our province, while in another it is done with one cursory visit to prepare the child. In fact, in outlying areas of Ontario, it may well be done by the child being picked up by a taxi service, hence the transfer is made and the child is totally unprepared for the change of home at all.

It is essential that the child welfare branch of this government establish printed guidelines, updated every four to five years, to be adhered to consistently throughout this province, no matter how small the town or village, where a child is in its care, and establish these guidelines, Mr. Speaker, by seeking out the ablest people in the field of child care, in related areas of education and psychiatry.

Had this department set out firmly this policy on the separation of siblings in this particular child welfare branch of this government, the Timbell inquiry, in all likelihood, never would have come about.

Yet we sit tonight, Mr. Speaker, in this assembly while The Department of Social and Family Services is still dragging its feet in this matter. Except for the recommendation

of a chairman, we are still waiting to hear the appointment of the other four members to make up the council, appointed in February, to get on with the job of up-dating foster and adoptive care in this province.

I would like to close my remarks by saying, Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a privilege and a pleasure to be here and to serve under the leadership of Donald C. MacDonald.

Mr. E. Dunlop (York-Forest Hill): Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to enter this debate, and I am prompted to do so by a tide of misgivings. It had its first small lappings in some of the remarks I heard from some members during the course of the previous Parliament. It reached something of the proportions of a flood as I heard and studied the remarks of the hon. member for High Park (Mr. Shulman) in this debate something over a week ago.

Mr. Speaker, I have no misgivings about the privileges that we enjoy as members of this House. They were claimed and denied, asserted and quashed, enacted and repealed in that other Parliament to which we owe our very existence so long ago as the days of the Plantagenet Kings.

The most important of these privileges, the privilege of freedom of speech in this assembly, was enacted in the bill of rights almost exactly 280 years ago, and it has not been challenged since. Just a little more than one month ago, Mr. Speaker, at the opening of this new Parliament, you claimed this ancient and undoubted privilege on our behalf in those magnificent words conveyed to you from a respected past.

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, I regard your high office as the very embodiment of the privileges of this House, and I should like to congratulate you on your election to that office, and for the careful and tolerant and judicious manner in which you are discharging its obligations.

My misgivings, Mr. Speaker, are about the clear and present danger that these privileges may be abused, if they have not already been abused, as I believe they have. Quite clearly, it is essential that members of this House should enjoy the privilege of freedom of speech in this House if they are to speak their piece, free from fear or favour, or hoped for reward. In earlier times, it was necessary that they speak so, and have such privilege so they would be free from fear for life and limb and property.

Under the law of our constitution, no court in this land would entertain any proceeding against any member of this House for anything he says in this House, or for anything attributed to him in the journals or reports published under the authority of this House. Clearly this is as important today as it ever was. A member must feel free to examine, to probe, to criticize the actions of Ministers and members of this House, and the conduct of Ministers and members of this House, no matter how slight their grounds, be they little more than rumour and conjecture.

So far as Ministers and members of this House are concerned, all well and good. They can defend themselves, and the House has the machinery to settle the matter, if need be. My misgivings are about the position of people who live and work outside this House. As one hears some of the things which have been said, and as one fears some of the things which may be said, one wonders if some remedy should not be found for those who are outsiders.

A member may libel and blacken, slander and besmirch, and they can find no remedy as the situation now exists. I suppose that nothing less than a constitutional amendment could deprive members of this House of that awesome privilege.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Is the member in favour of such amendment?

Mr. Dunlop: I do not suggest any such amendments, but I do say that our right to enjoy that privilege will depend in the long run—

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): It is not a privilege, it is a right.

Mr. Dunlop: The member indicates his lack of knowledge of the constitution, I will debate that with him outside some time.

The responsibility—

Mr. Renwick: I will debate it right here in this Legislature, right now.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): The member should read some of the comments of the Cabinet Ministers over the last 10 years if he wants to talk about slandering people outside the House. He is suddenly getting disturbed about a situation that is long-standing.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Dunlop: Mr. Speaker, I suggest that whether or not we should enjoy this right

with respect to outsiders depends, and will depend, upon the public view of the responsibility of the manner in which we exercise that privilege. I should say that my cautionary remarks are addressed to all members of this House, to some more than others, and I suggest to the member for High Park more than any other.

Mr. MacDonald: We had slandering of an outsider just a few moments ago and everybody on that side cheered.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Dunlop: I should like to say that I would ask the member to watch what I applaud, and keep a careful record of it before he tells me that I did.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Dunlop: The remarks of caution that I would like to adress to you came from the same Sir Edward Coke that my friend, the member for Sudbury (Mr. Sopha), referred to in the long hours before the dinner interval with some approval. And this is what Sir Edward Coke said to the Commons in 1593:

> You are granted the liberty of speech, but you must know what privilege you have, not to speak everyone what he listeth, or what cometh in his brain to utter.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest unless we exercise this privilege, which is a privilege against other people outside this House—

Mr. MacDonald: Like Pierre Berton.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Dunlop: Mr. Speaker, I suggest it is the responsibility with which we exercise this privilege which will enable us to keep it. If we fail in the long run, we could lose it and we could lose Parliament itself. I would like to quote some comments of Sir Winstoin Churchill on Parliament:

> The authority of the House of Commons and its hold over the electorate depends to no small extent upon its episodes and great moments. Destroy that hold which Parliament has upon the public mind and the living organism of the House of Commons will be greatly impaired.

He said:

> It has a code of its own, which everyone knows, and it has means of its own of enforcing these manners and habits. It is the citadel of liberty, the foundation of our laws, its traditions and privileges are as lively today as when it broke the arbitrary power of the Crown.

If this is to be so, if our Parliament is to retain its authority, then we must not let it degenerate into a forum, in which any member can say any loathsome thing about an outsider, about all those outsiders who are not among the 117 of us returned to this House, secure in the knowledge that they will never have their day in court.

I do not suggest that Ministers and members should not be attacked; I do not suggest a constitutional change. I do suggest that when attacking outsiders members of this House exercise the greatest care. Cherish their liberties. Think twice before you conclude that its in the public interest to blacken and smear them.

It is in the usual way of things that spectacular charges achieve spectacular coverage in the press, and rebuttal rarely commands much attention. I suggest we must accept this as a fact of life and not fall into the moral abyss which whispers enticingly that because it is quite legal to say a thing in this House, it is quite moral. There are times when legality and morality set sail on separate courses, no matter when these must ultimately cross.

There is one other word of caution which I would like to express to the members of this House and to the members of the press gallery—who are something of a special case, both with us and against us—that their easy assumption of the breadth of parliamentary privilege may well not be so. In these days of reporting by handout, it may well be found that the handout does not enjoy the status of privilege.

The courts have determined the privilege extends only to remarks made in this House and reports printed in the journals authorized by this House. The doctrine of fair comment has protected many a publisher and editor and reporter from damage actions, yet in the hands of the skilled lawyer it may well be found that the press handout, the press release, which is new withal to jurisprudence, is not, in fact privileged.

I hope that this will be found to be so. As one expert in constitutional law I discussed this point which said, "I do hope there will be somebody with enough money to take it to the courts and find out." But I do hope it will be found to be so because I think it

would have several valuable effects. It might be that—

Mr. Singer: It might save a lot of paper.

Mr. Dunlop: That is right. It might be that publishers and their libel lawyers and editors might wish to be sure that the doctrine of fair comment depended upon what was actually said in this House or what had been read to have been said in this House. This would have the effect of probably increasing the attendance in the press gallery above your head, Mr. Speaker, and probably also would have the effect of shortening quite a number of the press handouts of at least some members who would then, of course, have to reserve white space for their slanderous remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I opened with a reference to the member for High Park and I would like to close with another reference which I hope might be considered relevant, at least relevant by the Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. Stewart), and these are words said by another Coke, in another century, really about another matter. But, as the member for High Park returns so often to questions of ancient history and matters of the past, I thought this quotation from Coke not inappropriate. He said: "Let us peruse our ancient authors, for from these old fields we must grow the new corn."

Mr. Speaker, I should like to congratulate the mover (Mr. J. R. Smith) and seconder (Mr. Meen) of the address and reply, and I should like to urge members to vote against the amendments and vote for the main motion.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville) moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Mr. Speaker, before moving the adjournment of the House I would advise that tomorrow we will continue with the Throne debate.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 10:35 o'clock, p.m.

No. 29

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

First Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Tuesday, March 19, 1968

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1968

5

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Tuesday, March 19, 1968

Presenting reports, Mr. Welch 923

Seventh report, standing committee on private bills, Mr. Meen 923

Statement re The Vocational Rehabilitation Services Act, Mr. Yaremko 923

Statement re promotion of Ontario tomatoes, Mr. Stewart 924

Question to Mr. Robarts re Ontario gold mining, Mr. Nixon 925

Questions to Mr. Yaremko re assistance to low-income working women, Mr. Braithwaite 925

Question to Mr. Wishart re Hal Banks, Mr. Braithwaite 926

Question to Mr. Haskett re Philip Englishman, Mr. Young 926

Question to Mr. Dymond re health services to Indians, Mr. Bernier 926

Questions to Mr. Randall re Don Mount urban renewal site, Mr. J. Renwick 926

Questions to Mr. Simonett re the Ontario Northland Railway, Mr. Jackson 927

Questions to Mr. Simonett re water pollution studies in universities, Mr. R. S. Smith 927

Questions to Mr. Wishart re the late Harold E. Rider, Mr. Shulman 927

Questions to Mr. Wishart re the late Ronald Eyes, Mr. Shulman 928

Resumption of the debate on the Speech from the Throne, Mr. B. Newman, Mr. Brown, Mr. Reilly 929

Recess, 6 o'clock 956

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

TUESDAY, MARCH 19, 1968

The House met at 2:30 o'clock p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are pleased again to have visitors to the Legislature and we welcome today as our guests: in the east gallery students from the University of Guelph, in Guelph; and Canadian girls in training from Mount Albert; and in the west gallery the 1st Trafalgar Venturer company from Oakville; the Girl Guide company, from Don Mills; and pupils from St. Gabriel's separate school, Willowdale.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Hon. R. S. Welch (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present to the House the following reports:

(1) The 1966-67 annual report of The Department of Energy and Resources Management.

(2) The annual report of the settlers' loan commissioner for the year ended March 31, 1967.

Mr. A. K. Meen from the standing committee on private bills presented the committee's seventh report which was read as follows and adopted.

Your committee begs to report the following bill without amendment: Bill Pr24, an Act respecting the city of Oshawa.

Your committee begs to report the following bills with certain amendments:

Bill Pr33, An Act respecting the city of Toronto.

Bill Pr34, An Act respecting the county of Welland.

Bill Pr36, An Act respecting the city of Windsor.

Bill Pr38, An Act respecting the board of education for the city of London.

Your committee would recommend that the fees less the penalties and the actual cost of printing be remitted on Bill Pr37, An Act respecting the Brockville club.

Mr. Speaker: Presenting reports.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

Hon. J. Yaremko (Minister of Social and Family Services): Mr. Speaker, I should like to advise the House that The Vocational Rehabilitation Services Act has been proclaimed in force and a complete set of regulations has also been approved. You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that the new Act was a rewriting and improvement of the former Rehabilitation Services Act. It continued the programme of rehabilitation of disabled persons.

The disabilities of human beings are many and varied. We assist in the rehabilitation of men and women who are paralyzed in arms or legs or in all their limbs and confined to wheel chairs; those who have had limbs amputated due to accidents or disease; people who are partly or completely blind or deaf, or mute; those with epilepsy, arthritis, arteriosclerosis; the whole range of disabling with illness.

We assist others to re-establish themselves who have recovered, or partially recovered, from tuberculosis, cerebral palsy, neurosis, or heart attacks. Persons discharged after treatment in mental hospitals form a large percentage—68 per cent—of the 5,700 people who annually are given services by our rehabilitation services. Our aim is eventually to place these men and women in gainful employment, so this is rightfully called "vocational rehabilitation".

The legislation is written in the broadest terms so that our branch has access to all the material and means and measures necessary to accomplish that purpose. We can start with medical restoration treatment to ensure that the person is in the best possible physical and mental condition, proceed to assessment of his capabilities, counsel him in choosing a career, and give whatever training or education is appropriate. At the end of his vocational course we help him in job placement and in the follow-up procedures that make for success.

The types of training or education we offer are manifold. It may consist of a complete

university education, professional courses, or clerical or trade school training, or on-the-job experience in office or factory in vocations calling for every degree of skill and ability. The jobs in which we finally place these graduates run through the whole spectrum of employment, from a sheltered workshop for those unable to compete in the industrial commercial world, right through semi-skilled, skilled, clerical, technical and professional positions.

We have helped persons to become established in their own business, and one of the features of the revised Act is that it expands the items we can provide, including occupational tools, business equipment, supplies and licences.

Mr. Speaker, as often happens the person requires a living allowance while he is taking training. The new regulations increase the amount of these allowances granted on the basis of need to trainees and their dependants. The regulations also make a new provision for travelling expenses where the disabled person must travel away from home to get rehabilitative services. A further benefit is premium-free Ontario hospital insurance and medical services insurance for the disabled person and family during the period in which he is receiving rehabilitation services and a living allowance.

The Act introduced for the first time, operating capital subsidies for sheltered workshops where vocationally handicapped persons are permanently employed or undergoing assessment and work training.

Under the new regulations, the non-profit organizations operating workshops can now claim a payment of $20 monthly for each person accommodated. Further, to encourage the opening of more sheltered workshop facilities, the Ontario government will pay 25 per cent of the cost, up to $3.75 per square foot, for the establishment or expansion of workshops and, in addition, 25 per cent of the cost of the equipment and furnishings.

The operating and capital subsidies of sheltered workshops are effective from April 1, 1967. The province expects to pay out some $540,000 in operating, and $160,000 in capital grants for the year ending March 31, 1968. There are over 2,600 persons in the 81 workshops in Ontario likely to be eligible for the operating grant. The increase in living allowance for many trainees will amount to over $131,000. As I have stated, over 5,700 persons annually receive some type of aid from the rehabilitation services branch and the number is increasing from year to year.

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): Mr. Speaker, I have an announcement to make at this time concerning a programme that is being undertaken by the Ontario food council. With your permission, Mr. Speaker, we are placing samples of the 1967 crop of Ontario tomatoes on each desk as a means of graphically illustrating the fact that the industry is presently involved in a special promotion for this particular product.

There are a number of reasons why this product is displayed here. First, I can think of no other assembled group of people who can benefit more from the fact that tomatoes are high in vitamins C and A, and very low in calories. Second, I wanted every member of this Legislature to know that at this time we are encouraged in a programme designed to encourage the use of Ontario tomatoes in our diets.

The 1967 pack of Ontario canned tomatoes was well above average and was the best quality pack in some years, with excellent colour and solids. At the request of the Ontario tomato products council, which embraces all segments of this industry, and as Minister of Agriculture and Food for Ontario, I have suggested the Ontario food council adopt Ontario canned tomatoes as a "plentiful food programme". The objective is to conduct an all-out promotional programme, in an effort to move supplies and thus assist producers, processors, distributors and consumers.

All segments of the industry are being asked for their help in increasing the sale and use of Ontario canned tomatoes. The Ontario tomato products council is conducting a concentrated promotion campaign to co-ordinate with the efforts of the food council. This campaign got under way March 18 —yesterday.

Contracts have been made with top level officials of chain stores, independent retail organizations, food editors, dietitians, nutritionists, public relations personnel and others involved in the sale, distribution and promotion of food products. Agricultural representatives, home economists and departmental officials in various departments and institutions across the province will assist in promoting the product.

Mr. R. E. Goodin, secretary of the Ontario food council, who has co-ordinated previous successful "plentiful food programmes" for other farm products in the past, will again

act in that capacity. "Plentiful food programmes" are designed to increase the use of agricultural food products which are in abundant supply, and thus stabilize the market.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to the samples which the hon. members will find on their desks today through the courtesy of the programme, I would like to draw their attention to the excellent booklet, "Canned Tomato Recipes", which is available without charge from the Ontario food council, Department of Agriculture and Food, Toronto. This booklet is also prepared through the good offices of the Ontario tomato products council.

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of Her Majesty's loyal Opposition, and being the member for this assembly who has more tomato processing plants, more tomatoes, and the largest production of them in Canada, I would like to compliment your department in undertaking this great promotion. I heard this on the radio yesterday as I was coming into Toronto, and there is only one comment I can pass and that is that possibly we could change our labelling laws and indicate what canning plant actually packed this on behalf of what firm. These are packed for — It does not specify the canning plant as such, and I think it is in the public interest that this be known.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, yesterday I gave notice to the Premier of my intention to ask a question about the new two-price system for gold that was announced in Washington. He was not in the House then, and today I do not have the exact wording of the question with me, but perhaps it would be possible for him to comment on the effect of this announcement on the mining industry of Ontario—not necessarily the stock market.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): I received the question this morning—as a matter of fact I received it by telephone yesterday—but this is fairly detailed, and in order that we may all understand it, I will read it. All Ontario gold mines except one, Campbell Red Lake, are receiving federal gold mining assistance varying from $2.89 to $10.27 per ounce. The effect of the two-price system on these mines will depend on the level of the free market price for gold, and the free market price for gold has recently fluctuated between $40 and $44 per ounce.

Most Ontario gold mines were selling gold for a price consisting of the fixed price which is $35 per ounce American, or $38.05 per ounce Canadian, plus this aid that I have mentioned that varies from mine to mine on a per ounce basis. With the exception of Campbell Red Lake, not a single gold mine in the province obtained a price lower than $40.94 per ounce, while one-third of Ontario's gold mines received $48.32 per ounce.

In other words, the price is made up of the basic $35 per ounce, plus a scale of subsidies from the federal government. The increase in the free market price of gold, to be of benefit to gold mines, must be higher than the aid payable under EGMA or the subsidy. Where this is the case, the mines with lower operating costs would gain the most to the extent that for any particular mine, the free price exceeds the fixed price by more than the amount of assistance per ounce received by that mine, and there will be an incentive for dormant mines to recommence production.

Consequently, if the difference between the free price and the fixed price exceeds the amount of assistance received by the most heavily subsidized Ontario gold mine, you may expect a general increase in production. Ores previously considered to be sub-marginal will be mined and will contribute to output, and the higher free price will also stimulate exploration activity for gold which may lead to new developments.

It is obvious that the first effect of a higher gold price will be a reduction in, or disappearance of, federal subsidies under The Gold Mining Assistance Act. Since it is not clear at this stage in what direction the free market price will move, or how long the two-price system will remain in effect, gold mining operations will be unlikely to take action toward expansion until a clear trend has been firmly established.

Mr. L. A. Braithwaite (Etobicoke): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Social and Family Services. In view of the fact that many working women are the sole supporters of families which often include small children, and in view of the fact that these same women are not on welfare and are not eligible for welfare because they are permanently employed, and in view of the fact that these women earn less than $4,000 a year, does the Minister have any plans to assist these individuals because of the increases in OMSIP and hospitalization?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Sir, as I made reference yesterday, the matter of supplementing

the incomes of employed persons by assistance through this department has very wide ramifications.

OMSIP now has provision for full subsidization of premiums for those who do not earn a taxable income, and partial subsidies for those who do not have taxable income in excess of certain specified amounts.

Our programme of social assistance is widely based, and is available to anyone who comes within the definition of a person in need—for example, elderly persons, persons who are blind, disabled or permanently unemployable, and women who are widowed or deserted and who must support their children.

There are no more tax dollars presently available in this department for extension of existing programmes or new additional subsidies.

Mr. Braithwaite: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. May I ask the Minister if his department has any plans to subsidize the increase in hospitalization costs?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: As I indicated, Mr. Speaker, there are no tax dollars presently available within this department for extension of existing programmes or new additional subsidies.

Mr. Braithwaite: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Attorney General (Mr. Wishart). Will the Attorney General state the total sum of monies spent and expected to be spent by the government in connection with the abortive attempt to extradite Hal Banks? And secondly, will the Minister table the details of such expenditures?

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, the total amount spent up to this time on the extradition proceedings relating to Hal Banks is $21,908.85. I am advised that this represents practically the total amount which will be required to be spent.

I have here, Mr. Speaker, a breakdown of these costs, which I shall be happy to table.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Transport. Will Philip Englishman, who was robbed of his car and driver's licence at gunpoint near Windsor on Friday last, and whose licence was not recovered with the car, be issued a new driver's licence without charge?

Hon. I. Haskett (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, regulations promulgated under The Highway Traffic Act specifically provide for the replacement of a driver's licence lost or stolen on the payment of the nominal administrative fee of $1. Regulation 227, section 20, subsection 1, item 8.

Mr. Young: Will the Minister accept a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker? Would the Minister not agree that it is rather absurd that a man robbed at gunpoint of his driver's licence should have to pay for its replacement; and will the Minister take steps to review the regulations so that a person in this situation can be met properly?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Speaker, I do not feel that kind of inquiry rises to the dignity of a question before the orders of the day in this House.

Mr. L. Bernier (Kenora): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Health. What action does the government propose to take in view of the directive which has been issued by The Department of National Health and Welfare in Ottawa to all Indian chiefs and councils of this province, advising them that health services to their people will be reduced, and that Indian citizens will not be entitled to receive medical and hospital services as has been the policy in the past, until they can prove they are indigent.

Hon M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, so far, this province has not yet received any official notification of this move on the part of the federal government, and until it comes I am not really in a position to state what our attitude will be. However, we are looking very deeply into this, which actually becomes a very complex matter, and as soon as I get official notification, I will be able to inform this House of what we shall propose.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Economics and Development. By what authority has the Ontario housing corporation or its contractors at the Don Mount urban renewal site deprived Mr. Dorothy Graham of her means of ingress and egress to and from her place of residence, by obstructing Munro Street from Dundas Street South to her residence at 60 Munro Street?

Hon. S. J. Randall (Minister of Economics and Development): Mr. Speaker, a number of streets and public lanes in Don Mount urban renewal were closed by city of Toronto bylaw 184-67, dated April 26, 1967. By virtue of the bylaw, the streets and lanes in question are

no longer public thoroughfares, including Munro Street. The Ontario housing corporation has taken all reasonable steps to provide Mrs. Dorothy Graham with means of ingress to and egress from 60 Munro Street by requiring its contractor, Vroom Construction to provide a boardwalk from the site to her residence.

I might say that this has cost us about $400 to date. The only time it is lifted up is when a transportation or construction truck has to go through, and it is put down again so that we do not inconvenience the lady.

I might also say that the Ontario housing corporation was given access to the site by the city of Toronto for the purpose of construction in accordance with the approved urban renewal scheme. Number 60 Munro Street, which was expropriated by the city of Toronto, is located approximately in the centre of phase two of the development. While we appreciate the inconvenience to Mrs. Graham, the contractor has been advised by the OHC to do all he can to assist Mrs. Graham under the present circumstances.

Mr. D. Jackson (Timiskaming): Mr. Speaker, I have two questions for the Minister of Energy and Resources Management, and with your permission, I will place both at once. What caused the last train derailment at Latchford on the Ontario Northland Railway? How much is the Ontario Northland Railway being paid by the Canadian National Railways for the use of ONR locomotives on the GO system? What is the rate per unit hour of operation? Is the ONR responsible for the mechanicial maintenance of these locomotives, either physically or financially?

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Mr. Speaker, the derailment at Latchford was caused by a broken wheel on a foreign box car.

In answer to the second question, I understand that Ontario Northland Railway are not supplying engines to Canadian National for the GO system. I might explain to the member that the GO transit is operated by The Department of Highways.

Mr. R. S. Smith (Nipissing): I have a question for the Minister of Energy and Resources Management. It is in two parts. What effect will the recently announced cuts in provincial grants to Ontario universities have on water pollution studies now in progress in these universities? And second, will the Ontario water resources commission provide sufficient funds to the universities involved to carry on their programme in spite of the decision by The Department of University Affairs?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Speaker, I understand that: part 1, funds are being supplied by the Ontario water resources commission for water pollution this year; and part 2, apart from the funds that the OWRC has supplied in support of this programme, no requests have been received by the OWRC from other universities for grants for fundable projects. Therefore, the OWRC has no plans this year for funding beyond its present arrangement.

Mr. F. A. Burr (Sandwich-Riverside): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs (Mr. Rowntree).

Mr. Speaker: Since the Minister is not present, perhaps the member would withhold it?

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): Mr. Speaker, I have two questions for the Attorney General. In view of the complaints that Con. A. Bayliss who was discharged from the North Gwillimbury police and Con. P. C. Garvey has been kept on night shift for two months because these two officers informed their superior that their chief had beaten up a prisoner as indicated by news report, will the Attorney General order a further investigation?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, I would take this question as notice, and furnish a report and answer later.

Mr. Shulman: The second question for the Attorney General, Mr. Speaker, is in light of the fact that Mrs. Rider has examined the photographs supplied by the Attorney General and said that they are not of her husband, does the Attorney General plan any further investigation of this case?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, I answered the question as to the identification of the late Mr. Rider, some few days ago in this House. An examination of the photographs, due to the very great state of deterioration which the body had reached when is was discovered, would not serve any useful purpose as far as identification goes; nor do I think that exhuming the body would add anything to identification.

The body was identified most definitely and completely by persons who knew the late Mr. Rider, and had known him for a period of time. The hotel clerk, who found him in his room at the time of his death, and had seen him on many occasions for

a considerable time previously and was acquainted with him and two taxi drivers who worked with him, identified him beyond all question so there was no question of identity.

As I said, exhumation would not prove anything further, and the photographs would be the least useful feature in identification. I would say that Mrs. Rider has not spoken to me about this matter.

Mr. Shulman: Would the Minister not consider that an examination of the teeth would settle the doubts in this case?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: There was no doubt about the identification of the body of the man who was found dead in the hotel room, that it was Rider. And there is not now.

Mr. H. Peacock (Windsor West): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Municipal Affairs. When will the Minister release the report of the commissioner appointed to inquire into the sale of lots in Sandwich West township?

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the inquiry to which the hon. member refers is not yet complete. I understand that the commissioner, Judge Sidney Clunis of Windsor is scheduled to complete his hearings next week. I am in no position to inform the House when his report will be available.

Mr. R. H. Knight (Port Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Education (Mr. Davis). Would you like me to read the question into the order paper?

Mr. Speaker: As we stated yesterday, this is the week of the conventions. The Minister will be glad to receive these questions and answer them the first time that he is in the House.

Mr. Knight: In view of the general public ignorance of our history, and the need for greater self-identity among our students as Canadians as stated in the Toronto *Telegram* yesterday, what steps does the Minister intend to take to encourage the study of history among the students of the province beyond the grade 10 level?

Mr. Speaker: I have just been advised by the member for Ontario South that in the Speaker's gallery we have with us today the members of the Ontario county council, and I am sure that we are glad to see this other body of legislators here joining us today.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: This question was asked of me yesterday by the hon. member for High Park, and I would like to answer it today. The question is as follows:

1. Is there any explanation for the fact that Ronald Eyes, who died in Orangeville on March 21, 1967, was listed in the post mortem report as having upper natural teeth, whereas in actuality he had false teeth?

2. Is there any explanation for the man being described as being 176 lbs. (80 kilograms) in weight, with black hair?

3. Was the new car involved in this death examined to determine whether mechanical defect was the cause of the accident?

4. Why did Mrs. Eyes' request to Dr. Cotnam on May 24, 1967, for an inquest, receive no answer?

The answer is that Mr. Eyes died on the night of March 21, 1967, from injuries received when his car crashed through the bridge abutment near Orangeville. The post mortem report is in error when it states that Mr. Eyes had natural upper teeth. The information now available indicates that his teeth were extracted prior to the accident. So, in that respect, the post mortem report is in error.

With regard to his weight, which you have given as 176 lb. or 80 kilograms. The post mortem report indicates that the weight figure is an estimate; the body was not weighed.

The colour of hair, of anyone's hair, tends to be a personal opinion. The post mortem report indicates that Mr. Eyes' hair was black; other persons who knew him said his hair was dark brown. In this case, Mr. Speaker, the detail as to the colour of hair seems to be quite immaterial.

The car which Mr. Eyes drove was a 1967 Chevrolet which was leased from Belmont Auto Leasing Limited and insured with London Lancashire. The car was very severely damaged, and in the circumstances it was thought that no useful information could be obtained from examination of the vehicle which would indicate whether any defect was a part of the cause of the accident.

With regard to the letter which Mrs. Eyes wrote to Doctor Cotnam, a reply was not written to the letter which was dated May 24, 1967, because when the letter was received, officials of the supervising coroner's office invited Mrs. Eyes to come in and discuss the case and on June 2, 1967, Mrs. Eyes and

her son, David, met with Mr. E. J. Hills and Mr. Kenneth Lewis, two officials of the coroner's office. The case was discussed in detail.

It was explained to Mrs. Eyes and to her son David that an inquest could not serve any useful purpose. There were no witnesses to the accident. On the night in question it was snowing, the road was very wet and slippery. It could only be inferred that Mr. Eyes lost control of the car, slid into the abutment and sustained the fatal injuries. All the information was available that could be ascertained and it was not felt that an inquest, in those circumstances, could add anything to the matter.

Mr. Shulman: I have two supplementary questions. First; can some steps be taken to ensure that we do not have repetition of these errors in post mortem reports by checking up on discipline?

Second; would the Minister consider issuing instructions, in cases in which the cause of death is not clear, where the automobile would be examined to determine if the structural defect was the fault, in future?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, I am as much concerned as the hon. member when I find that some detail has been overlooked in the pathological report, and I agree with him. I can assure him my feelings in that regard have already been expressed. It is not something to be condoned or excused, although it is a small detail at this time.

With respect to the question of examining an automobile, I think this depends on the circumstances of the case. If a vehicle is so badly smashed as this one was, there is very little that can be determined if many parts are broken and many parts are destroyed. The state of the vehicle itself determines whether it is possible to obtain anything useful, as to a mechanical defect. If the vehicle is smashed to a great extent, this has to be a matter, I think, for the investigating authorities to determine whether there is any use in picking up the pieces to determine whether the defect existed prior to the accident. But, that is a matter for each case, I think, in its own.

Mr. Shulman: If they do not try they will never know.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Oh, they do try. In the majority of cases I would think they do examine the vehicle, particularly where more than one vehicle is involved. This is a case of a single driver leaving the road and driving into an abutment on a very wet and slippery condition. The car was smashed beyond a state where any useful purpose could be served by examining it.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Waterloo North has arrived now and he has a question.

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Education, with notice.

Ontario education association president, Willis Glenn, has predicted that universities must join the ungraded course approach as an extension of the current trend in secondary education. Does the Minister intend to give guidance and leadership in this area?

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The 1st order, resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the amendment to the motion for an address in reply to the Speech of the hon. Lieutenant-Governor in the opening of the session.

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in the debate on the Speech from the Throne, may I add to those of the many hon. members who have preceded me, my congratulations to you on your election to this high office. Knowing of your abilities and your military background, and having seen you in action for over one month now, I know you are more than qualified to carry out your responsibilities ably and impartially. My congratulations also go out to the re-elected and newly elected hon. members of this House. May they all find their work on behalf of their constituents and the people of Ontario most rewarding and self-satisfying.

I would be remiss, Mr. Speaker, if I did not offer my congratulations and best wishes to the new Cabinet Ministers, the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. McKeough), the Minister of Mines (Mr. A. F. Lawrence) and the Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Guindon). These men have replaced fine men from whom I have received the utmost in co-operation. I shall miss Mr. Wilfrid Spooner's fine grasp of his department and Mr. George Wardrope's fine wit and ever present constituent letter. Even though the majority of the people of Ontario voted against this Conservative government, I must offer my congratulations to the hon. Premier (Mr. Robarts) for his victory at the polls.

The Opposition may have scored more total runs or votes than did you sir, but you won more ball games or members and that is what really counts. We accept things that way, and as my fellow colleague, the hon. member from Grey South, would say, "that is the way the ball bounces."

To the hon. members from Windsor West (Mr. Peacock) and Sandwich-Riverside (Mr. Burr), my congratulations and best wishes. I know of their capabilities. I know that they have made a contribution to the proceedings of this House and will make a much more substantial contribution in the days that lie ahead.

Mr. Speaker, the rebel county of Essex and the city of Windsor have not been too kind to you politically for some eight years now. The results of the 1967 election must show by now, that there is a growing discontent with the Premier's attitude toward the county and the city, as can be witnessed by the election of three Liberal members and two New Democratic members.

During the last 32 parliamentary years of representation, or eight years for each of the four members from Essex county, only seven of those years have had Conservative representation.

An hon. member: Seven years too long!

Mr. B. Newman: Seven out of 32 or roughly 20 per cent of the time. By the time the next election rolls around, Mr. Speaker, it will only be seven years out of 48 or only 14 per cent of the time.

With all the Premier's election ballyhoo of having a member from the side of the government, and how much more could come to the area were they to elect a Conservative member, the electors in Essex county still do not trust him. They had no faith in Conservative administration and they completely discarded his approach to the solutions of the many problems affecting the area.

Mr. Speaker, I am very humble when I says how honoured I am to have been selected for a third time by the fine people of Windsor-Walkerville. I shall continue to give them the finest representation that my ability enables me, and shall always present their problems with the hope of coming up with a satisfactory answer for them.

Mr. Speaker, it is customary in the proceedings of this House at this time to congratulate the mover (Mr. R. J. Smith) and the seconder (Mr. Meen) of the motion in relation to the Speech from the Throne, two fine new members in this House.

Is it not peculiar, Mr. Speaker, that all the members on the government side who have taken part in this debate, have gone to all extremes in congratulating the Premier and his fine government, yet each and every one of them, without exception, have found fault with the way things have been run. I only hope that as the House proceeds with its business in the days ahead they will not be afraid to express their concern and dissatisfaction.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday was the day of the green or St. Patrick's day, a happy day to all the Irish.

An hon. member: The day before yesterday.

Mr. B. Newman: Well, it was celebrated in here yesterday. If the Minister had been here he would have found out. We missed him.

Mr. Speaker, Sunday was a day on which Hungarians in all parts of Ontario, yes, in all parts of Canada, came together to commenorate the 120th anniversary of their declaration of independence, the independence declared on March 15, 1848.

In my own community, Hungarians from Essex county, from Windsor and Detroit, gathered some 500-strong at Mendszenti hall to hear many speakers recall the early struggles for freedom of the people from Hungary. This meeting, chaired by a Mr. Stephen Kovac Smith, heard members of the clergy, Rev. Martin Gaspar, Rev. Laszlo Mosonyi, Rev. Tamas Nyaradi, and Rev. Laszlo Dienes. Each made a substantial and emotional contribution to the proceedings of the afternoon.

The guest speaker, Mr. John Mezei, head of the Hungarian section of the international services of CBC, recalled the gallant days of 1848 and the bitter memories of the subsequent aggression and defeat.

The bloodless revolution of 1848 led to laws under which Hungary became a modern democratic state. The government was vested in a Ministry responsible to Parliament, and all of the inhabitants of the country were declared equal before the law. The privilege of the nobility was abolished; the soil was declared free; the right of free worship was accorded to all: the utmost liberty of the press was secured.

Mr. Speaker, this was Hungary in 1848. Once again the Hungarian nation was reborn with the doctrine that "all men are equal." The nation started to grow with this doctrine as its guide. The happy event of freedom

filled the whole country with the bright hope of a better future.

However, this new-found freedom under Louis Kossuth, was short-lived when the Russian Czar, in collaboration with the Hapsburgs of Austria, in order to prevent other enslaved nations from throwing off the yoke of tyranny, threw vast armies into Hungary to crush freedom at its very roots.

Many of the people associated with this 1848 revolution found their way into United States and Canada. Louis Kossuth, himself leader of the revolution and the first president of the first Hungarian Republic, visited Niagara Falls, Ontario, in May, 1850.

In its adherence to, and defence of, the doctrine that all men are equal, the Hungarian nation has struggled supremely and filled the pages of its history, with brilliant deeds of valour and admirable patriotism. Perhaps there is no nation on earth that has struggled more, and shed more blood than the Hungarian nation for the principles of equality of man and the recognition of the rights of others.

During the 1,000-odd years of her existence, the Hungarian nation has never fought a war of conquest.

Today there is a lot of talk concerning the two languages in our own Canada, French and English, the official languages of the country. There is quite a bit of disquietude coming from certain areas of this great nation. Allow me, Mr. Speaker, just a moment to show you the Hungarian attitude toward the use of more than one language within its boundaries.

In the early days of Hungary, Latin was the official language. By the first half of the 19th century the Magyar language was made the official language. After 1849 German became the official language, and this language remained official for 18 years, until 1867, when it was once again replaced by Magyar.

In 1868 Law 44 was passed. This law ensured persons of language other than Magyar the use of their own language in justice and administration. It also allowed minority groups the right to use their own tongue, if they so desired. Laws at this time were so considerate that the government provided facilities in any part of Hungary for any person to receive secondary education in his mother tongue. This law also allowed communities, churches and individuals to found and maintain schools which received equality of status with state schools.

All of this, Mr. Speaker, was exactly 100 years ago in Hungary.

Mr. Speaker, you may wonder why I am bringing this up during the Throne debate. Well, I want the people of Ontario to know that we are fortunate that many people have settled within our midst; that we are better people, a better province and a better nation as a result of the contributions, in this case, of the Hungarian people.

Their contribution in the field of labour and, by the way, one of the first labour unions formed in Canada was by the Hungarian people. Their crafts, their contributions to athletics, cultural and ascetic arts, education, medicine—I can mention Dr. Hans Selye in this case—the legal profession, and in business.

In business, the Steinberg markets today are an example of the people of Hungarian descent who have done well in this country. All have added immeasurably to a better way of life and a more awareness of the needs of others, and to an understanding that peoples of all nations can live side by side, each making his own contribution to a bigger and better multi-cultural Canada.

I know, Mr. Speaker, all members of this House join with me on this, the 120th anniversary of the 1848 Hungarian revolution, in the fervent hope that in the not to distant future the red, white and green of the Hungarian flag will once again fly proudly alongside the flags of the free nations of the world. Hungarians in the past have made a substantial contribution to man's fight for freedom, and now ask for the same opportunity to make a more substantial contribution to Canada in its centennial plus one year. They too, Mr. Speaker, are one of the Canadian mosaic.

During the 27th Parliament, a select committee of this Legislature was appointed to study the whole election law and procedures. This committee did meet, but never submitted a report. I certainly hope that the hon. Premier reactivates this committee, so that by the time the next election comes around many of the criticisms that have been made will have been corrected.

And by the way, Mr. Speaker, is it not about time that we updated our voting procedures here in the House? It seems, in the 20th century, out of place having each and every one of us stand up individually, bow to you, sir, and then wait for our name to be called. How simple it would be to press a little button on our desk and have our vote recorded electronically on a so-called

score board on one of the walls in this Legislature.

Other Legislatures have adopted electronic methods of voting, why should not we in Ontario? We consider ourselves to be in the forefront when it comes to legislation, when it comes to programming and so forth. Let us not be in the background now. Let us stand up, and let us copy some of the good ideas that have been implemented by Legislatures in other parts of the United States.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Conservative but not necessarily progressive.

Mr. B. Newman: As the hon. member has just mentioned, gentlemen, you may be Conservative over there, but in this instance you are definitely not progressive.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): The member does not really mean that.

Mr. B. Newman: Oh yes, I really mean it. The other night, it was approximately one hour and 20 minutes we had waited to vote, and it took us maybe 20 minutes to vote—well 15 minutes to vote. We could have had this all electronicaly recorded by the push of a little finger, and if you cannot do it with the little finger, use the index finger.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The NDP would not press the button.

Mr. G. Bukator (Niagara Falls): They even had a button for the hon. member.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. B. Newman: The "no" button? It was almost a case of guess what, that night.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to turn my attention to the exporting of jobs. Now is the time to have a second look at our export-import picture. I raise the question of the matter of labour content or a man-hours principle when it comes to imports and exports.

The dollar content of Canada's exports exceeded imports in only two of the last 16 years, that is in the period between 1951 and 1967. When you translate this picture onto a graph it does not look too bad, the fact that we may have imported more than we exported. However, let us look at the picture from a labour content point of view.

In the year 1961, wheat, lumber, iron ore exports totalled approximately $900 million. The labour content of this type of export, Mr. Speaker, is extremely low. Automobile parts, cars, trucks, chemical products, and other imports totalled approximately the same $900 million, but the labour content of this type of import is extremely high, in fact 77 per cent of Canada's total imports are in a fully manufactured condition.

This situation creates jobs for workers in other countries, but not in Canada. We are exporting jobs. If we are to continue to develop our Canadian economy, and to continue to provide employment for our increasing population, we must consider the labour content of our exports as well as the dollar content. We cannot provide increased employment opportunities on exports of low labour products while we import high labour products.

Were such a principle adopted, we would be forced to speed up the establishment of new manufacturing facilities here in Canada. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Randall) would initiate studies in this field in the hope of rather than having a balance of payments, we would have a balance of employment content between our import and export picture.

Turning to the question of housing, a headline of one editorial reads: "Cheaper homes great need". A second: "Housing costs more than food". A third; "Housing key issue in Tuesday's voting". A fourth: "Windsor's housing needs acute". A fifth: "Housing to continue as pressing problem". Another: "Continuing need for public housing".

I do not intend to say much more on the subject of housing, because each and every member in this House is fully aware of the situation. Well, Mr. Speaker, if this government is as sincerely interested in assisting the alleviation of this problem, here is one place where they could lead and show the way.

A sales tax is a heavy burden on those who regard adequate shelter as one of their most urgent needs. It can, and will, be argued, of course, that the removal of the sales tax on building materials, and specifically on housing, would be illusionary at best, as the revenue thus lost would have to be recouped through a new and augmented tax levy and the net gain would be negligible.

So far as it goes, this position has some points in its favour, but it misses the one point at issue—the need, and, in fact, the responsibility to provide the people with adequate housing.

The sales tax on building materials, Mr. Speaker, is bad because of its deadening

selectivity. As a blow to the home, it becomes a blow to the nation itself. There is one way where this government could eliminate or assist in partially solving the housing problem, and that is by eliminating the five per cent sales tax on building materials. Mr. Speaker, you would be setting an example for the people in the other governments, in the senior government, to follow. Let us put Ontario in the forefront, and eliminate the sales tax on building materials.

My own community is just as concerned as are communities throughout the province. However, knowing that there may be some hesitancy on the part of governments to eliminate sales tax for building materials, they have passed this type of resolution. You can see that by the resolution they are extremely conservative in their point of view, and the resolution adopted by a council meeting in August of 1967 read:

> That the provincial and federal governments be petitioned to enact legislation exempting from provincial and federal sales taxes all materials used in the construction of non-profit or municipally owned housing.

So, Mr. Speaker, if you cannot eliminate, or if you refuse to eliminate the sales tax on building materials in general, at least you can eliminate the sales tax on the construction of non-profit or municipally-owned housing.

Back in 1966, in the Throne debate, I made comments concerning the solution, or a partial solution, to the housing problem. I would like to repeat some of them, because just as they held true in 1966, they are true today, and had the government of the day followed some of these considerations, the problem of housing today would not be as acute as it is.

I would suggest to the Prime Minister that he consider an emergency housing relief authority, a body that would undertake the purchase of 10,000 mobile homes or some number that can be accurately arrived at, and provide to each community the number needed to take care of the housing requirements of that community. Windsor could make use of at least 2,000 right now.

This method of housing relief would have many advantages: 1. It would enable municipalities to attract and hold industry and to take advantage of the new industrial outlook. 2. It would enable municipalities to plan in a more leisurely and economic fashion, instead of being stampeded into housing developments. 3. It would assist in partially overcoming the shortage of help, a serious problem for industry, by assuring housing to families wishing to move into that area. 4. It would have a moderating effect on the inflationary rent spiral and home building costs. 5. It could be a partial answer to the farm labour problem by providing much needed mobile housing in many rural parts of Ontario during planting and harvesting. When the mobile homes had met the purpose for which they were intended, they could be sold as summer cottages.

There are many more advantages too numerous for me to mention at this time. I hope that the Prime Minister or the Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Randall) seriously consider this suggestion.

Mr. Speaker, the province has thousands of geared-to-income housing units, and at the some time there are thousands of people who pay much more than they really can afford for rentals. They are depriving themselves and their families of many of the necessities of life.

I would suggest to the hon. Premier that he consider some type of rent subsidy to those on a lower income, to those who could not get geared-to-income housing and, as a result, are caught in the inflationary rent spiral and have to pay more than 25 per cent of their income for rentals. These people have been punished in some instances solely because they do not have the political contacts to obtain geared-to-income housing.

We subsidize one group of our people by providing them with the geared-to-income housing, and then the others who cannot be placed in this type of accommodation have to pay the full extent of housing accommodations, in many, many cases more than they can really afford, thus depriving themselves and their own families of many of the necessities of life.

Why cannot we provide some with geared-to-income housing, and then subsidize the others in the lower-income bracket as far as their housing costs are concerned? The United States does this; it is a good scheme. It works. Why are we so backward in copying things that have proven to be quite useful and effective in other jurisdictions? We are supposed to lead the way—yet, Mr. Speaker, you can see in many of the things that I have mentioned today, we do not lead. In fact, we do not even follow.

Mr. Speaker, I will only read a few comments on this topic and the topic now is air pollution.

"September pollution excessive." "Air pollution knocking out power lines." "Air pollution petition asks quick action." Mr. Speaker, we in our own community are bothered by air pollution from another jurisdiction. The location of the prime source of air pollution in our community is from an industrial complex across the river, an industrial complex called Zug Island.

If this pollution problem is not taken care of by the administration in the city of Detroit, the siege of the city of Detroit may start all over again. But instead of being an attack on the city of Detroit, it may be the siege of Zug Island. The people are getting to the point where they just do not know what to do. The municipal officials in Detroit act, but do not seem to act quickly enough to the problem.

Earlier in the session I asked the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond) if he was going to support a Windsor recommendation "that the construction of an $18 million incinerator on the banks of the Detroit River, be not pursued". In other words, Windsor objects strongly.

The Minister said that he was going to register the government's complaint to the international joint commission. This is only an advisory body, Mr. Speaker. Complaining to them is too long a procedure; we would rather have had the province of Ontario write to the city of Detroit and say: "The government of Ontario joins with the city of Windsor in objecting to any construction of a plant that may be responsible for air pollution in the city of Windsor."

The government should not bother going through IJC, a long procedure like that, when a simple letter sent to the city of Windsor or sent to Detroit could have registered the province of Ontario's objection. After that, if they wished to contact the international joint commission, that is quite all right.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few comments on a topic of great concern to the many people in the Windsor area—that is the shortage of hospital beds.

The shortage of hospital accommodation is not a question of statistics, it is a very human one—

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Hear, hear!

Mr. B. Newman: —certainly to those in need of hospital care who have difficulty getting accommodation. Our hospitals try to provide room for emergency cases, but, even if they succeed, this is not the answer. It can mean that others who should be in hospital have their entry postponed. Any delay where health is concerned can be dangerous.

These needs have been discussed over and over again. In my own community, priority has been given to the Metropolitan hospital to modernize its facilities without the addition of any extra beds. After Metropolitan's modernization, comes expansion at the IODE hospital, followed by a new chronic-care hospital, and finally by more beds at Metropolitan hospital.

However, Mr. Speaker, all of this does not provide for a single extra bed for a year or more. Since the period from the planning stage to the time when the bed is ready for occupancy is quite prolonged; since the need for accommodations is so acute; since many beds are occupied by chronic patients who could be cared for elsewhere; and since both Riverview and Huron Lodge are always filled, despite the enlargement of Huron Lodge, there is the need for a crash programme to provide some type of nursing home facilities for people who are mobile and who can look after their personal needs, eat in a common dining room and so forth.

Mr. Speaker, the capital works programme in a municipality may preclude a municipality from contemplating, or even constructing, such a facility in the foreseeable future.

May I ask that the Ontario housing corporation in conjunction with central mortgage and housing corporation, just as they provide accommodations for senior citizens, do the same for people requiring nursing home care. Or, in simple terms, the Ontario housing corporation and CMHC undertake to build nursing homes just as they build students' housing accommodation or senior citizens' housing. If legislation prevents them from doing so, Mr. Speaker, surely the legislation can be amended to accommodate the same. Such an undertaking would resolve or relieve the pressing hospital bed shortage in my community, and could make for better planning of acute hospital beds.

I would like to conclude my remarks on this topic by just reading the following short excerpt taken from Mr. Lum Clark's column in January 1968:

HOSPITAL BEDS SHORT

In all the talk of Medicare, few mention a companion problem. There are not enough hospital beds available for the sick.

The other day a woman had a severe stroke; her family could not get her into hospital for four days, and then experts

say they have plenty of hospital beds in the city.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to turn my attention to the minimum wage. A dollar an hour is much too low for a minimum wage. An increase in federal unemployment insurance benefits has incidentally demonstrated that Ontario's minimum wage is unreasonably low. Under the new insurance benefits, an unmarried man will be able to obtain a top payment of $42 a week. This is $2 a week more than would be earned by a man on a 40-hour week being paid on the provincial minimum wage.

This wage is $1 an hour except for construction industries where it is $1.25. It should be more. The rate was set in 1963. The cost of living index at the end of 1963 was 133. In January of this year the index had reached 152.6 while the minimum wage rate remained unchanged. Ontario's present rate is among the lowest in Canada. Comparable rates include New Brunswick—$1.25; Manitoba—$1.10, to be $1.25 at the end of this year; Prince Edward Island—$1.10. Mr. Speaker, we are in the banner province in Canada yet Prince Edward Island has a minimum 10 cents higher than Ontario.

The national rate for industries coming under federal jurisdiction is $1.25. The national rate in the United States is $1.60, and this is also the standard in New York state. Ontario is the only jurisdiction in Canada which does not have a compulsory time-and-a-half payment for overtime also. A minimum wage law is not meant to set a standard for wages that should prevail. Its purpose is to set the absolute minimum that can be paid—really a minimum for subsistence. It applies to only two categories of employers, those who can afford more but who can find poor souls who, through various circumstances, have no choice but to work for them at a minimum and those who cannot afford to pay more. The dollar an hour today is not even a subsistence wage.

Mr. Speaker, I could refer to the brief presented by the congress of Canadian women to the members of the Ontario Legislature. Their recommendation is that the minimum wage be $2 an hour, and I think, Mr. Speaker, in some intances that $2 an hour might not be enough.

I would like to turn my thoughts to one other topic, very briefly, and that is the need for summer jobs, especially for students. A headline in the March 13 issue of the London paper read: "Hints scarcity of summer jobs for city students". That headline could be repeated, Mr. Speaker, in every city, town and village in the province of Ontario.

We either provide or co-operate with industry in providing summer jobs for students —that is those who need summer employment—or we have to increase the amount of the bursaries or student aid loans provided to them when they further their education and attend one of our post-secondary schools.

So you either get some work out of these youngsters—and they are all anxious to work —or you provide them with an extra loan. I think it would be much better and it would behoove the province to see if they could not expand the junior forest ranger programme into some type of programme that could accommodate some of the students attending college; some type of a programme in conservation.

There are many ways by which the government of the day, through co-operation with industry, could increase the number of students employed during the summer vacation. It is a very simple thing—I should not say a very simple thing—but it is a simpler thing for a boy than a girl to obtain summer employment. The young lady is really handicapped when it comes to obtaining employment, and I think the same consideration should be given to the young ladies as would be given to the young men.

Mr. Speaker, there are just one or two other topics that I would like to bring up and one concerns The Separate Schools Act. In the nominations for the various elected offices in my municipality last November, a man by the name of George A. Johnson, a very fine, able, capable fellow, was nominated to the separate school board. Mr. Johnson is listed on the assessment rolls as a public school supporter; his children attend public school, but he was acclaimed to the separate school board.

Under Ontario law a separate school supporter cannot be a public school board trustee. Also under Ontario law, a public school supporter apparently can be elected to a separate school board. The only qualifications a separate school board trustee needs is that he has to be over 21 and a Canadian citizen.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask the hon. Minister of Education to look into the situation and see if The Separate Schools Act could not be changed so that representatives of separate school boards—individuals who are separate school supporters—be given the same treatment as are public school supporters.

Mr. A. E. Klein, of North Bay, president of the Ontario separate schools trustee association, says his group has been making yearly requests for a change in the law. Mr. Speaker, Ontario's law quirk needs quick change now.

Year after year in this House, especially in the Throne debate and in the debates during the estimates of The Department of Lands and Forests, I make mention of the need for park facilities on the northern bounds of the county of Essex, and I make that, Mr. Speaker, because the lands that are available keep diminishing year by year.

We are very close to a very large metropolitan area and the dollar seems to be no problem for our friends across the border. When they take a look at our small area with their weighted pockets they do not hesitate at all to purchase lake frontage along the shores of Lake St. Clair, the Detroit River, and Lake Erie.

The Department of Lands and Forests should now purchase all available lands along the shores of the waterways in Essex county and either develop them into some type of park area or hold them for the time when they will be needed; because according to the Doxiadis report, the area extending from Minneapolis on the extreme west right through to Montreal, will be one large megalopolis.

When it does become that large megalopolis there certainly will be an acute shortage of recreational lands for the people of the day. This land can and should be purchased today. So once again I plead with the government to purchase properties along Lake St. Clair, along the Detroit River, along Lake Erie—any properties that would be suitable and available.

An hon. member: Lots of room at Grand Bend.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Speaker, in this connection I would like to read from an address by Mr. William G. Maslen, superintendent of acquisition and planning, lands and surveys branch of The Department of Lands and Forests, to the 57th annual international association of game, fish and conservation commissioners. He said:

> The haphazard planning we are getting by on now will not be sufficient for long. We are hampered by a shortage of good short term plans and an utter lack of long term planning.

He is referring to the acquisition of recreational and park lands. Mr. Speaker, the government should hasten today to purchase properties, otherwise it will be paying two, three, four and even ten times more for these properties in the not too distant future.

In 1958, when representation was made to the then Minister of Lands and Forests, Mr. Clare Mapledoram, the properties involved could have been purchased for $40,000. That property today, Mr. Speaker, could not be purchased for $400,000, yet the municipalities press this government to buy the property and they refuse to act.

If, in ten years, the property can multiply in value by ten times, just think what could happen to the properties that this government is refusing to purchase today. Ten years form today that $1 million investment would from today $10 million so, Mr. Speaker, give these fellows a little nod and tell them we in Essex county want to see a park on Lake St. Clair or somewhere in that neighbourhood.

Essex county is the only area, I understand Mr. Speaker, that does not have a conservation authority. Maybe if there was a little encouragement on the part of the government here the county area might get a conservation authority, and maybe the conservation authority method might be a way of getting parklands. But until that time, I would urge this government not to delay at all in the acquisition of properties along the waterways in Essex county.

An hon. member: Get the lead out!

Mr. B. Newman: Get the lead out of your feet fellows.

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Provincial Treasurer): Did the member think he meant something else?

An hon. member: Get your feet out of the lead!

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Speaker, I would like to turn my attention to bus fares. Just this morning, an Act respecting the city of Oshawa was approved by the private bills committee, and in it was a request that the city of Oshawa provide a subsidy to the transportation system in the community.

The operation of municipal bus systems is generally a non-profit-making operation, very few municipalities are able to operate in any other fashion but with deficits. Now, the government did not hesitate to subsidize the local area extremely heavily when it came to the provision of the subway in Toronto, or the GO train. How about the hundreds of other municipalities in Ontario that need

transportation? Why not consider them exactly the same way as you consider Metropolitan Toronto? You cannot build subways for them, you cannot build GO trains, but you can subsidize their bus system—

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): A good point!

Mr. B. Newman: The government can also see that the senior citizen in the community does not have to use approximately one-half a day's funds received from Canada pension or from old age assistance—in other words 50 cents—to go to a downtown area and back home. The senior citizen needs that money for more important things than simply riding on a bus.

Were you to subsidize the bus systems in communities, then, that senior citizen would not be cooped up in the accommodations that he lives in, but would have an opportunity to see what the downtown area of a community is like. He would be able to go downtown to enjoy the few years remaining in his life, Mr. Speaker. We do not ask for too much when we ask for this government to give to the outlying areas a little more consideration than is given in the transportation line.

Mr. Nixon: Give them their gas tax back.

Mr. B. Newman: That is a very nice way likewise. My hon. leader mentioned the fact that you could be subsidizing municipal transportation systems by the refund of the fuel tax.

An hon. member: You have just put them farther in the hole.

Mr. B. Newman: You have got to come along and consider this. If you want growth in other areas, in areas other than this Golden Horseshoe, you are going to have to look at the problems that other communities have, and look at them with the intent of assisting them.

I certainly would like to see this government provide some type of subsidy for transportation systems in communities so that they could provide better service, and, at the same time—

Mr. Sargent: The Prime Minister promised to do the same thing across Ontario. He promised that.

Mr. B. Newman: —provide better transportation, and provide cheaper transportation for the senior citizen. The city of Detroit provides it. They come along and subsidize the senior citizen. The senior citizen is able to travel on the transportation system there at a reduced rate.

An hon. member: What is preventing Windsor from doing it?

Mr. B. Newman: We do it for students in schools, do we not?

An hon. member: What is preventing Windsor from doing it?

Mr. B. Newman: I beg pardon? The government is preventing Windsor from doing it, by not providing to the outlying communities the same type of assistance that you provide right here in the city—

Mr. R. M. Johnston (St. Catharines): Come on over to St. Catharines, we will give the member a free ride.

Mr. B. Newman: —of Toronto. You do not do it. Provide us with the funds the same way that you do here and we will do it.

Even Chatham needs help, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Bad sugar beet industry down there.

Mr. B. Newman: Sir, I was going to comment concerning the cruel and heartless way in which the workmen's compensation treats individuals who have been incapacitated as a result of a loss of limbs. However, when we do get into the debates of The Department of Labour I will bring up those comments then. I have only two other small topics that I would like to bring up, and they are as follows.

I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if there is any supervision by authorities concerning the offering of the various prizes, cash and otherwise, by the gas outlets and by retail stores. They make a big splash in the newspaper advertising that a person is going to receive $100 or $500 or $50. Is there any check that these prizes are actually made?

Mr. Nixon: I wonder if the Attorney General has ever won a prize?

An hon. member: At election time.

Mr. B. Newman: Is ask, Mr. Speaker, because I checked on one and found there was a non-existent individual.

The last thing I would like to bring up is something for the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs. He is not in the House at this time, but I think that the department should be looking into things of this sort.

Here are three packages of one commodity, all purchased the same day in three different stores in the community. There must be something wrong. These purchases were made on January 19, 1968. This article sold for 99 cents, this one for $1.59, and this one —the same thing—for $1.83. Surely there must be something wrong when you can have the same article and a variance of prices from 99 cents to $1.83.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. B. Newman: There is a Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs who can look right into things of this sort, Mr. Speaker. This should not be tolerated here—a spread from 99 cents to $1.83.

I only happened to pick out one thing—soap. This must go on in other things too, Mr. Speaker. I just happened to find this, and it just seemed to be very strange why a $1.59 item should sell for 99 cents and $1.83.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. B. Newman: These are all the same size. They are all the same size package, five pounds each.

I would like to conclude my remarks by just mentioning that there must be something wrong with the educational system in the province of Ontario when we have to steal talent from other countries. We cannot train and develop enough of our own so we go and steal talent, and we steal the abilities of people from countries that need that talent more than we do. We do not develop enough talent in this country at all.

The skills and talents of these countries should not be stolen. In fact, some of the iron curtain countries today refuse to allow individuals of above average schooling to leave the country, and for the only reason that the country has invested thousands of dollars in the education of that individual. We, by holding bait, the Canadian dollar, in front of the individual we entice him to come within our shores.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that we should be developing that talent here, and it speaks very poorly for our education system that we cannot produce enough skilled manpower to take care of the needs of the province.

If it were automobiles or another article, we would produce it if the demand was there, but when it comes to skilled, professional people, we in the province of Ontario certainly cannot do it.

We may talk of other underdeveloped countries. Let me tell you we have not developed to the point that we should speak too loudly of our educational system. It has not produced to the extent it should have.

Mr. Speaker, there are dozens of other things that I could bring up in the course of my comments on the—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. B. Newman: —I could go at the Attorney General concerning a facility for Windsor, Mr. Speaker. I will reserve these comments for the estimates in the department and at that time, I will have much more to say on a large variety of topics.

Mr. J. L. Brown (Beaches-Woodbine): Mr. Speaker, as I rise to join in this debate, I want to thank your office, the office of the Prime Minister and my own caucus for the co-operation that I have received in becoming a new member for the 28th Legislature of Ontario. As those of you who have been through this before know, it is not an easy thing to come into this body, and find your way around in the maze of all the complicated proceedings and processes by which the government's work is done.

I am pleased to represent the new riding of Beaches-Woodbine, a combination of two ridings, both represented here previously by members who are no longer present. I am particularly pleased to be representing the one-third of the Beaches-Woodbine riding that was held by Ken Bryden, a good man. As I sat back here in the last three days or so, speculating and wondering, my mind sometimes turned to imagining the pleasure it would have been to have seen Ken Bryden with this powerful 20-man caucus, dealing with the government as he did so effectively last year when there were only eight.

The other two thirds of the riding were represented by Jack Harris, the deputy whip, in the last Legislature. I am not so unhappy that I have replaced him, in fact you could say I am almost filled with a boundless joy. I have a great deal of respect for him. I admire him. I do not mean in any way to criticize either him, or the work that he did for the people of Beaches-Woodbine. But you know I thought that it was awfully nice of the government to offer him a job when he lost the election. He is a good man, no doubt about that, and I would not say that there was anything like patronage involved in that selection, but I would like to ask the government, had I lost the election, would I have been offered that job? Of course not.

I would like to say to the members on the government benches, the hon. members on the government benches, that in my opinion, you do yourselves an injustice. I have listened to you. Every time a positive proposal has come before the Legislature, to serve and help people in need, you protest that it would be a handout of some kind. I say to you, hon. members, you did yourself an injustice when you gave a handout to Jack Harris. He did not need it, and you do not need it. I wonder why you compromise yourself in this way?

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): They have a special welfare policy for their friends.

Mr. Brown: Well, it was sitting there for some time. I guess that they must have anticipated that there would be a few available people.

Mr. Speaker, the Beaches-Woodbine riding has been served since 1963 by a service centre started by Ken Bryden and Andrew Brewin and I have a little brochure here which I would like to make available to those members interested. It is called "What's going on" and it is an illustration of the kind of basic democratic need that exists in the various ridings of the province, and the effort on our part to do something about it. I will just read briefly from it. It is a service centre, operating in Beaches-Woodbine. It reads:

> Most individuals and most families at some point in their lives, require the service of a government department or some type of official agency. But the regulations governing any kind of aid have grown so complex that a person seeking help needs the knowledge and trained mind of a lawyer, and the tenacity of a bulldog. It also helps to have the skin of a rhinoceros because the burden of administering the complexity of the regulations has, in many cases, caused staff to become indifferent or even hostile towards the people their department or agency is supposed to serve.

The Beaches-Woodbine service centre acts as an organizational ombudsman; it has two full-time staff members, Mrs. E. Bull and Mr. Stan Bullock. I would like to say on behalf of this proud organization that we are always pleased to receive donations and contributions from those politically-minded members of the Legislature who like to see a grass-roots democratic principle at work.

As you can gather from my remarks so far, I am new to politics, and I am not wise in the way that things are done here. But I am very pleased to be here to learn, because I am happy to look into the eyes of my adversaries.

As some of you probably know, a number of hon. Ministers in the Tory government have found fit to be nipping at my heels in the last couple of years, and I am pleased to be here for a direct confrontation with them. And they shall get that confrontation.

As you know, I am a professional social worker, having spent some 20 years in the field of social work prior to entering politics; a charter member of the national association of social work; a member of the American group psychotherapy association; and a member of that plumbers' union known as the Royal society of help. I want to say, on behalf of my profession, that I am proud to be a social worker.

But I am also concerned—as I think people in various professions need to be at this trying time in our development. Social work began as a reform movement; people organized to take care of ills which were not presently being served, and that is how we began. But in the course of time we have become that group of people who patches up the lacks and evils in our system, and we do it for a pittance. And we identify all too often in our professional identification with the people in the establishment rather than with the people who are needing service.

As a director of Warrendale for 13 years, I used to be so naive as to think that because the government protested they were concerned about services to people, and particularly services to children; that if they knew how to provide those services, if they were shown ways that it could be done, they would be pleased to pick up these ways and to provide those services. I have learned a lot since that time. I learned a few other things in the Warrendale operation, and I would like to talk about it briefly.

It is hard to set up services for people; it is hard to set up programmes that involve change. You cannot do it without personal risk. You cannot do it without making a mistake every day that you work. And you have to learn how to look at those mistakes honestly, and try over and over again as you bring about the necessary changes to bring our services to people up to date.

So as I sit here watching the performance in this Legislature as the members raise their questions of the Cabinet, Mr. Speaker,

I am struck by the fact that these men jump to their feet to assure the members in the Legislature and the public outside the Legislature, that everything is absolutely perfect in their department.

Now I know that is impossible, and I am struck by the audacity of these men in trying to imply that they do not have serious problems, when they know, and I know, that they do have serious problems, and that it would be impossible not to have serious problems.

Can you imagine Ministers in charge of organizations as large as The Department of Health, or Reform Institutions, or Social and Family Services administering these vast sums, dealing with all these people, and with the critical problems of our society, having the audacity to rise in this House and imply that there are no problems in their departments, and that there are no ills and evils that they have to deal with?

It is obviously an effort to fool the public and to whitewash their service. Either they are doing this as a direct deceit, or they are doing it because they have no confidence in their own ability to solve those problems themselves. They fear the public would not accept these shortcomings and they undersell the public.

I would like to take just a moment to speak about The Department of Health. I hope to come back to it in the estimates with a little more attention. I say to the Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond)—this "horse and buggy doctor" with his sassafras solutions to health problems in Ontario—that the health services of Ontario are 25 years behind time. These services will not improve until the Minister is able to admit: one, that he has problems; and two, that he is ready to take the stand of breaking the medical control on health services in the province.

In my professional capacity, Mr. Speaker, I would be more than pleased to extend help in any area that would benefit services to people. But before that would be possible in the departments of government, it would be necessary for them to admit a few simple things. One, for instance, that right now they are hung up by trying to provide modern services in old archaic buildings that should not serve people, and should not be used for that purpose. They are a danger to the patients, they are a danger to the staff.

Right now they are suffering serious problems every time they try to introduce a new programme, in that they have a civil service oriented to old ways of doing things and not prepared to change readily. This is a problem. It would be a problem for anyone who tried to introduce changes in a social sense in the province of Ontario. It cannot help but be a problem for the Minister of Health. And no matter how much he comes before this Legislature and implies that he has no difficulties, he has very serious difficulties that are part and parcel of the fact that these services are outdated and tremendous changes are required to bring them up to date.

As for the Minister of Reform Institutions (Mr. Grossman), how can he ever deal effectively with the children showing deviant behaviour if he does not first of all admit that there may just possibly be a few minor defects in The Department of Reform Institutions, and perhaps something missing in the very concept of reform institutions. Certainly he would need to admit that there is something inappropriate and vile about sending young children to training schools under section eight of The Training Schools Act. It robs children of their civil liberties.

I have said little in the Legislature to the Minister of Reform Institutions, but I have made it a point in all of my public appearances to say a great deal about the Minister and his services. I have said them outside the House, sir, without the privileges of this Legislature.

Not only does this Minister whitewash the wrongs of his department, but the hon. members behind the Cabinet benches ridicule individual cases of human misery and despair brought to this Legislature for redress.

Mr. S. Apps (Kingston and The Islands): That is not true. Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I would like to know who the member is talking about. He is saying the back-benchers behind the Ministers; who is he talking about specifically?

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Brown: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): That is not a point of order.

Mr. Brown: I would say, Mr. Speaker, that if what I have said about the back-benchers hits the hon. member, he can apply it to himself; if it does not, he should not.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Brown: I have watched the hon. members opposite and I say if their actions, Mr. Speaker, in this first month of the twenty-eighth Legislature represent honestly their

position, there will be no meeting of minds here. No amount of talking will bring our differences together. We are irretrievably opposed to them. They are wedded to the large corporations; hopelessly sunk in the smug, selfish and irresponsible establishment. They pretend concern for people.

Mr. MacDonald: The Minister smugly smiles.

Mr. Brown: Who did they soak in the last Budget if they are so concerned about the ordinary man? Now the hon. members know, Mr. Speaker, that the NDP, the New Democratic Party of Ontario, has the real interests of the people at heart and you can see that, Mr. Speaker, in our programmes for medicare, in our $2 minimum wage. We do not haggle about $1.25 or $1.50—a $2 minimum wage. A respectable minimum wage.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Brown: Our stand on housing for all. Our tenant bill of rights. Our rights of the small businessman, who has been forgotten in Ontario in a rapid movement to shut off the province to big business and the establishment. The small businessman gets hurt as much as anyone in the province.

Our stand on day nurseries. Our concept of free education for all and our aid to those who are dispossessed and underprivileged. These are the things that we stand for and fight for in this House, and this means we are the people who represent the interests of the voting public in Ontario.

Now, I would like to digress for a moment and I would like to assure the hon. member for Eglinton (Mr. Reilly) that I will be finished in time. But I would like to digress for a moment and bring an old friend into the Legislature, a man that some of you may not have a great acquaintance with at the moment. I hope before the next four years are out you will get to know him better; he is a gentleman called Dr. Sigmund Freud, who was born in 1856 and died in 1939. One of the first great social scientists to turn the scientific method of investigation upon man himself.

In his work he discovered that there are two mighty forces that compel man to act. One, the sexual force, which includes all that is dynamic that has to do with pleasure, with realization of oneself, with the fufillment of the individual under the general source of the sex drive.

An hon. member: How is your libido?

Mr. Brown: The second greatest force is the aggressive force. Some of you may notice that that is just a modified crippled kind of expression here in the House. I would like to take a moment to talk about it. You know we have passed through the sexual revolution in the last ten years and it has not left any of us wanting. We are all a little more able to live with the fact that sex does exist, that it is pleasurable and that we are part and parcel of it.

However, in terms of the aggressive drive we have not been so fortunate. We are still hung up, and perhaps nowhere does it show more clearly than in this Legislature, Mr. Speaker, around the aggressive drive. We have not learned yet to live with our own repressed aggression. Freud discovered that guilt is not related to sex; guilt is related to repressed aggression.

And one of the reasons I say to you, gentlemen, there will be no meeting of minds here is because you are hung up around your repressed aggressions against the common man of Ontario.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Brown: Mr. Speaker, it is my belief that the Tories hate ordinary people and I believe that is because they have soaked them. They deny them medical services, housing, education, dignity and respect. And they love corporations. They reward them. They build them roads and wine and dine them; give them our natural resources and leave waste land for the ordinary people—a hole in the ground and an empty pocket.

I am not trying to convince the members opposite of anything in these remarks, because they are bound to their position by the guilt of their misdeeds to the ordinary citizens. They cannot escape it, they are trapped in their own psychic dynamic.

I would like to digress for a moment and remind the hon. members of the Legislature that in the 25 years that the Tory government ruled the province of Ontario one-half of the world's population has turned to socialism. For a good reason; and with a great deal of effort and a heck of a lot easier than we have been able to move ahead even to declare our independence from the United States of America. Countries all over the world, without our technology and without our wealth have thrown over archaic forms of government in social and economic organization and have turned to socialism and turned to it with good reason and with good reward.

As Mao Tse-tung once said—and listen carefully, hon. gentlemen, you may meet him face to face someday whether you like him or whether you do not, he rules the largest nation on earth—

Mr. J. H. White (London South): The member's philosophy becomes apparent.

Mr. Brown: He says politics is war without bloodshed and war is politics with bloodshed. I want you to know as far as I am concerned this is precisely my position. It is my intention in all my actions here to defeat you in honourable combat, to expose you, to reveal your shortcomings to your own discredit.

Last night, I listened in the House to the hon. Don Quixote from Sudbury riding backwards on his ass, thinking that he sees horizons in place where he has been, sitting there in his shabby uniform, half-Tory, half-Liberal, wandering aimlessly, leaderless, around the chambers of this Legislature, taking pot shots at the flag, at your hat, kind Speaker, at the prayers, and at friend and foe alike, with wild abandon. It came to my mind that the greatest single threat to the legislative process in Canada rests, my good friends from the legal profession, with lawyers and legal profession itself—all of them.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Brown: They are preoccupied with their own holy sanctified position. They hold themselves above criticism, above accountability, even above the rule of law, Mr. Speaker. Using the high office and esteem that the public mind has for these people, they whitewash misdeeds to protect the vested interests of the rich and mighty against the poor and the helpless. I say to you lawyers, on both sides of the House, Mr. Speaker, clean your own house. Clean your own house, come back to a rule of law that is truly equal for rich and poor, for the privileged and the underprivileged.

There is a grave injustice in immoral action each day of the week in our towns, in our cities, our counties, in our province, in the courts, in the conduct of justice for the ordinary citizen. Nobody knows this better than the lawyers themselves.

I came to Ontario 20 years ago in 1948, without help or without any particular assistance. I had a contribution to make. I have tried, in the period of time since then, to make that contribution. But the hon. members on the Tory side of the House saw fit to attack that work, hiding behind the privilege of this Legislature just about one year ago. Our unctuous member for York-Forest Hill (Mr. Dunlop) did not rise in his seat that day to talk with these platitudes that we heard yesterday about the moral responsibility of the speakers in this Legislature attack members outside the Legislature, not one word was said at that time. The hon. members know what happened to George Peck who made that attack. He was defeated by the member for Scarborough Centre (Mrs. M. Renwick) with one arm tied behind her back—a wife with a family to take care of to boot.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Brown: All right, all right.

An hon. member: There is a difference, you know.

Another hon. member: Does he know?

Mr. Brown: Mr. Speaker, all the voters in Scarborough Centre have for the first time a working member to represent them, and I tell you that when these four years are over, the hon. members in the Tory ranks will bear the battle scars of that fact.

In closing, I want to say to the lawyers and judges, the hon. Tory Ministers, and the hon. Liberal hacks, that behind the Legislature, behind the judiciary, behind the rule of law, stand the people. You have fooled them too long. We will see that you fool them no longer. The hon. member for High Park (Mr. Shulman) whose talents, Mr. Speaker, allow him to choose any occupation or profession in our land, and whose high status in the establishment would have made it possible for him to have any privilege available to any citizen in the province of Ontario, chose to stand for the unrepresented people in his office as coroner, and to speak for them and to protect them.

And he did that in the finest sense that we can talk about service to people, with no advantage to himself.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): There would be as long as he is a Tory.

Mr. Brown: Not only that, Mr. Speaker, he gave service to the public of Toronto—Metropolitan Toronto—and Ontario, knowing full well that the establishment would come down on him, come down on him hard and try to break his back. Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, he stood for them; he did not falter. He still does not falter and the public knows—they are not fooled. You will see in the next

election as you saw in his election in High Park that they are not fooled.

I personally, Mr. Speaker, deem it a great honour to caucus with this courageous man. He shows more honesty and common sense in five minutes than I have seen from the Liberals and the Tories since the House opened. The hon. members from the opposite side of the House do not like it when one of their own refuses to play their nefarious games any longer and comes over to the party of integrity and genuine social conscience.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Brown: The people who do this present too much of a threat for them. They pose a threat to the hon. members because they know their ways and they know how to repudiate them. Do not kid me. It is not the hon. member for High Park's conduct that worries them—that is not what worries them one bit. It is what he knows about them, what he has on record that causes them to tremble, and so it was for the esteemed member for Riverside—

An hon. member: Riverdale!

Mr. Brown: Yes—our national president.

Some hon. members: Riverdale!

Mr. Brown: Riverdale. Thank you.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Brown: I would like to ask the members of the Legislature, Mr. Speaker, could they think of anything that shows more wisdom and maturity than the NDP selecting him as their national president? Now answer me!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Brown: You will notice, Mr. Speaker, that men of conscience and good will come to our party and play important roles regardless of their background. We are comfortable, Mr. Speaker, with the corporation lawyers and the millionaires if they are men of principle, as we would be if they came from a socialist working class family as I did. I would like to repeat that once more for those of you who were so busy guffawing at your own stupidity that you did not hear it. We are prepared to work with people from all classes and from all walks of life if they are men of principle.

Mr. N. L. Olde (Middlesex South): That leaves the members out, that leaves him out.

Mr. Brown: Well, Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that the opposition, the real opposition, to the Tory government rests in the New Democratic caucus, and I want you to know, Mr. Speaker, that we are ready for battle, and we are ready for victory.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): When are you going to start?

Mr. Brown: Will the member shut up? Excuse me, Mr. Speaker. It is not because we are looking forward to inheriting the mess of a Tory Party. Despite the fact that we will inherit a mess from the Tory Party we are prepared for victory and to move in and clean it up. Why? Because we are the only party with the ability and the determination to correct the abuses that have been developing over the last 25 years.

Quite honestly, Mr. Speaker, I do not relish cleaning up the mess in The Department of Health. I am not looking forward to that one bit. But I will say this, that for every one of the four years remaining in this Legislature, I will see that the Minister of Health has his nose rubbed in his mess, day by day that I am here.

Mr. Speaker, I have been quietly sitting in the Legislature since it opened and I have had an opportunity to look across at the Tory benches, and I want to tell you that I have had a growing consternation as each day went by because the Prime Minister seemed to be growing in stature to be a veritable giant. I thought that there must be something wrong. It did not sit right until I realized that his Cabinet were a bunch of dwarfs, and that they were dwarfs hanging on to their seats, just discovering that they could occupy them.

The Legislature will note the fine team we have working for us in MacDonald, Renwick, and Lewis. So powerful a team that you can only ridicule it; you do not know how to attack it, you do not know how to fight it. And I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, that the back benches of the NDP will follow this leadership to victory in Ontario.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to close my remarks. I have little engagement down in Chicago with the American orthopsychiatric association to show an Ontario film. It is not "A Place to Stand and a Place to Grow," it is a film called "Warrendale," made in Ontario, by Ontarians, for Ontarians. I am very pleased to be taking it to Chicago, in the United States of America, and I hope that it gets a better reception there than it has across the way.

Mr. L. M. Reilly (Eglinton): Mr. Speaker, first of all, I should like to say a word of

congratulation to you, sir. I know of your record here at Queen's Park. I realize that you have been a very able Minister of Highways and you did an excellent job as Minister of Municipal Affairs, that you acquitted yourself most favourably as the Attorney General in the province. I agree with the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts), he has made an excellent selection in making you our Speaker for these sessions.

Yesterday evening, the hon. member for Sudbury (Mr. Sopha) mentioned my name in connection with the Speaker's assignment. May I say to you, sir, that it is hard for us to know what happens as time goes on. Speculation is made by members of political groups, and by members of the press. Names have been bandied around and mine was one of them, but I think that in election of you as Speaker, I think that we in the House can be assured of a very able and impartial administration.

May I congratulate you on what you have done so far, it has not been an easy job. May I also say to you that I am delighted with your Deputy Speaker, the hon. member for Waterloo South (Mr. Reuter). We saw him last year substitute as a chairman of the committee as a whole. I have been up in his area and I know how the people of his area feel about him and the manner in which he has conducted himself, and looked after his constituents. All of us here in the House are very proud of the work that he is doing as your deputy.

May I say too, sir, that we all often take for granted the Sergeant-at-Arms, who lends a lot of dignity to the House. I think that the way that he performs his duty is well recognized by all the members of the House but sometimes we have a tendency to take him for granted, and I would like to say a word of tribute to him.

Now, Mr. Speaker, just previous to my rising, the hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville (Mr. B. Newman) was speaking to this group and saying that congratulations should be made, and have been offered, to the Prime Minister by some of our members and then, subsequently, we would find fault with the same Prime Minister. I hope that this is always the case.

I hope that we can feel that we can congratulate a person for a job that is well done and at the same time feel that if there is something that should be improved, or some form of betterment, that we are in a position to do it. The hon. member has also referred to applications for education. He wondered why we should actually steal teachers from other countries. Perhaps he did not know that there were applications made for this province, some 500 strong, and it was not a question of stealing them, it was a question of trying to select those that could come here. Would he deny them the right to come, if they wanted to come and made application to come? I suggest to you and I am sure that under the circumstances he would not have done so.

I have done this, it was not a question of recruitment, it was a question of selection. It was a question of meeting with those people who made application. Now the hon. member for Beaches-Woodbine (Mr. Brown) unfortunately had to leave in order to meet some friends in Chicago, he told us. May I tell you that I agree with what he has said about the former member for Woodbine, Mr. Bryden. I share his viewpoint.

In my opinion, Mr. Bryden was an excellent member of the Legislature. I think that he did a good job for Woodbine; I think that no job was too small for him; and I think that whether it was a question of a board of education matter, a civic matter, a federal matter, he served his constituents well. I would be inclined to agree with the hon. member for Beaches-Woodbine that Mr. Bryden served his constituents well, but when he goes on to find fault because the government has placed a man like Mr. Harris, I disagree entirely.

Just because Jack Harris happens to be a Conservative is no reason why he should not receive an appointment. It does help in many instances, but it should not hinder. That is the point that I make. Jack Harris came into this Legislature with me in a by-election of 1962, and Jack Harris served the people of the province of Ontario, and his riding of Woodbine, well, and nobody could have done better.

He was a dedicated and devoted representative of this area, and he had ability. Just because there is a vacancy, and because a man happens to be a Conservative, is not any reason why he should be denied the opportunity to still continue to serve the people of Ontario in another way.

An hon. member: You could not get a job in Saskatchewan unless you were a socialist, remember that now.

Mr. Reilly: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Beaches-Woodbine has suggested, of course, that the Ministers over here have serious problems. I should hope so. They

are able to deal with serious problems, they are trained to deal with them. I would suggest that with the absence of serious problems, we would not require the same kind of talent that we have now in the front benches of this government. The absence of problems may make it easier, but who does not have serious problems? Because serious problems exist, the situation is not objectionable. It is how we deal with those problems.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): But you must first acknowledge the existence of the problem.

Mr. Reilly: I was glad to hear my good friend here, the hon. member for Beaches-Woodbine, join me now in the House as a new member for the defence of the small businessman, sir. He is a newcomer in the House, and I welcome him on my side. This is something that I have been in favour of doing, as the members know now, of doing everything and anything that we can to help the small businessman. I was a little concerned when the hon. member for Beaches-Woodbine started talking about the lawyers, and suggested that, perhaps, they should clean up their own house, and forgot that there were two good lawyers, the hon. member for Riverdale (Mr. Renwick) and the hon. member for Lakeshore (Mr. Lawlor), both from his own party. I knew he was not talking about them.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): He did not forget; he just forgave.

Mr. Reilly: I have the highest respect for both of them and, as a matter of fact, what concerned me most is when he suggested that the hon. member for Scarborough Centre (Mrs. M. Renwick), who has a home and a family to consider, I wondered, just at that time, what was the status of the member for Riverdale. I asked him what was going to happen now that both the Renwicks were in the Legislature, and he assured me that he was going to continue to help his wife do the dishes.

We are glad to know that it is a three-man team, according to the hon. member for Beaches-Woodbine. He says that it is Renwick, Lewis and Brown. I thought it was a 20-man team, but if it is only a three-man team, we will show you how a team operates if you will observe what happens here on the PC side.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Reilly: Mr. Speaker, one of the reasons why I am taking part in this debate today is because of some of the things that have happened in the Legislature and which I thought might be helpful to some of the new members. The hon. member for Scarborough Centre indicated that there were some 41 new members in this Legislature. I think she told us that last night. Perhaps some of the new members may want to be reminded of some of the customs of the Legislature and perhaps some of the old members also have to be reminded of them.

First of all, I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that my maiden speech in 1962 dealt with some disrespect that we had in this Legislature and the absence of courtesy. I think sometimes we have to remind ourselves about it. For instance, I have before me a book of Alex C. Lewis on the parliamentary procedures of Ontario dealing with something you might hesitate, of course, to mention, Mr. Speaker.

It says in respect to the Speaker, on page 24, that on entering or leaving the chamber or in crossing the floor of the House, a member faces Mr. Speaker and bows. I think this is something that we, perhaps, should be reminded of.

Once again, Mr. Speaker, along the same vein on page 97, it says whenever the Speaker rises to his feet, any member speaking or attempting to speak must resume his seat and the House must be silent in order that the Speaker may be heard.

Sometimes we have to be reminded of the rules and it is easy enough in our excitement and in our enthusiasm over some debate to forget what actually happens in the House.

I would refer you to something here on page 30, Mr. Speaker, where it says in referring to another member during a discussion a member, while addressing the House, must not refer to him by name but must call his attention or designate as the hon. member for his constituency or the hon. member, or the Minister of whatever—naming the Minister by portfolio.

Now I realize that in our friendly banter back and forth in the camaraderie of spirit it is easy enough for us to be talking about Eddie, Elmer and so on. But I suggest to you that sometimes we lower the dignity of the House and it is worth reminding ourselves about it. Also, in connection with interjections Mr. Speaker.

Mr. V. M. Singer: (Downsview): Now we are getting back to Freud?

Mr. Reilly: The Freudian flip.

On page 29 it says a member is expected to so conduct himself as not to interrupt or retard the business of the House, nor interrupt nor interfere with a member when speaking by means of irrelevant remarks or interjections or by making unnecessary noise. I know many of the old members or the former members of this House are familiar with all these rules. Sometimes we have to remind ourselves about them even from the standpoint of asking questions and wasting the time of the House.

On page 110, rule 37 is something that the hon. member for Grey North might be interested in when he referred to questions that may be put to the Ministers of the Crown relating to public affairs.

Mr. E. Sargent: Grey-Bruce!

Mr. Reilly: Grey-Bruce, I am sorry, and to other members relating to any bill, motion, or other public matter connected with the business of the House in which such members may be concerned. But in putting any such question, no argument or opinion is to be offered, nor any facts stated; and in answering any such question, a member is not to debate the matter to which the same refers.

Mr. Sargent: May I speak on a point of order? What has this got to do with the tax situation in Ontario?

Mr. Reilly: Well, should I remind the hon. member for Grey-Bruce that at the present time we have not started into the Budget debate. It will start very soon. At the present time we are on the Throne debate and as such, he and all members of this House are privileged to discuss any phase at any time. I thought perhaps his leader would have instructed him to that effect.

Mr. MacDonald: The problem is, what good would the instructions do?

Mr. Reilly: Mr. Speaker, if I am mean, I take it all back. I had no intention of being mean.

One reason I am on my feet now is to refer to something that happened here during the private members' hour. On March 8, a week ago Friday, the hon. member for Lakeshore at that time was on his feet. What I think was rather unfair about it and rather unsportsman-like was for the hon. member to have the motion introduced in private members' hour at five minutes after 12 and to continue to speak for almost 15 minutes and then to move the adjournment of the debate. This, I think, was very unfair, not only to others who wish to speak, but to himself and to the private members' hour.

May I suggest to you that by moving the adjournment of the debate, at that time, he alone was the only person who had spoken—six people were listed to speak. So what he had done—

Mr. Lawlor: Not a single one has taken objection.

Mr. Reilly: What he had done, Mr. Speaker, in connection—

Mr. Lawlor: We know what the hon. member would do!

Mr. Reilly: —with that is that he had denied the right of other people to participate in that debate.

Mr. Lawlor: No one lost any rights to speak!

Mr. Reilly: As a matter of fact, I would even consider that it was insolence on the part of any member during a private members' hour.

Surely it would not be considered by him that what he had to say was of so much importance that he would say the members have to be here and the Ministers have to be here. I have something to say and I am the member for Lakeshore.

Mr. Lawlor: You had better be here in future or the same thing will happen again.

Mr. Reilly: Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, he should be reminded that it was arranged by the members of all parties and by agreement with all three Whips that we would—

Mr. Lawlor: There was no arrangement of that kind at all.

Mr. Reilly: —have a private members' hour and that during the private members' hour we would not have any votes—

Mr. MacDonald: You ought to join the legal profession.

Mr. Reilly: —and, so under the circumstances, I suggest that not only has he wasted the time of the House—

Mr. Lawlor: Sour grapes!

Mr. Reilly: —but he is unfair to others who wanted to participate.

Now mind you, in fairness to him, Mr. Speaker, it may have been done somewhat impulsively because I understand he has some Irish background, or maybe the member for York South—his hon. leader—might have triggered him into it, suggesting that it might embarrass the members of the Progressive Conservative Party on a Friday morning.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Reilly: I would have no reason whatsoever to discount the words of the hon. member for York South. But may I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the very action might have ill effects upon the private members' hour.

Mr. MacDonald: Is that a threat?

Mr. Reilly: No, I am not saying that it is a threat, I am saying that the very action could have ill effects because what could happen is this.

Mr. Lawlor: What is the point in speaking if you are all going to leave?

Mr. Reilly: I will come to that my friend, the hon. member for Lakeshore. Where was he yesterday—if he wants to talk like that—when some of us were talking?

Mr. MacDonald: Give us the right to have votes.

Mr. Reilly: So it may be that summaries can be made. I will be glad to sit down with the Whips of the other parties and discuss new rules for the next four years if that is the intention or the will of the House; I will be glad to do this.

Mr. MacDonald: We have tried that but got nowhere—

Mr. Reilly: But I say let us sit down and make some new arrangements.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Reilly: But I suggest that he would be working not only against the mover himself if he had been genuine in his effort for a vote to be taken—under those circumstances he would be working against himself; he was working against the hon. member for Downsview—

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Oh no, he was quite satisfied.

Mr. MacDonald: The hon. member for Downsview supported the motion.

Mr. Reilly: —who was the next speaker, and he was working against all the members of the House who want to participate.

Mr. Lawlor: I deny that.

Mr. Reilly: The hon. member for Lakeshore talks about absenteeism. I do not want to get into the question of absenteeism, because what we did in former situations was just tossed it back and forth to say how many people were here from this particular group and how many were from the other group, and work it out on a percentage basis. This went on last year and the year before. I do not think we accomplished anything among ourselves by doing it.

Mr. MacDonald: Never mind, from this point on you need 50 per cent plus 1.

Mr. Reilly: Let me say, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. member for York South, that I went into a committee here only a week ago on a Friday morning, and there were 18 members of the Progressive Conservatives and only two of the Opposition. Let me tell you that I went into another meeting where we had a private bills committee and there were 16 members of the PC's, six Liberals and two NDP's and it started at seven minutes after ten. I do not want to go into this, Mr. Speaker; I do not think it helps us a group.

But all I am saying to you is that we are here, on the job and I have had the utmost co-operation from the members of the Progressive Conservative Party. When we have taken a vote, as you recall, quite recently, it came up with 52 to 38, a total of 90 members in the House. We do not want to waste the time of those 90 members.

The hon. member for Lakeshore says something about absenteeism, and being in the House and so on. His friend and colleague, the hon. member for Peterborough (Mr. Pitman), does not share his viewpoint, according to an article that appeared in "Queen's Park, where the action is," by Douglas Fisher, in the Toronto *Telegram* of March 8. He says Walter Pitman is most enthusiastic about the Legislature and about his party caucus. He is impressed with the attention Premier Robarts gave the daily proceedings. There were never this number of Ministers in the House in Ottawa, and the Prime Minister never spent the time in and around the chamber that Mr. Robarts does. This is what the hon. member for Peterborough, said.

Mr. Lewis: That is true. The Prime Minister is often in the House.

Mr. Reilly: And let me tell you that in the *Globe and Mail* of Thursday, March 7, George Bain points out in an article in praise of politicians that there is a lot more to be said for a member of Parliament sitting in his office marshalling his thoughts for a debate on a subject he knows something about, than sitting at his desk in the House of Commons listening to a debate on a subject to which he can contribute nothing.

Mr. Lawlor: Let us all go out and marshal our thoughts, now.

Mr. Reilly: And he goes on to say:

> What does the MP for a downtown constituency do by remaining stoically in his place through a debate on some Pacific salmon convention, that would be half so useful as his getting on with answering letters from his constituents?

Further, he says:

> This is not a case for absenteeism, that has been put up, far from it. But it is an argument against the notion that being constantly in his place in the House of Commons is the essential mark of a good member; and the concomitant implications that when an MP is not in his place, he can only be goofing off.

He concludes the article by saying:

> Meanwhile there are other things for him to do, and contrary to the impression created by occasional inflamed comments, suggesting rampant absenteeism, the great bulk of MPs put in a solid day's and week's work.

This is by George Bain.

Mr. Lawlor: The government makes a farce of the private members' hour.

Mr. Reilly: And then, Mr. Speaker, may I remind my good friend, the hon. member for Lakeshore, that in the Toronto *Star* of March 11, an article reads: "A good member of Parliament does not warm his seat." Some of the paragraphs go on to say that a member must also spend much of his time talking to constituents and answering their letters. That is a part of his duty as a representative of his constituency.

So it does not follow that when a member of Parliament is absent from the House, that he is out carousing in Hull. He may be attending an important committee, or dealing with complaints from his constituency.

In either case, he may be more usefully employed than he would be sitting through a long debate on the condition of the wharf at Skizook Inlich, New Brunswick, or the misconduct of the postmaster at Alibi, Manitoba. All this, of course, is no excuse for the Tuesday to Thursday club. Whatever work a member is engaged in, he should always be within call for important votes. But rules that chain him to the House sittings would considerably diminish the value of a conscientious member of Parliament. So I suggest to the hon. member that we perhaps could substitute the member of Parliament (MPP) in this particular case.

It does point out, however, there is a definite need for some understanding and some rules in connection with the private members' hour. And I am prepared to go into this with other whips.

Mr. Lewis: Will you allow votes?

Mr. Reilly: This is something that will be discussed by the whips when they get together. It is not likely that votes will be permitted.

Mr. Lewis: Well, there goes the private members' hour.

Mr. Reilly: No, I would not be inclined to say so, but we can discuss this among ourselves. Another reason why I am my feet, Mr. Speaker, at this time, is to talk about another incident that happened the night before. It was on the Thursday night of March 7. One of our members, I guess it was the member for Grey South (Mr. Winkler), later on in the evening suggested that things that had been done by a member of the Opposition, in the parlance of the street, "had not been above board."

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that it is very difficult for members of the government to be sitting on this side, as we often do, receiving from time to time innuendos, aspersions, and insinuations and without rebelling in an ordinary way, in a human way.

Mr. MacDonald: Yes, but provide some documentation.

Mr. Reilly: Yes, I would be inclined to agree that this perhaps is necessary. Just because it is given to us, I do not think that we should turn around and hand it back. I am not suggesting this. But the one point I would like to relay to the members opposite is this, that I had promised the hon. Ministers that if they were away from their seats I would take time to give them an opportunity, in case of a division bell, to return to this House.

Two or three of them had given me telephone numbers at which they could be reached. They said: "We have to come from the tenth floor, or we have to come from the eighth floor, we have to walk down, in many instances, the circuitous route and across the building—you will have to allow us 15 minutes."

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): You said the Royal York hotel?

Mr. Reilly: The hon. member, I am sure, has either misinterpreted or has been misinformed. Such was not the case.

Mr. Gisborn: You are hard to understand sometimes.

Mr. Reilly: I am sorry if I make myself difficult; should I repeat it for the hon. member?

An hon. member: I do not think it will really matter.

Mr. Reilly: Mr. Speaker, what I had suggested and promised to the hon. Ministers, was that I would wait 15 minutes for the Ministers to come here. I think that the hon. members of this House will have to appreciate that if the division bells are called under the present circumstances, it will require a minimum of 15 minutes for the Ministers to return here from the other buildings.

Mr. MacDonald: Nobody is arguing that point.

Mr. Reilly: But it was disappointing, when I left my office at 14 minutes, after having promised 15 minutes, to come into the Legislature and meet some members of Opposition parties, who said: "Well, if you are going to wait for your members, then we are going to wait for our members." And immediately this caused a further delay.

Mr. MacDonald: But no one has been told about their 15 minute rule.

Mr. Reilly: We were waiting for the Ministers; we had not attempted to get in touch with our members. But then, after knowing that you were going to call members, this was when we attempted to reach our members by telephone. I wanted to clear that point. I do not agree with the hon. member for Sudbury who said last night that it was leaderless and it was rudderless and so on. On the contrary, it was anything but.

The thing was planned, as far as I was concerned, to wait 15 minutes, and then to come in. Some members of the Opposition were not ready, and so we had to wait for them. When they were calling members from elsewhere, we went out and called members from elsewhere and under those circumstances we waited for them to get here.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Reilly: I would be inclined to say that if you give your word to members that you will wait 15 minutes, I think under those circumstances every hon. member of this House would wait for 15 minutes.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Explain the half hour wait for the member from the Royal York!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Reilly: Going back, Mr. Speaker, it all points out the need for some understanding and, perhaps, some rules from the standpoint of division bells. As far as I am concerned, I think if nothing else comes from this than to point out that need, I am all for it.

As far as the insinuations are concerned, Mr. Speaker, I would like to refer to something here on page 26, in which it says that a member is expected to confine his remarks to the subjects under discussion, and not to introduce irrelevancies or to indulge in repetition.

It goes on to say that personalities are taboo as lowering the dignity which should characterize proceedings in the House, and it is a serious infraction of the rules for a member to impute improper motives to another member, or to reflect upon the honesty or good intention of any vote in the House.

Now, I think we realize this and I would say to you, Mr. Speaker, that I have no room in my heart, or in my make-up, for people who want to cast insinuations and cast aspersions and to be political and personal about it. I think that we, as members of this assembly, should refain from it even if we do have, as the hon. member for York South has suggested, documentation. I do not know what we accomplish by the use of it, but if there should be charges, I agree, we should support them with documentation.

The difficulty is this, that if we become vindictive in the House, what happens here at the province would be reflected the same way as it was reflected in Ottawa. I do not think we would have heard of a Gerda Munsinger if they had not started mudslinging in Ottawa. I think we should rise above it.

I do not think we, as members of this House, should get to the point where we are casting aspersions against each other to the point where we are saying, "We are going to get back at him", or "We are going to get back at somebody else," or "We are going to embarrass the leader," or "We are going to cause trouble for the other party." I think that we should realize that what the people want us to do is to deal with the business of the province, not to deal with some of these personalities as has happened from time to time.

I would be inclined too, Mr. Speaker, when I am on my feet, to suggest to you and to other members of the House that perhaps there would be a need for putting a limit, a time limit on some of our speeches—on the Speech from the Throne and the speech on the Budget. I am suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that most of us are kept busy now, some 12 or 15 hours a day. This adds up considerably when we have to be in the House and wait for, not the half or three-quarter hour speech, but for somebody who is going to make a speech like last night—which took between three and four hours—by the hon. member for Sudbury.

I am not disputing the quality of his speech, nor the content, I am merely suggesting from the standpoint of the business of the House—that we do not expedite the business of the House when we have members speak for three or four hours. I am not singling out any particular member. I could, on the other hand, refer to a member from the New Democratic Party who took maybe more than four hours. If you want to, we could go back into a former session when a member who was running for leadership in the Liberal Party took some seven hours, over several days, and you know what happened to him.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Reilly: Yes. I am just suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that if we are going to expedite the work of the House that perhaps if we had a limit on the length of time that members would speak on the Throne debate, or in the Budget debate, it might speed up the work of the House. I am not suggesting that the leaders should be restricted to half an hour, three-quarters of an hour, or an hour, or even as a wind-up speaker. I am merely suggesting that as far as we are concerned, we should keep it in mind and perhaps discuss the merit of a time limit.

May I suggest to the hon. members of the House, Mr. Speaker, merely to substantiate what I have said about the 15 minutes that I have promised the Minister to wait, that I had written over here to the Deputy Minister of Public Works in February, stating to him that the hon. John Yaremko, the hon. Matthew Dymond and others were not able to be reached and that no buzzer system has been installed.

I have a letter back from him on February 27 stating that a study has been commenced by the department to determine the feasibility and the cost of providing buzzers. I merely point this out to tell the House that this took place some week or ten days before the Thursday night when I asked the members to wait some 15 minutes.

I would agree with the hon. member for Sudbury last night, when he said that we should do something to improve the amenities for members, particularly from the standpoint of office space. I believe that we are living in a new world today and we cannot go back to the old world.

Some people have a tendency to say, "Well, this is what we did ten years ago, or eight years ago, or when I first came into the House". Those days have gone and we have to realize that today is a new day. I think we have to be fair to the members who come here, not for six weeks, as was the case at some time, but perhaps for six months as the case is now.

I think it is very unfair to the members when they have deputations, when they have even a single visitor, when they have dictation to do, that they have to share an office with three, or four, or five other members.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Reilly: The way things go now, if we are going to continue without time limit on debates I can tell you that this statement may be made: "You can get Reilly before seven in the morning or after 11 at night." Now I realize that this is a self-inflicted wound. I have no one to blame except myself, but so have all the members of the Legislature. Soon, if we continue the way we are with the present work load, we will need a bed, as well as a secretary and a desk.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Reilly: I did not hear the question, Mr. Speaker, likely I shall before I conclude.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Reilly: That is a very important question, Mr. Speaker, and may I suggest to you

that it has been established to have a committee, comprising members of all three parties, to sit down as the Speaker's House committee, to discuss this particular aspect and many other aspects of it.

Mr. Sargent: The idea sounds good.

Mr. Reilly: I cannot say how long these things take, but I would suggest to you that you have representatives who will be sitting on it. Relay your thoughts to them and make sure that they are conveyed to the committee. Perhaps, under those circumstances, a lot can be done to improve the conditions here for the private members.

Candidly, Mr. Speaker, I was a little surprised to hear members of the Opposition talk about the election. I was surprised because had I been a member of the Opposition, and had I said some of the things that were said previous to October 17, such as, "Wait till election comes, we will show them", "Call an election—we dare you" and then to be defeated as badly as they were, I would never have said a word about it.

I would have sat in my seat quietly. But perhaps I can understand their particular strategy because they more than likely felt that the members in the Progressive Conservatives will have a tendency to say something about it. So under those circumstances what we better do is face it head on. I think perhaps if I were in their position I might have adopted the same strategy.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Reilly: One of the things I admire about the Opposition, particularly about the New Democratic Party, is their tenacity of purpose and their optimism. They are true optimists.

May I say to the hon. member for York South, Mr. Speaker, that I think we have a better Legislature with more members in opposition. I think that this is better for the province of Ontario. But I was surprised—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Reilly: —I was so surprised also to hear from the Liberals, and I thought that the hon. member for Sudbury last night said it so well, you saw what he did. He turned the focus from the losing Liberals over to the losing NDPs, and instead of focusing the attention on the Liberals who had lost, he turned it onto the NDP who had also lost.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Reilly: Did members see the platform that the Liberals had in 1967; they went on to say that Ontario needs policies now; they need tax reform now; lower living costs now; reform government now; build Ontario now. This is part of their programme; northern development now; better communities now; housing now; recreation policy now; law reform now; stronger Canada now. You know what the people said: "Not now, no."

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Reilly: And then you see the reason for this programme they were going to take. They were going to pay 80 per cent cost of the education. They were going to spend another $100 million in northern development. Universal medicare, another $100 million—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Reilly: —highway construction and parks, another $100 million. What is a $100 million to the Liberals? So they planned $600, $700 million extra but the people said "Not now, no." The NDP were just as bad, maybe worse.

Mr. MacDonald: Except that we indicated where we would raise the money!

Mr. Reilly: The NDP were prepared to promise the same things, and more. Yes. The hon. leader of the NDP group would have added, to this the cost of implementing a compulsory automobile insurance programme—

Mr. MacDonald: But it would be cheaper—

Mr. Reilly: —and a guaranteed income. Yes, and the cost of paying for some 41 Crown corporations.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Reilly: All this—

Mr. MacDonald: That's a figment of Ab Campion's imagination, those Crown corporations.

Mr. Reilly: —according to the programme for Ontario, of course, they would have added hundreds of millions of dollars more.

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Billions. Billions!

Mr. Reilly: But what did the people say? At a time when everything was in their favour—

Mr. MacDonald: Seven per cent more of them did not vote for the government.

Mr. Reilly: I assume, Mr. Speaker, that when the hon. member says seven per cent did not vote for me, refers to the fact that I had some complaints in my riding because we lost one or two polls.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Reilly: Yes, it was most embarrassing to the members of my team to learn that I had lost a poll. But at a time when everything was in favour of the Opposition, when education costs were high, when taxes were high, when inflation was increasing, when costs were spiralling, when everything appeared to be going up, they still did not have an appeal with the general public.

Mr. MacDonald: Well if the public knew what the government planned after the election the vote would have been different.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Reilly: Yes. Instead of 67 in 1967—the New Democrats came up with 20 seats. To me, having an objective of 67, and winding up with 20 is a dismal failure. But Ontario spoke loud and clearly.

Mr. MacDonald: We are on the way up, make no mistake.

Mr. Reilly: You know what our hon. friend from Sudbury suggested last night. He suggested that if you only got 42 per cent of the vote—referring to us in the PCs—then this meant that 58 per cent of the people voted against us—that 58 per cent did not want us.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Reilly: So if we use this reasoning, I would say that if the Liberals got 32 per cent, that 68 per cent of the people did not want them.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: How many wanted that other pack?

Mr. Reilly: And if you use the same reasoning, I would say to him that only 27 per cent of the people wanted the New Democrats and 73 per cent did not want the New Democrats.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, 58 per cent were opposed to the government, and there is no mistake about that.

Mr. Reilly: Are you suggesting we put a time limit on it now, Mr. Speaker?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Reilly: I would have thought that the Opposition by now would have learned that you have to discard the old strategy—there is no use talking about highway scandal, there is no use of talking about syndicated crime, there is no use of talking about a tired, old government. It just does not work because this is a new, vibrant government. And they change their board of directors frequently.

I guess the only thing that the Opposition could possibly say is, "If we are elected, we cannot do anything better than is being done, but we will try to do as well". That is all they could say, and the people recognize that.

Mr. D. M. De Monte (Dovercourt): How about the fact that the government lost every seat west of Ossington in Toronto?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: How many did you win east of Oshawa?

Mr. Reilly: You see, when we talk about a tired, old government, Mr. Speaker, we do not talk out a government just because it has a number of years of successful accomplishment. No, nor do we toss out Ministers, nor do we toss out members, now do we toss out businessmen because they have successfully operated a business for a number of years.

Mr. MacDonald: No, they just toss out coroners!

Mr. Reilly: No what we do is, if a man continues in business successfully, we continue to do business with him. That is how the people of Ontario have felt; they have had good government from the Progressive Conservative Party and gave them once again their mandate to succeed themselves.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Reilly: The hon. member for York South, the leader of the New Democratic Party says, "It is the smallest vote to be had in years". May I remind him that when his party went into power in 1960 on their vote, they had a smaller vote and they had the audacity to introduce the programme of medicare with fewer people, some 60 per cent, against them.

Hon. S. J. Randall (Minister of Economics and Development): We cried all the way into power.

Mr. Reilly: It must have been a bitter disappointment, Mr. Speaker. I have an article here from Sudbury *Star* that might be helpful to the hon. member for York South. It says:

> Stagnation under CCF-NDP policies is being overcome in Saskatchewan. Socialism in Saskatchewan proved to be a costly experiment. Following the defeat of the CCF government in that province after almost 20 years in office, 1944 to 1964, it has now become possible to asses the price paid for socialism under CCF-NDP government. The free welfare benefits promised to the people under a hospitalization plan, saw costs rise from $7.5 million to $65 million in 17 years. Under the socialist government the provincial debt rose from $150 million to $600 million.

Mr. MacDonald: Yes, but their per capita cost is $26.50, while this government says ours is $48.

Mr. Reilly: But this was only a small part of the price the people in Saskatchewan had to pay for their free benefits. During a period of the CCF-NDP regime, more than 60 completely new taxes were introduced. And 650 other taxes were increased.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Reilly: In the words of the current Liberal Premier, Ross Thatcher, per capita taxes in Saskatchewan were soon substantially out of line with her sister provinces. One more reason why industry located elsewhere.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Reilly: Mr. Speaker, in an effort to make their theory work, the socialist government introduced compulsion in a number of ways. Some of them are listed as follows: Boards and agencies were manned by some social theorists who told businessmen how their businesses should be run.

Everyone in the north was forced by law to sell his timber to the government—monopolized timber boards. Every trapper was required to sell his fur to the government-fur marketing board.

An hon. member: What a skinning.

Mr. Reilly: Every fisherman, Mr. Speaker, who caught a fish was forced by law to sell it to the government fish board. Every purchaser of an automobile was forced to take his insurance from a government insurance company.

Mr. MacDonald: The member does not know what he is talking about.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Reilly: Drivers of government cars and trucks were instructed to buy their gasoline from co-ops. Mr. Speaker, in his role as the leader of the government that succeeded CCF-NDP in Saskatchewan, Premier Thatcher has had the opportunity to take an inside look at the socialist government's operation. He recalls how the socialists promised to make the province a mecca for the working man. Instead, he saw the greatest mass exodus of people out of an area since Moses led the Jews out of Egypt more than 3,000 years ago.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, the hon. member who just spoke says that we should substantiate charges we make. Let us hear him substantiate those figures.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Reilly: Mr. Speaker, I am entirely in accord, and if the hon. member for Yorkview will recall what I said, I said to him here was an article that appeared in the Sudbury *Star* of last year, May 9, I am reading it to the House. And I do not know of any members of this group that use the articles from the press more frequently than do the members of the New Democratic Party.

> Each of the other provinces which had private enterprise governments increased in population by leaps and bounds after 1945.

Mr. M. Makarchuk (Brantford): Like Newfoundland, Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island, New Brunswick.

Mr. Reilly: On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, virtually speaking, Saskatchewan stood still.

Mr. MacDonald: The hon. member is wrong and does not know it.

Mr. Reilly: I continue to quote:

> She increased 12 per cent while the nation increased 60 per cent. In two decades—

Mr. Lewis: How do you increase 12 per cent at the same time as having a mass exodus?

Mr. Reilly: The quote continues:

> —270,000 of our citizens left Saskatchewan to find employment elsewhere.

Hon. Mr. Randall: They could not stand the abundant life.

Mr. Reilly: In other words, Mr. Speaker, he concludes the article by saying:

> Persons who think that the NDP has the answer to all problems should note the words of Premier Thatcher. He says: In our province we know socialism not from textbooks but from hard, bitter experience.

He goes on to say:

> We have found that there is nothing wrong with socialism except that it doesn't work.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Reilly: Now the hon. members, when they were speaking here recently, referred to medicare. Mr. Speaker, do you know how many people approached me previous to the election in connection with a compulsory medicare scheme, asking that it be implemented? Not one. Do you know how many letters I received asking for it? Not one.

Mr. Makarchuk: They knew it was useless.

Mr. Reilly: But I have received letters telling me that they are in opposition to it.

Mr. Makarchuk: From Colin Brown, no doubt.

Mr. Reilly: No, not from Colin Brown, but from someone here by the name of Adele Shaw. "If you are interested," it said, "I want to register my opposition to medicare in any shape or any form at this time." And from others on the same basis.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Reilly: Another one here said that the privileges and the gifts given free are not appreciated and do not help the majority of people who receive them. But this writer goes on, Mr. Speaker, to quote an article from the *Daily Star* which said certainly the community should look after the elderly, who have earned the right to secure old age, as well as those who are physically or mentally unable to work. So for those who are capable of working and who are unwilling to find work, the community should provide the opportunity.

But then they go on to say that there is something seriously wrong with a healthy person who is not willing to work enough to cover the cost of his physical needs. If we insist on giving such people something for nothing, it will be harmful to them as well as to society.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Singer: There is something that happens to people who become whips!

Mr. Reilly: Mr. Speaker, I always admire the hon. member for Downsview and he generally has something worthwhile to say. I am glad to see him in his seat and I notice today he is a very patient listener.

Hon. Mr. Randall: He is a man of a few million words, too, when he gets going.

Mr. Singer: That is right, yes.

Mr. Reilly: But basically, Mr. Speaker, most people agree that it is a praiseworthy objective to try to provide comprehensive medical care for every member of society. Yet the problem is, how do you organize medical services so as to ensure that every citizen receives high quality medical service regardless of where he lives, or his economic status?

Mr. MacDonald: Read the Hall commission appointed by Diefenbaker.

Mr. Sargent: The federal plan!

Mr. Reilly: Most of us would like to see this ideal state of affairs, but we must view it from the practical as well as the theoretical viewpoint.

Some Canadians see nothing but good in the systems of socialized medicine such as exist in Great Britain and the Scandinavian countries, and they think that Canadians should adopt a similar system. Others believe that the greatest scientific progress comes and the best medical care is provided when government avoids direct participation. They point to the great progress in medical science in the United States as evidence of this.

In Canada today, approximately eight out of ten Canadians have some type of protection for medical services. Here in Ontario over 95 per cent are covered by some form of health insurance. This is why I was somewhat surprised to hear a member of the Liberal Opposition stand up and say that this province needs medicare. It was anything else but, from the standpoint of need.

According to an article that I read in the United States *News and World Report*, Mr. Speaker, some European experts have made

four suggestions regarding health insurance. First, they suggest that medical services should not be absolutely free. All patients except the indigents should be charged a reasonable part of the cost.

Second, they say: Do not move too quickly in expanding the coverage, lest the demand for medicare exceed the capacity of doctors, hospitals and nursing homes. The third point they make is that the freedom of the patients to choose doctors should be zealously guarded. Fourth and finally, they say that the government resources should concentrate on maximum medical care for the aged and other groups with the greatest need.

Now this same article pointed out that Sweden's experience with the system of compulsory health insurance and free hospitalization for all has resulted in serious delays and lengthy waiting periods. I understand that changes were made recently so that now that the government pays as much as 80 per cent for some of the hospital charges and that some element of cost-sharing of medical charges has been imposed upon the individual.

Medical experts in England warn that the British national health service is the worst possible model for a country to copy. The British system is chronically starved for capital and operating funds. Costs have soared so far beyond estimates that some benefits had to be reduced. No funds were available to raise salaries nor to improve facilities. In fact Britain levied a co-insurance fee of 32 cents per prescription from which they estimate they will, perhaps, save some $65 million. Referring to Britain's national health plan the *Globe and Mail* had an editorial last year. It states:

> A Labour government report has disclosed that one million children are living in poverty. Medical standards are falling; hospitals are outdated, understaffed, ill equipped; the universal old age pension has been raised, but so slightly because the raise must go to all that those in need are still without enough. A belief is beginning to develop that universality in welfare programmes militates against those who need them. It maintains them at subsistence level while the gap between them and the affluent grows. The solution, say many in Britain, is to abandon universality and give the help where help is needed.

In fact, I understand that over 11 million people found it necessary to be covered by private plans in Britain because the national plan is simply not working.

Mr. Speaker, in France where a system of national health insurance has been in effect since before the second world war, it was found that people took advantage of the so-called free medical care. Changes were inevitable and the government is now paying up to 80 to 85 per cent of a fixed fee schedule.

Mr. Makarchuk: Why does the member not get back to Saskatchewan and be relevant?

Mr. Reilly: In Italy, every Italian is entitled to doctor's care, hospitalization and medicine —all without charge. I understand that there are numerous complaints about red tape, shortages of hospital beds, and even fatal delays in treatment.

An hon. member: It shows that socialism does not work anywhere. Does not work anywhere.

Mr. Reilly: In West Germany where a medical plan has been in operation since 1883, authorities recommend that any medicare plan be limited to low-income groups, and that, in any event, those covered should pay part of the costs of treatment and medicine.

Mr. D. Jackson (Timiskaming): That is 60 per cent of the people in Ontario—low-income.

An hon. member: It proves you cannot get something for nothing.

Mr. Reilly: Austrian medical authorities state that free medical care encourages patients to take a wasteful attitude towards medical care, running to a doctor at the slightest symptom of ill health, real or imaginary. It necessarily follows that when a doctor is burdened with an excessive number of patients, plus an abundance of prescriptions and forms to be filled out, that the quality of medicare tends to deteriorate.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, the summary of European opinion is that it is folly to travel too far or too fast on the road to socialized medicine. An article in the *Wall Street Journal* reminds us that a socialist vision in Britain has been blurred by some harsh economics. After all, it goes on to say, no nation's resources are limitless; a point also worth remembering on this side of the Atlantic.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Reilly: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has suggested that I speak about Saskatchewan. I would say to you that, in fact, the Minister of Health in Saskatchewan is reported in a western newspaper recently as finding the medical costs "frightening and alarming", and then he goes on to say that he estimates an increase of possibly 10 per cent per year on hospital costs.

Saskatchewan, as you know, recently found it necessary to introduce a service or a co-insurance fee of $1.50 for each office visit by the doctor. As suggested, we do not have to go beyond our own Health Minister to compare hospital costs. Since 1959 the Ontario hospital plan cost $163 million. I understand that an estimate was made by our Minister that by 1971 it will rise from that $163 million to $1,000 million.

Now those of us who are genuinely interested in providing medical services, Mr. Speaker, for the needy should study the results of other plans that are already in the field. We should benefit by them and by their experience.

Mr. MacDonald: That is what the Hall commission did. They threw all those proposals out.

Mr. Reilly: It is my belief, Mr. Speaker, that a compulsory government medicare scheme would not only cost more money for our taxpayers, but would also deprive them of the prompt, courteous and careful services that they require. Interestingly enough, the latest suggestion in Great Britain is that competition by all forms of carrier be encouraged, subject, of course, to state standards, so that the schemes with the lowest cost and highest consumer preference is implemented. In Canada, not only will business be affected through ever increasing taxation, Mr. Speaker, but every member of business—

Mr. Sargent: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, will the hon. member justify that OMSIP will require a subsidy of $37 million this year?

Mr. Reilly: I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that you would not recognize this as a point of order, but I am always glad to hear—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Reilly: The hour is closing in. Give me 30 seconds, Mr. Speaker, to complete this and I would say this. If the recommended compulsory plan is implemented in Canada not only will business be affected through ever increasing taxation, but every member of business, as an individual person, will reap the consequences in terms of personal medicare and attention.

It is my view that if the federal government insists upon this compulsory scheme the time will come when it will be necessary for us to turn back and retrace some of our steps in the interests of doctors, the patients and the whole community.

Mr. Speaker: It being 6:00 o'clock, I do now leave the chair. We will resume at 8:00 o'clock.

No. 30

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

First Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Tuesday, March 19, 1968

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1968

5

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Tuesday March 19, 1968

Resumption of the debate on the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Young, Mr. Breithaupt, Mr. Gisborn, Mr. Bernier 959

Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Lewis, agreed to 999

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, **agreed to** 999

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

The House resumed at 8:00 o'clock, p.m.

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE
(Continued)

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Speaker, in entering this debate tonight, I want to add my congratulations to you, sir, and to the member for Waterloo South (Mr. Reuter), for your elevation to these positions, and to wish you well, to assure you that we will give you every co-operation when things go well and as tough a time as necessary if we consider that is required as the session continues.

I am very sorry, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member for Eglinton (Mr. Reilly) is not here because I had intended to make certain observations; but he did provoke me to some further observations which I want to bring before the House, first of all tonight.

I do feel that he needs a bit of education and a bit of information about some of the subjects with which he was dealing, not too adequately and without too much background, I fear.

However, I will say tonight, Mr. Speaker, in facing this government, that they did win an election. True, they did not get the majority of the people behind them, but they won; and in a democracy that is an achievement.

An hon. member: A misfortune!

Mr. Young: And a great many of us—a misfortune my hon. friend says—however, they are there.

A great many of us perhaps did not get that 50 per cent even in our own ridings, on both sides of the House, and we abide by the decision of the electorate as we have it. So that for four years now, more or less as the case may be, we are here in this House and we are going to do the best we can to govern this province and to discuss the issues that we ought to discuss.

But having said that, Mr. Speaker, I want to say to this government: Just do not be too smug and too complacent, because you have won. Because among other things, they did not come clean with the electorate on October 17. They did not tell them what they planned as far as the OMSIP premiums were concerned. They did not say a word about the hospital premiums. They did say something about the basic shelter exemption grant and promised it, but now they have placed the Minister—the new Minister—in a very awkward and embarrassing position because he has not the slightest idea of how he is going to get that grant out to the people of Ontario.

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Provincial Treasurer): Do not bet on it, do not bet on it!

Mr. Young: Well the hon. Provincial Treasurer thinks he has some ideas. We hope he has some. We hope he comes up with something to assist the Minister, because the last time this was discussed in the House he certainly had no answers.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: The hon. member will have an answer.

Mr. Young: Answers have to be found; and the Minister has provided for this in the Budget so he will have to get it out there somehow or other for the benefit of the people.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Very clever young man.

An hon. member: Where is it?

Mr. Young: We are on the way—the new mathematics; that it right, it may well solve the problem for him.

However, all I am saying is that this government should have, prior to October 17, told the people what it planned in the realm of taxation and given us a clear picture of what was to come. My guess is, and I think it is a pretty informed guess, that if they had done that, then the picture on that side of the House may well have been somewhat different than it is today.

Now the hon. member for Eglinton had certain things to say which we have heard from time to time from the other side of this House. Time after time—

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Like "67 in '67".

Mr. Young: Yes we will deal with that if the Minister wants. We did hope and we made no bones about it, that we were going to elect 67 members in '67. We said so up and down this province.

In other words, we set our sights at a high level. We were after the government. But—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Young: If the House remembers, against that statement of 67 and '67 the hon. Provincial Secretary (Mr. Welch) last winter, in that famous speech of his when he made a name for himself in this province, telling us what he planned and what the Conservative Party planned for this group. The House remembers the hon. Provincial Secretary said at that time that what is going to happen is not 67 in '67—he was right in that—but he also said. "What we are determined upon is that we shall eliminate the eight by '68". Remember that? We will eliminate the eight in '68.

All right; the elimination has not taken place and in that process on October 17, while it is true that neither one of us was able to achieve what we set out to do in this respect, the fact is that on October 17, the vote of the Conservatives went down like this and the vote of the Liberal Party went up like this and the vote of the New Democratic Party went like this.

This, Mr. Speaker, is why all their hysteria about socialism around this House during recent days. There is real fear of what the people are thinking. Even up in Grey-Bruce today, there is wailing and gnashing of teeth because of a certain election up there that was not won as well. However this is the sort of thing that happens at election time; we cannot always know exactly what is going to happen.

However, we are setting our sights on '71 now, and we are going to go out from this point for the "71 in '71". Now if they are going to try to eliminate the 20 in '71 they are going to go some. It just will not happen.

Prophecy is always good for the soul, and you have to set your sights at reasonable levels. We are setting our as of this moment.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Eglinton brought out again this afternoon all these cliches that we have heard time after time over the last few years about medicare. I am not going to attempt to deal tonight with all this tripe we heard. I really thought better of the hon. member for Eglinton. I thought he knew better than his speech would indicate. However, there are certain things I want to say.

I would like to say this: He makes a great deal, as others have made about this matter of filling out forms under medicare. All kinds of forms! How often we have heard that. I do not know what forms we need under PSI, under the London Life, or whatever plan we have. We go to the doctor and the doctor had to fill out forms. Plenty of forms, he must keep his books.

Bureaucracy? It is bureaucracy sure, but somehow that bureaucracy exists under private systems and flourishes there more than it does under the public systems.

Under the public systems, the doctor sends his bill to the public fund. Too many private systems insist that the doctor bill the patient and the patient bills the fund, and the fund pays the patient and the patient goes back and pays the doctor. This is too much work. This is a multiplication of forms in a way that should not be.

As far as medicare costing, I just want in passing, to point out to this House that medicare today is costing almost as much as it will under a public plan. A figure of $80 million federally is mentioned. This means perhaps $30 million extra in Ontario. I ask you, sir, the hon. member for London South (Mr. White) if this would be a reasonable figure—if it is $80 million federally? It is a matter of $4 per head more at the present time than the total we are now paying to our private plans, into OMSIP, into all these multiplicity of plans which we have in the plants and through our private family plans everywhere. But the thing that we forget is that if we systematize a plan through a public agency, then all the bills are paid through that agency. There will be a tremendous saving all along the line in advertising, in salesmanship, in—you name it, it is there.

An hon. member: In profits to the insurance company!

Mr. Young: Profits to insurance companies, the whole bit. But more than that, Mr. Speaker, if we bring in a public plan, then everybody gets medical care as a matter of right. We are putting the emphasis where it ought to be, because today the emphasis is on how we pay the doctor, that is the emphasis.

Mr. J. H. White (London South): The wrong emphasis.

Mr. Young: The wrong emphasis is right. The emphasis should be upon building health in our people, and with a public medicare plan putting the emphasis where it ought to be we will have a far healthier people. The little extra $4 per capita cost—if it will cost that much and I am not convinced it will, but supposing it does—will result in better health all around, not nearly as many people sick. If our people are more healthy, they are more productive. We will see far far less man days lost because of illness. And this nation and this province will make up many times over the little added expense there may be in a public plan through increased productivity of wealth over the years to come.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Young: As far as abuse is concerned, I am always left cold by that. We heard this again this afternoon that people would abuse a public plan.

Mr. White: The hon. member had better discuss that problem with Prime Minister Wilson.

Mr. Young: Prime Minister Wilson is facing a real problem today, where the British pound had to be the first line of defence of the American dollar.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Young: He is suffering for that.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): And your international bankers—

Mr. Young: That is right—who made the attack on the whole situation. He also, as was demonstrated the other day in this House, had a legacy from a Tory party which left that country bankrupt and desperate.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Young: Mr. Thornycroft was quoted in this House as making that statement himself. And if anybody wants to read history—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Young: Mr. Speaker, I bring a good Tory as a witness to this effect, Mr. Thornycroft, a good Tory. Nobody ever said he was anything but that—and this is what he said: "It was the failure of the Conservative government in past years to face up to the problem, running the country into the red. But this government now has to face the music and try to bring it back."

However, as far as costs are concerned, if any person in this province is going to be in that position where he is maligning, where he is dipping into the plan more than he ought to be, whose responsibility is that? It is the responsibility of the doctor himself. When I heard this statement made again this afternoon I can only say that it is maligning the medical profession of this province.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): The hon. member has been doing that for years.

Mr. Young: The hon. Minister leaves me speechless in a situation like this.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, that is an accomplishment.

Mr. Young: That is a really tough spot for me to be in.

Mr. Lewis: Let not that happen again!

Mr. Young: The fact is, for years the man or the woman with money could go to the doctor as often as he or she wished; they could get looked at, it did not make any difference whether there was anything wrong or not. Okay, the doctor was going to take advantage of the situation, he could, but I am saying this tonight, Mr. Speaker, that any person in this province of Ontario who thinks he has an illness, who has a pain any place on his anatomy, that person—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Young: Mr. Speaker, that person has every right to be assured and to be reassured and to be cured if necessary.

Now if he has an imaginary pain perhaps he needs mental therapy and he has a right to mental therapy, too. But it is going to be up to the medical profession to decide whether or not this plan is going to be of use or not. I have quite a lot of faith in the doctors of this province—an able group of men. I do not think they are going to take advantage of a plan instituted today, or in the future, than they would today. They are the same people, some new people coming out of college, perhaps, but the same people, the same attitude and the same ideals. They want to treat people's diseases, and whether that disease is imaginary in the mind or whether it is a physical thing that person still has a right to be reassured and to be treated.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Lewis: Why are you so extra democratic tonight?

Mr. Young: I am not just sure of what the hon. member means by democracy, what his definition of democracy may be. I do not know.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: Undemocratic but extolling doctors.

An hon. member: You need a little medicare over there.

Another hon. member: It is nothing to do with Colin Brown of the Canada Life or London Life.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Young: Mr. Speaker, this afternoon again we had dished up for the umpteenth time, this bit about Saskatchewan. I wish the speech writers in the Conservative Party would dig up some new material because this sort of thing is on hand time after time, year after year.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Young: I do not know whether some of these speech writers know that the Liberal Party is now in charge of Saskatchewan. I am not sure they know that; perhaps you people should educate them on that.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Young: With the aid of a Social Credit Party the same as in the case of Ottawa today, they have power there and are maintaining it with that kind of aid, and if they like that, that is fine, but as far as Saskatchewan is concerned, I heard again this afternoon about this matter of population. I thought that was defunct years ago.

As a matter of fact what happened—and I am not blaming the Liberals during the thirties for this, in all honesty the member for Eglinton should not bring this before the House—we had a change in the agricultural situation. We had depression, and when the CCF at that time came into power, the population trend started to move up and the population trend from 1945 through the period when the CCF and New Democrats were in power in that province moved steadily upwards; not as fast as in the industrial centres because they were just beginning to build an industrial economy, a thing which had not happened until they took power.

Let me give you a couple of figures. The trend away from rural areas was nation-wide. Obviously the greatest impact would be felt in Saskatchewan. The writer of this report noted that the size of the farm had increased in Saskatchewan by 45 per cent in the 20 years previously as at 1963. Compared with the state of North Dakota, with the population increase of 2.1 per cent, and South Dakota—adjacent American states—with a 4.1 per cent population increase, Saskatchewan had fared well in the decade of 1950-60 showing a population increase of 11 per cent. Now that was due to the increased industrialization in that province, but there was a large outflow of young people, particularly because of the increased size of the farms at that point. But a very interesting thing took place in this House a few years ago when this kind of claptrap was being promulgated on the public.

An hon. member: I thought they had all left.

Mr. Young: The kind of claptrap that was put out here this afternoon.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Shame.

Mr. Young: We had a look at the situation in Ontario and this was an interesting fact: in Ontario, the two counties which had a decline in population from 1950-60 were Victoria, the constituency of the leader of the government, and Grey county, the constituency of the leader of the official Opposition.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that was not their fault. It is not the fault of this government particularly, that Lanark and other eastern Ontario counties have shown very little population increase. This is a trend of the industrial society, away from rural areas and farming areas, with mechanization and with increased acreages on each farm. These areas are being denuded of population relatively, and the cities are picking up that surplus population. And so all I ask the hon. member for Eglinton and others who are talking about this kind of propaganda, is that they had better be honest about this, and that they had better face up to the fact that great changes are taking place in population, and that Saskatchewan today, is seeing a continual increase in population. It is small, true, but as industry grows, there is no question that the increase will accelerate.

After all, we heard about failure, this afternoon. I want to put on record an edi-

torial, dated Thursday, April 23, 1964 from the Toronto *Daily Star*, and it says this:

> Although the final results are not yet absolutely certain, it appears that yesterday's vote in Saskatchewan ended the rule of a great reform government. For twenty years the CCF government in Regina was the flagship of social change for the whole country. It brought in the first provincial hospital insurance plan, which led to the adoption of hospital insurance on a nation-wide basis.
>
> It pioneered government medicare insurance, and by doing so made medicare a national issue.
>
> The best proof of the success and popularity of this scheme, is that the Saskatchewan Liberals abandoned their former opposition to it, and even promised to extend it, and Ross Thatcher, who fought against it.

If I may add this, all those years, had not only maintained it, but has promised to build it better.

Going back to the editorial: It likewise introduced Canada's first system of low-cost government automobile insurance. And that has saved the province a great deal of money contrary to what the hon. member for Eglinton had to say.

Coming back to the editorial:

> The CCF government was a bold innovator in other fields too. Labour relations, education, mental and public health. It made its share of mistakes, particularly in some of its early and ill-fated experiments in public ownership, but over the years, it was remarkably effective and relatively free from corruption. Why then was it defeated? Any explanation outsiders can present at this stage must be tentative, but some possibilities suggest themselves.

And I would like the hon. members opposite, Mr. Speaker, to take note here:

> Precisely because it was an energetic reform government, the CCF regime made more than the normal quota of enemies. Businessmen resented its ventures in public ownership; organized medicine rejected violently to medicare—objected violently. Insurance companies deplored government automobile insurance; eventually the accumulation of active enemies became too great. The opposition was less divided this time than in the past—

There is the Toronto *Daily Star* speaking. The quote concludes: "In particular, a large part of a former social credit vote, seems to have gone to the Liberals." The Toronto *Star*—1964.

I have here, a short article setting out the Saskatchewan record during that period, and I want to put it on record to counteract some of the speech this afternoon.

It was the first province to give provincial government employees the right to organize and bargain collectively, and to take part in political activities. The first province to establish a government insurance plan for automobile insurance. And the first province to implement province-wide hospital insurance for all residents.

You remember how the Tories across the land, fought this, as did the Liberals; Ross Thatcher was vehement against it. But this has come to be accepted, a part of socialism which this government had to come to or face defeat.

Mr. Lewis: Right.

Mr. Young: The first province to legislate a bill of rights, not all provinces have come to that yet. The first province to establish an industrial development office with an industrial development fund; slowly some of the other governments are facing up to this. The first province to provide free health care for senior citizens. This again is a socialist measure which this province finally, reluctantly adopted. The first province to provide free medical treatment for cancer, tuberculosis and mental health. I hear some grumbling over there but the fact is that when these were brought in both old parties said they were impractical and impossible, and yet we have them in Ontario today.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mrs. M. Renwick (Scarborough Centre): Does the member opposite think the government can be proud of its mental hospitals?

Mr. Young: Socialism—here they are—the first province to provide free polio immunization, to all citizens.

An hon. member: How many Tories were in Opposition then?

Mr. Young: How many Tories? How many Tories? The first province, and still the only province to bring in a medicare programme providing health coverage to all residents, and that is coming in spite of what we hear from the opposite benches. Within this term of office, within this Parliament, this government is going to be forced to bring medicare for

the people of Ontario, an issue upon which Tommy Douglas staked his fate and met personal defeat, because of the combination of forces against him. But Saskatchewan got the medicare plan. The people there are benefiting from it and all across Canada, medicare is coming in little fits and starts and before long even staid old Tory Ontario is going to have it—in spite of what the government says today. Then it was the first province to legislate a minimum wage and to establish the principle of equal pay.

I put this on the record, Mr. Speaker, because I think it needs to be put there. I might also mention that Saskatchewan was the first province to establish an air ambulance service. We heard a great deal a few days ago from both sides of this House about the necessity for an air ambulance service in the province of Ontario and I think it will be here in more or less adequate measure before too many have passed. But the Saskatchewan people have had air ambulance for two decades.

Now a record like this, you see, cannot be dismissed as simply and as easily as this government would like to dismiss it. I was reminded this afternoon of a little item which I thought I had in my files, and I dug it out. It is typical toryism the way they fight these issues, saying they are impossible, they are impractical, will destroy initiative, what will they not do, and then gradually over the years they have to come. This is from a small pamphlet called "Education and the Industrial Revolution", by W. D. Morris, and I quote:

Mr. Lewis: Oh, Willy Morris?

Mr. Young: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: You remember what the hon. member for Peterborough (Mr. Pitman) said about reading news clippings at some length?

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Lewis: And he was a superb decorator too.

Mr. Young: I am going to read a lot tonight before I am through.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is why the hon. member for Peterborough is away tonight.

Mr. Young: Right.

> Thus in 1807, when Whitbread introduced a bill into Parliament to provide two years' free education in reading, writing and arithmetic, at a total cost for the two years of only ten shillings per pupil—

Ten shillings per pupil—the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Davis) ought to hear that one.

> —it was opposed by Giddy, the president of the Royal society, who declared, and these are his words, "however specious in theory the project might be of giving education to the labouring classes and to the poor, it would in effect be found to be prejudicial to their morals and happiness."

Destroy their initiative, I suppose.

> It would teach them to despise their lot in life instead of making them good servants in agriculture and other laborious employments to which their rank in society has destined them. Instead of teaching them subordination, it would render them refractory as was evident in the manufacturing counties. It will enable them to read seditious pamphlets, vicious books, and publications against Christianity. It would render them insolent to their superiors.

Whitbread's modest bill was destroyed in the House of Lords where it received only two votes.

Good Tory House of Lords!

> And it was of interest to note that it was the Archbishop of Canterbury who moved its rejection.

Then again it was not until August 17, 1833, the first move was in 1807, in 1833 the first state grant was made for elementary education. Then the meagre sum of £20,000 was voted to aid private subscriptions toward school houses for the children of the lowest orders. Another little interesting facet of this item is this. Interesting in the light of what is happening in the Budget this year. In the same year £20,000 for education for all of England—in the same year Parliament granted £50,000 to improve the royal stables.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Young: In the struggle against medicare today, I hark back to the struggle against public education a century and a half ago—the same mind, the same people, the same traditions, the same battle, and I suppose that all through the years, if we look over the history, we find that this kind of attitude has been typical of the Tory mind.

Now, my hon. friend from Eglinton this afternoon said that he had not received a single letter asking for medicare, and I can understand that. I can understand that no-

body knowing the attitude of the hon. member would bother wasting a stamp or the effort to write. And anyway, very few people write letters of this kind unless they are given some bit of a stimulus. Now a stimulus was given in Ottawa recently by a group of people who are concerned about medicare.

An hon. member: You have to put ads in the paper.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): You get results.

Mr. Lewis: What about Colin Brown?

Mr. Young: Well, let me read some of these names of the people:

Rev. Father John Shea, Ralph W. Sutherland, M.D., Bill Zimmerman, Rabbi David R. Powell, Rev. David Pohl, Rev. Kenneth Micklethwaite, Rev. Père Jean Louis Morin, and several others.

An ad appeared in the Ottawa paper which simply said this:

> No postponement for medicare. We believe in the medical care legislation and want to see it in effect for all Canadians on July 1, 1968. If you are willing to add your name to support this statement please send it in.

And I have here a copy of a letter written to the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) on March 4, with a copy to the leaders of the other two parties in this House. The letter says this:

> The people of Ontario need and want medicare. That is our opinion and one that is supported by the response we received to a small advertisement placed in three local newspapers on Saturday January 27. All but two of the 762 replies were in favour of having medicare introduced without delay and a number of strong personal convictions were expressed. In a city where the major work force, the civil service, is discouraged from identifying the social causes and is relatively well covered by its own medicare programme we think this is a significant response. We enclose photostat copies of the advertisement and all the replies we received, with the exception of 97 signatures which were included in one congregation's Order of Service. The actual signatures are available to any of the 18 people named in the advertisement. A Gallup pole survey, published by the Canadian institute of public opinion on January 31, clearly illustrated strong feeling for medicare in Canada and this province.

And so the letter goes on, I am not going to read more of it. This gives the purport of the letter and here we have 762 replies to that small advertisement published on one day.

The support for medicare—I am trying to persuade this government, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. member that there is support for medicare in this province even in civil service Ottawa.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Young: Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to turn to a couple of other matters tonight. I was rather taken aback this afternoon, as I said, by the hon. member for Eglinton. This interpolation in my speech was caused by that speech and so I felt I must put these things on the record tonight, next to the speech of my hon. friend from Eglinton. This afternoon I raised with the Minister of Transport (Mr. Haskett) the problem of Phil Englishman, of 1577 Lawrence Avenue West, in my riding. The problem of a young chap who last Friday was driving on his holidays towards Windsor, and who picked up a hitchhiker, unfortunately, nice clean looking lad, he said.

But before he got to Windsor he found himself on the receiving end of a revolver, told to drive off Highway 401 and finally five miles off on a side road told to get out of the car, which he did. The car drove off with all his personal belongings, his driver's licence and whatever else was in the car.

He managed to get in touch with the police, and the police located—the police in Windsor I presume are extremely efficient—did succeed in finding this chap in a parking lot. But he saw the police about the same time they saw him, backed up and tried to get away and in the mix-up he did a great deal of damage to Mr. Englishman's car. The police did recover most of the goods, but the driver's licence was not recovered and they do not know exactly where it is at the moment.

Now, Mr. Englishman was put to a great deal of inconvenience. His holiday had to be cancelled, he came back to Toronto. He was told by the police he should apply for a new driver's licence which he did yesterday, and he was told he would have to pay $1 to get that licence. Now, Mr. Englishman being a bit put off by the events of the weekend figured that he should not have to pay $1 for a licence which had been taken from him at

gunpoint. He became just a bit stubborn at that point and said: "No, I am not going to". "Under these circumstance where it was not my fault I should get this licence without having to pay $1. Now $1 is not that much, but it is a matter of principle with me and I believe that this principle ought to be established."

I asked the Minister and also took it up with the department prior to that, but I got the reply that regulation 277 section 20 said that he had to pay $1 and that was it. I can understand that the civil service must administer the regulations. I am not blaming them. I do think perhaps the Minister has some power of discretion in a case like this. If he has not, then I would say to the Minister tonight that surely that regulation ought to be so amended so that it can cover a situation of this kind. When armed robbery takes place and a man loses his licence in this way he should not have to pay for replacement.

Again, this brings up the whole question of compensation for victims of violence. This was property damage and the loss of his licence. I would hope that what is forecast in the Speech from the Throne will be dealt with quickly, and that we will have legislation in this province in respect to compensation for victims of this kind.

Last Friday night, Mr. Speaker, there came into my office in my riding a man who was in rather bad shape. Every Friday night I have a clinic in my office and people come to tell me about their problems and I get quite a lot of them. This man was suffering from severe bronchial trouble and emphysema.

He did not want an MD's advice at this point. What he wanted was some help because he was on a very small pension and this government had refused him adequate care.

Mrs. M. Renwick: And he knew where to come.

Mr. Young: And he knew where to come, yes. However, what had happened was a very simple thing, and something which is happening across this province wholesale. This man had been a smoker of two packs and more per day of cigarettes for some years and now at 50, a former small businessman, his health gone and in a very serious condition.

I think all of us have been aware for some time of the serious nature of this problem of the cigarette. The report of the Royal college of physicians and surgeons back in 1962 in Britain brought this to the attention of the world. Then the surgeon general's report in Washington in 1964 re-emphasized the problem that is being faced by the cigarette smoker. I am not going to burden you tonight with the literature on the subject, but I do want to bring to your attention some of the information which is before us.

I have here the Canadian smoking and health programme, a publication of The Department of National Health and Welfare in Canada, and it says this on page 9:

> At least 15,000 Canadian deaths are annually associated with smoking.

The Ontario safety league on December 15, 1967, says this:

> Each year cigarettes kill five times more Americans than do traffic accidents. Lung cancer alone kills as many as die on the roads. The cigarette industry is peddling a deadly weapon. It is dealing in people's lives for financial gain.

And from Britain. From the Royal college of physicians committee on smoking:

> In 1960, in England and Wales, 22,000 people died of cancer of the lung, four out of five as a result mainly of cigarette smoking. This works out at one death every half hour, three times the number killed on the roads, six times the number killed by tuberculosis.

In New York state, a recent study conducted there by the special committee on smoking and health. These words:

> At its public hearing, January 30, 1964, this committee received testimony that the cigarette, with or without filter, is a deadly poison and a lethal weapon and an addiction for many. More citizens of this state are killed each year by lung cancer by cigarette smoking than by injuries sustained in automobile accidents. More frightening, 36 per cent of all deaths among men aged 50-69 in this state each year are caused by cigarette smoking and its related diseases.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Young: I am bringing before you the facts as they are outlined by these learned gentlemen and, from our own Department of National Health and Welfare in Ottawa, this:

> Studies in Canada, Great Britain and United States have shown that the total death rate, all causes combined, is on average about 70 per cent higher among male cigarette smokers than non-smokers. It varies with the amount of smoking as follows:

> Less than ten cigarettes a day, only 40 per cent higher; 10 to 19 cigarettes a day, 70 per cent higher; 29 to 39 cigarettes a day, if you are in that category, 90 per cent higher; 40 or more, 120 per cent higher.

Mr. Lewis: That finishes the chairman of the House.

Mr. Young: What this does to the chairman of the House, we are not sure. He says he smokes that amount.

An hon. member: What about a pipe?

Mr. Young: The pipe, according to the figures we have and surveys, is not as dangerous as the cigarette, nor are cigars, although both are obnoxious and both have a tendency to cause cancer of the lip and of the throat in the smoker; and of course air pollution par excellence.

Mr. Speaker, following the report of the surgeon general in Washington, congress commissioned two reports to be brought forward, two investigations to be conducted. One of these was into the effectiveness of a caution which the cigarette companies agreed to put on the box of cigarettes—on the package. The caution read, after a great deal of scrapping about it: "Caution. Cigarette smoking may be hazardous to your health."

The federal trade commission entrusted with this investigation issued a 57-page report last June, and they said this regarding the effectiveness of the caution required on cigarette packages:

> And there was virtually no evidence that the warning statement on cigarette packages has had any significant effect. If cigarette sales are viewed as an index, one finds that in 1966 more cigarettes were sold than ever before; even during January and February, 1966, the first two months that the warning appeared. The commission is convinced that the present cautionary statement on cigarette packages cannot compete with the forces that promote cigarette smoking.

Among these forces, they pointed out, are cigarette advertising promotion, on which the industry spent nearly $300 million in 1966, apportioned among the media roughly as follows: 67 per cent on TV; 15 per cent in newspapers and magazines; 10 per cent on radio and 8 per cent in other forms of promotion. Of the total budget, the report adds, 75 per cent was spent on advertising filter cigarettes.

This to build up the illusion that filter cigarettes are safer than others. And according to reports in New York state they are not. But there is an arresting fact about the audience to which they cater, in spite of their agreement to keep away from teen age audiences as much as possible. The population and TV industry data relating to 60 network programmes sponsored in whole or in part by cigarette products during the week beginning January 11, 1967, shows that on an average, each of 197 million inhabitants in the United States viewed 5.9 cigarette sponsoring programmes during the week. But the figure is higher for the 18 million United States boys and girls between the ages of 13 and 17. Within that age group, the average number of the 60 cigarette-sponsored programmes seen during that single week that year was 7.8, a substantial increase, the report notes, over 5.9 programmes viewed on the average by all Americans.

Mr. Sargent: Who wrote that?

Mr. Young: This is the report of the New York committee.

Now as to the effect of the advertising, the report says this:

> An estimated 58 per cent of the public feel that the current cigarette advertising leaves the impression that smoking is a healthy thing to do. More than that 44 per cent of the public and 57 per cent of the filter cigarette smokers believe that filters reduce the health risk in cigarette smoking.

More than that, the big appeal in present day cigarette advertising is to the younger people. The most startling example of this, and I read this for your edification, is an advertisement that does not violate any of the specific prohibitions which the cigarette advertising industry has laid down for itself. It says this: "Lucky Strike separates the men from the boys; but not from the girls".

In which category would any normal teen age male want to place himself, the report asks. The report goes on to say that self-regulation by the industry has proved to be ineffectual.

Now in view, Mr. Speaker, of the dangers, the obvious dangers of the cigarette—

Mr. E. P. Morningstar (Welland): What about pipes?

Mr. Young: I already—if you had been awake—through you, Mr. Speaker: If the hon. member had been awake he would have

heard my explanation of the pipe some time ago. I will not repeat it at the present time. He can read it in *Hansard*, it is all there.

Now Canada has moved in this regard to do something and I am not going to outline here tonight the steps that Canada has taken because they are rather significant. We had a national conference, then, of young people.

In this province the hon. Minister of Education and the Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond) have set up committees to work on this. We have published in Canada a book of information for doctors. It has been sent out to all the medical men. We also have instructions for teachers on how to teach the hazards of smoking, which has gone to most of our teachers, I believe, or will go shortly. And of course we have produced through the Canadian cancer society and the American cancer society, which has made part of its publications available through the Canadian society, pamphlets which are multitudinous and which are extremely good—including a coloured comic book which might be used by some of the members who may now find the King's English just a bit difficult. It is here and I would be glad to lend it to them.

These are here and they are being circulated. There has been set up, by the hon. Minister, committees, inter-departmental committees. This has been done with the help of government. But the various agencies, the volunteer agencies have set up similar committees and I understand they are to bring some pressure to bear upon the government committees. The government, through its inter-governmental committees, is working on this and work is being done, I think, of a rather significant nature.

Now the inter-agency council which has been formed excludes the government departments. It includes the voluntary agencies and some semi-governmental ones; like the addiction research foundation, I believe it is in. The idea here is to work independently of government, which is of course subject to pressure from the tobacco industry and other interests, and act as a pressure group from the other direction.

This group is working on such projects as the banning of advertising; the labelling of packages not only as dangerous but also indicating the actual tar content; the stopping of give-aways by the cigarette companies; and also approaching prominent people who appear on TV asking them to stop smoking on the air so that this activity is not associated in young minds with prominent names.

There has been a card which has been sent out—I have a copy here—sent out to all the doctors' offices and this can be put up in the doctor's office warning of the dangers. This has been circulated I think by the hon. Minister across this province, and we hope it is doing a good job.

But in spite of what is happening, in spite of what is happening, the progress is still slow. While the civil service is working hard and doing, I think, a fair job in this field, it still lacks the policy push from the Treasury benches to make the programme effective. More than that we have found, I think, from the surveys, that education is not going to be enough; that is telling the children what the dangers are.

The example of teachers, of course, is powerful here. The example of parents is fairly powerful, although not as much as it was perhaps a generation ago. It is the peer group which counts most with the young people, and it is that peer group which is going to determine what each member does.

So I say that the situation seems to be that knowledge alone is not enough. There has to be real pressure and real understanding. There has to be a building of status in connection with this. Just as the cigarette advertising is building status in one direction: That it is smart to smoke, it is the "in" thing to do; so on the other hand this government and the government at Ottawa, in co-operation, must build the other attitude: that smoking is dangerous to health; that it is not smart; and that it is the proper thing not to start. So I say tonight that the Ontario government, in co-operation with the federal authorities, must move.

And I make certain suggestions to hon. members.

The fact seems to be established that it is the young people, the pre-grade 7's really, who are under the greatest pressure. This seems to be where young people start. It is for that group that we must gear our main educational programme.

I suppose we might as well make up our minds that the group over 25 is hopeless. We are not going to persuade many people in this House who already smoke to give up the habit, no matter how dangerous it might be.

The same is true right across the board. People who are now hooked with the habit are going to keep on smoking by and large,

although some do give up occasionally. So let us face the fact that the after-25 group can be pretty well washed up. Let them go their own sweet way, and if they see some of the educational material and are convinced by it, well and good.

Just let us first of all go after the young people, particularly those just beginning the habit. We believe, if given sufficient motivation, they will kick it. We also must recognize that the main recruiting ground for the cigarette companies are the youngsters now in grade 7 and under, sir, and that the main educational programme about cigarettes should be geared to them.

Recognizing this fact, the government should aim—I am talking now about governments across Canada because I do not think one provincial government can be successful entirely in this field—first of all to curb cigarette advertising by the tobacco companies, with a view to eventually banning it altogether.

Already Britain, Italy and other countries are moving this to action. Some of the states in the United States are seriously going after it. Even Georgia, one of the great tobacco states has moved toward this, and already a bill has been introduced in connection with the cigarette in Georgia.

The second thing we must do is counter the cigarette advertising campaign with a public campaign designed to make non-smoking the in-thing, respectable, smart and groovy. This must take place, and if this government is really serious, and I believe that many of the members of the Treasury benches are serious, then we have to step up our television programmes, our radio programmes, our newspaper advertising, but particularly, the television programming beamed to young people to try and persuade them that this is not the proper thing to do.

Then, the third thing, is to speed up and beef up an educational campaign in the schools at the pre-grade 8 level to show the young people the danger of cigarettes and persuade them not to start on the danger course.

I know that there is the problem of the industry and its place in our economy, and I do not think we should shirk that fact. But since the industry will be assured of the present business until the present customers fall victims to lung cancer or the other hazards of life, it will have 30 or 40 years to make an adjustment. At every level the growers, manufacturers and distributors, will have that period—even if all the young people today made up their minds they are not going to smoke—they would still have a long period of time to make the adjustment. Even if most of the pre-grade 7's could be persuaded to give smoking the go-by, the industry could, in the next half century, diversify and shift its investment to other fields.

If present smokers choose and take their own risks involved with cigarettes there is little this government can do to stop them, and it should not put—and I re-emphasize it—too much emphasis and to much expenditure here. But government should discharge its responsibility to the young, both by cutting down on the alluring industry propaganda, and by putting the truth before them in attractive and convincing form.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to turn, for a few minutes, to another subject related in some small way to what I mentioned in the earlier part of my speech tonight. I want to make a few remarks about what is happening in this House, and what has been happening here since the House opened in February.

I mentioned that we have quite accepted the fact that we have this government for the next period of time. But also, I hope, that his government has accepted the fact there is, in the province, a growing body of opinion which we express, and that this body of opinion is growing very rapidly.

Mr. Lewis: That your days are numbered.

Mr. Young: And that your days are numbered.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): They can count them on the fingers of one hand.

Mr. Young: We have heard a lot about this thing called socialism in this House, and some of my colleagues have given some pretty good information and have shown some real wisdom in their treatment of it. I was interested in the hon. member for York East (Mr. Meen) when he seconded the Speech from the Throne. I am sorry the hon. member for York East is not here tonight because I would like to speak to him directly. He came to this House after having been one of the hydro commissioners in the township and borough of North York. In other words, he administered, for some years, and did a good job at it, a socialist institution in that borough. Then, I find him saying this in his speech—

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): It administers—

Mr. Young: The fact is that the commissioners at least said they believed—

Mr. Lewis: How do you know?

Mr. Singer: I sat on it for two years.

Mr. Young: The commissioners at least said they believed in—yes the hon. member for Downsview also had a part in this, he was the man who helped administer it—a socialist institution of that kind. It is really something! Then, in his speech he said this:

> I suggest that the HOME programme can be extended. It does not, right now, seem to help those 80 per cent making under $6,000 a year.

And so he goes on to say how government intervention should take place in this whole field of housing. He also said this:

> But we here in Ontario last year, Mr. Speaker, took the most courageous step in the institution of the Ontario legal aid plan, an imaginative and far-reaching plan as you will ever find.

Mr. C. G. Pilkey (Oshawa): Socialism!

Mr. Young: Socialism, but then the hon. member goes on to warn us of the danger of socialism, and he spent a lot of time telling us how dangerous that is. In other words, what he has done is accept socialism in hydro, in housing, in legal aid, and then tells us we had better beware of socialism.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Thank heaven, we are all socialists.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Young: Then I have heard in recent days, from various members of this House, a demand for subsidies for the sugar beet industry of Ontario. The private enterprise philosophy going down the drain for subsidies. We know about the subsidies of the gold mines.

Mr. MacDonald: How about the half million handout to industry in the EIO?

Mr. Young: EIO, gold transit, ONR, subsidies, socialism—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Young: Then again, we heard the hon. member for Prescott and Russell (Mr. Belanger) the other day talk about the need for government planning in his part of Ontario.

Mr. Lewis: Oh, now that is inexcusable!

Mr. Young: Then he went on to lambaste this thing he called socialism. Somehow or other, Mr. Speaker, some of these members have got to get their thinking processes cleared away and understand the meaning of words.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Young: Okay, we will try to educate them! The other day the hon. member for Welland South (Mr. Haggerty) said something that I have said year after year in this House, that we should have a municipal development bank. Socialism! Socialism!

Then we have heard about the need for governments to step in and curb private enterprise in the cleaning up of our rivers and our air. Pollution can only be cleared up by the hon. Minister of Health moving in and lending the whole apparatus of government to do the job even to the extent perhaps of subsidizing some of the companies to do the job.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Young: I am not now making an argument for socialism, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Pilkey: You should be.

Mr. Young: I am simply saying that members of this government year after year, day after day, talk about socialist measures and then get up—it is beyond my comprehension—they get up and then they say "we have to take our choice between free enterprise and socialism."

Mr. White: A simple view of complicated problems.

Mr. Young: Ah, let us hear a little more consistency over here. Now certainly I think that the kind of myths that our hon. friends over here seem to believe in, may have been all right in the primitive, early days of settlement of this nation. It was in large measure every man for himself and the devil take the hindmost. When the country was being hewn out of the wilderness, private enterprise was the rule. But as we developed our cities, as we were crowded closer together, and as we impinged one upon the other, then more and more we had to work together to achieve the goals that our society must achieve. And this, this is socialism. We have found today, as the hon. members across here said themselves, that private enterprise no longer can provide the houses we need. They cannot provide the sugar we need; they cannot provide the planning we need; they cannot provide the

good communities we need—private enterprise will build them all kinds of urban sprawl and disorder and all the rest of it, but private enterprise cannot clean up the pollution of our rivers and our air. These are things which these members themselves have admitted. And yet, they still cling to the myth of private enterprise. But private enterprise is losing its appeal to the voters—that is the most painful of all for this government.

Here again, Mr. Speaker, I come to another facet of something we heard a great deal about last night. We heard about investments, and one of the hon. members had a good deal to say about this. He said that certain advice that was given by a member on this side of the House, if taken, I think he said, "would rip the guts out of our economy" or something like that.

Mr. Sargent: Quite a tribute to the member!

Mr. Young: Well, quite a tribute to the member. But the advice he talked about was advice that if you want security for your investments, then you will have to go south of the border to get the kind of security you need. Now, let us look at what is happening. Already, all of us know the way that United States business is moving in to take over Canadian industry and Canadian raw resources.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Young: They are coming in, all right, but you know, the strange thing is that the party to which the gentleman belongs who castigated my friend last night, that party has finally gotten rid of the one man who talked about Canadian investment and recovering our nation for Canadians.

An hon. member: Hear, hear.

Mr. Young: This man's arithmetic was all wet; he could not add or subtract or whatever it may have been because he said that if we got 25 per cent of our industry, we would have the control we need. He did not seem to know the difference between 25 per cent and 51 per cent. But anyway the fact remains that that government in Ottawa has now finally sloughed off the one man who was leading the fight against foreign domination of our industry. But more than that, more than that—

Mr. G. A. Kerr (Halton West): How about investing in Canadian industry?

Mr. Young: All right, I am coming to that right now. If I had wanted to invest in a Canadian industry; if any one of you here were wanting to invest in a Canadian industry, where would you go? Well, you might have chosen Canadian Oil. You have a Canadian company you see.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Young: But in comes the American arm and you are investing in America's company. Not long ago, a friend of mine held some shares in Laura Secord.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Young: But Fanny Farmer gave an ultimatum to the people who owned Laura Secord shares and you had your choice of selling out and becoming an American investor or if you held your Laura Secord, to see the value of your stocks go down. This is what has been happening.

More than that you ask me, what about investing in Canadian development and Canadian shares? I have here the E. K. Cork report entitled "Finance and the Mining Industry" for the Royal commission on banking and finance. They tell us some rather startling facts. The Ontario mining association states that of 6,679 metal mining companies formed in Ontario between 1907 and 1953, only 348 brought in producing mines and only 54 paid dividends. They also say this:

> It has been estimated that of the total funds received by the broker-dealer in primary distribution, on an average perhaps 60 per cent goes to the distribution costs and profits, and only 40 per cent to the corporate treasuries. It has been further estimated that no more than $150 million was spent by the junior companies on exploration during that time, despite the fact that they received $340 million for that purpose. Putting it another way, of every dollar subscribed by the public for shares of a junior company, 40 cents actually reaches the company treasury, and of that 40 cents, less than 18 cents was ever spent on exploration—the purpose for which presumably the money was raised.

You ask me why Canadians hesitate to invest in the development of their own country?

Mr. Sargent: What happens to union funds?

Mr. Young: This kind of sheer skulduggery is obvious. We all know what happened to Prudential, and people thought that they were investing—many of them older people

putting their savings in there. We know what happened with Windfall, of the wash trading and the other things that took place. Another thing that I would point out—even people who felt that they were investing in blue chips in our economy, may have bought Domtar, one of E. P. Taylor's stable of companies, only to see his Domtar stock plummet—it was away up somewhere in the twenties and down to eight and one-half today. Perhaps even mother Bell, the friend of the widow or orphan is lacking; one buying mother Bell stock a few years ago, would only see that stock away down today.

An hon. member: What stock?

Mr. Young: Bell Telephone!

Now this points to one of two things. Bad management on the part of a company, or bad management of the economy by the government. And so, I say that a clean up of this situation is due. And I would say to the hon. member last night, when he talked about the advice that was given by an investment advisor, that he had better start to clean up the situation. After all, if we have two roads, one road having highwaymen and robbers down its length, and we know that the person going down there is going to be victimized, and the other road is clear of this and is properly policed, would you say to us that we should give the advice for the Canadian to go down the road where the highwaymen lurk? To do him damage? Any responsible advisor in the field of investment today would have to face the fact that these practices known in Canada do not exist south of the border, and he is going to advise his client that—and be honest about it—he is going to say, take the safer road.

Mr. Speaker: The member has a point of order. Will he state his point of order please?

Mr. White: May I ask a question of the hon. member? Is the hon. member aware—

Mr. Speaker: Order, we will see if the member will accept a question.

Mr. Young: Well, all right, we will let him have one question if it is a question.

Mr. White: Is the hon. member aware that the chairman of the FCC in the United States whose name, I think is Lavene, has said that Ontario has the most sophisticated and advanced securities legislation in the world?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): A point of order?

Mr. Speaker: Go ahead with the point of order.

Mr. Sopha: Is the hon. member aware that he does not mean the FCC, he means the SEC?

Mr. White: I have just now become aware of that.

Mr. Young: Let him go!

Mr. White: Mr. Speaker, I have to say I am easily confused by terms embracing letters of the alphabet, like NDP, CCF, FCC, SEC.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order, the member will carry on.

Mr. Young: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for London South has answered his own question, and need not be taken too seriously.

I also just have a word to say about the advertising industry. Last night an hon. member mentioned something about a title of a book, and he took great exception to it. I am delighted to know that he is now going out on a crusade to clean up the whole advertising industry. My friend did not suggest that name, although he was quite willing that it should be used, and we are quite familiar with the kind of advertising that goes on, as I pointed out tonight in the cigarette advertising, in the moving picture advertising and almost anything you want to name. Why single out one without going into the whole thing? I was interested to find out from my friend that this morning he had a call from his publisher, and the publisher asked him what happened yesterday—the book is selling like crazy this morning.

It may be that the member for Sudbury will be wanting a commission on today's sales—I do not know. At least he would have some claim on it.

Mr. Speaker, I want to call the attention of the House, to some pretty fundamental thinking in this whole field of the division of points of view in today's world, and I quote John Kenneth Galbraith: *The New Industrial State.* I recommend the reading of it, to all members of this House—it is a good document, and it goes into the present structure of our corporate society. The author points out several facts. Among them, that the modern corporation no longer depends upon the investor as private enterprise used to. This myth is still being carried in the minds

of many people who talk about private enterprise, but the modern corporation generates its own capital within itself; it is no longer dependent upon outside investment. The modern corporation has its own interstructure; experts who work in committees. No longer is there a boss, an enterpreneur who directs as the corporation's chief. The corporation today does not depend upon the market, it creates the market, it decides what it is going to sell and at how much, and then it goes out through the medium of advertising and management of market to sell its products.

I want to quote some ideas from Mr. Galbraith. "It is a genius of the industrial system" he says "that it makes the goal that reflects its needs. The efficient production of goods, a steady expansion in output, a steady expansion in their consumption, a powerful preference of goods over leisure."

Mr. Sargent: You are doing the same thing over there.

Mr. Young: Mr. Galbraith writes:

> Soap and dentifrices are accorded importance in the industrial system by the advertising by which it manages demand. Public clinics which may do more for health are beneficiaries of no similar promotion.
>
> Such services of the state as the care of the ill, the aged and the physically and mentally infirmed, the provision of health services in general, the provision of parks and recreation areas, the removal of rubbish, the provision of agreeable public structures, assistance to the impoverished, and many other services are not of particular importance to the industrial system, and they are in competition for funds with the wants that result from the aggressive management of the consumer, by the industrial system.
>
> In consequence, hospitals do badly in comparison for resources, with automobiles.

And, if I could add, safe automobiles do badly in comparison with the smart gadgety ones.

> Expenditures for parks, for outside play, do poorly in competition with those for Chromatic television. And so forth.

Now what Mr. Galbraith does here is point out that the industrial society holds what it calls a sensibly materialistic view of mankind and to question this view is to risk the reputation for eccentricity and asceticism. That is exactly what is going on in this House. We are questioning these goals. We are questioning today these materialistic values as ultimate goals for our society. Says Mr. Galbraith:

> In recent times in fact, there has been a persistent questioning of conventional economic and social goals. Economic values have been especially questioned. Alienation is evident among the youth. It has manifested itself in rejection of conventional attitudes on work, career, clothing and foreign policy. And this unease is not confined to youth, it has been widespread in the educational and scientific estate.
>
> The dimensional knowledge of a force by which one is constrained is a first step towards freedom. Another is to have clearly in view the dimensions of life which the industrial system by its very nature does not or cannot stir. And which because of its disability will tend to minimize.
>
> In a further step, no less important, there must be some political force accomplishing what the industrial system ignores and indeed holds to be unimportant.

And that political force is now emerging in Canada and in this province in the shape of the New Democratic Party.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Young: A final group of quotes from Mr. Galbraith:

> As the industrial system develops, it will not long be regarded as something apart from government.

Now this I commend to the benches opposite:

> Because there is now a close fusion of the industrial system with the states. Boeing [he points out], which at this writing sells 65 per cent of its output to the government. General Dynamics which sells a like percentage. RayTheon which sells 70 per cent. Lockheed sells 81 per cent and Republic Aviation which sells 100 per cent. But firms which have a smaller proportion of sales to the government are more dependent on it for the regulation of average demand, and not much less so for the stabilization of wages, prices and the underwriting of a specially extensive technology and the supply of trained and educated manpower.

And then he says these significant words:

> Increasingly it will be recognized that the mature corporation as it develops becomes part of a larger administrative complex associated with the state. In time the

line between the two will disappear and men will look back in amusement at the pretense that once caused people to refer to General Dynamics and North American Aviation and AT and T as private business.

He also says this:

> The instinct which warns of dangers in this association of economic and public power is sound.

In other words he says this instinct that has been manifest in the government benches is a sound instinct. But he says:

> Conservatives have looked in the wrong direction for the danger. They have feared that the state might reach out and destroy the vigorous money-making entrepreneur. They have not noticed that all the while the successors to the entrepreneur were uniting themselves even more closely with the state and rejoicing in the results. If we continue to believe [says Galbraith] that the goals of the industrial system—the expansion of output, the companioned increase in consumption, of technological advance, the public images that sustain it—are co-ordinate with life, then all of our lives will be in the service of these goals.

We will be people serving the materialistic goals of an industrial state. We will be bound to the ends of the industrial system. What will eventuate will be the benign servitude of the household retainer who is taught to love her mistress and see her interests as her own. But it will not be freedom.

> If, on the other hand, the industrial system is only a part, and a relatively diminishing part, of life there is much less occasion for concern. Esthetic goals will have pride of place. Those who serve them will not be subject to the goals of the industrial system.
>
> The industrial system itself will be subordinate to the claims of these dimensions of life. Intellectual preparation will be for its own sake and not for the better service of the industrial system. Men will not be entrapped by the belief that apart from the goals of the industrial system, apart from the production of goods and income by the progressively more advanced technical methods, there is nothing important in life. They will not be entrapped by this idea.
>
> The foregoing being so, we may in time come to see the industrial system in fitting light as an essentially technical arrangement for providing convenient goods and services in adequate volume for people. If other goals are strongly asserted the industrial system will fall into its place as a detached and autonomous arm of the state, but responsive to the larger purposes of society.

And so that struggle is joined, Mr. Speaker, in this House. It is no accident that from both sides of this House the attack is being launched upon this group. The establishment in power and the establishment that wants power are united in their attack. So we have seen this build-up of the attack on what is called socialism. Because the fear is there—in the government—the fear of the people rising in their power to overthrow this materialistic, crass philosophy of the past and build a new idealism for the future.

Then last night we saw this hysteria rise to a crescendo over on these Liberal benches, rising to crescendo in its attack; unreasoned, fearful.

And so, while we may not have elected 67 in '67, we are pressing on for the 71 in '71. We believe that the attitudes—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Young: Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of the hon. Provincial Secretary, I already had a go at him and pointed out how he was so desperately mistaken when he said they were going to wipe out the 68 by '68. He admits his mistake here, and said his proper *mea culpas* I presume, in the situation.

Mr. Lewis: Oh, he is very good on his *culpas*.

Mr. Young: So we are on the way. Mr. Speaker, the old frontiers, the old frontier philosophy, no longer holds in this twentieth century; and the King Canutes who are trying to say to the tide: "This far and no further," no longer will be able to hold that tide back, because the tide is sweeping on and the future will not be denied.

Mr. J. R. Breithaupt (Kitchener): Mr. Speaker, I am indeed honoured to enter this debate as the member of this Legislature for the riding of Kitchener.

May I first congratulate the member for Hamilton Mountain (Mr. J. R. Smith) on his speech made on the motion of thanks to His Honour for the Speech from the Throne. Next, I would congratulate the member for York East (Mr. Meen) on his remarks in seconding the motion. I also thank him for the kind references made to me when he noted my relationship to the late hon. Louis Orville Breithaupt who served this province

as the youngest mayor of Kitchener, as a member of Parliament for Waterloo North for 12 years and as the Lieutenant-Governor of Ontario from 1952 to 1957.

I am very pleased as well to recall his father, the late Louis Jacob Breithaupt who was a member of the 9th Legislature of Ontario from 1897 to 1900, and as well as a mayor of Kitchener, or Berlin as it then was. They in turn followed my great grandfather, Louis Breithaupt who served his community of Berlin as its mayor in 1880.

The influence of our citizens of German background in Kitchener is strongly felt in the pace of development in our part of the province. The "Busy Berlin" of the board of trade brochures of 1916 is now the fastest growing city in this province. From a few thousands we have grown to 100,000, and I am indeed honoured to be chosen by the electors of Kitchener as their first representative.

The growth of our city has been aided and strengthened by persons of many places and from many countries, and we have built a strong sense of community in the twin cities of Kitchener and Waterloo. Other than those from the British Isles, we have prospered by the addition to our populace of large numbers of Polish, Ukrainian and Italian citizens, who have served their chosen country well in times both of peace and of war.

I am pleased to congratulate the hon. member for Grenville-Dundas on his election by this House as its Speaker. The hon. member is learned in the law, and has demonstrated his abilities and his knowledge in his conduct of this House in the past several weeks. I wish him well as his responsibilities continue.

As a representative for a new riding, I am pleased to remind the House that my party was chosen by the electors in five of our six area ridings to represent our part of mid-western Ontario. We were exceptionally happy in our part of Waterloo county to be able to replace one Conservative member with two Liberals.

It is however to the sixth individual that I would turn my attention. All five of us are pleased to congratulate the hon. member for Waterloo South (Mr. Reuter) on his election as chairman of the committee of the whole House. He brings to this position a sound working knowledge of the rules of this House, together with a proven ability. Those who know him believe that he well deserves this honour paid to him.

In the past week, the hon. members have debated at length the name change of The Department of Economics and Development. From the comments made by members of the government, it would appear that this change may at long last rationalize the Topsy-like growth of the administration in this area. The Minister charged with the economic development of our province has been faced with a conglomeration of activities joined together in a department that could not sink and would not swim.

Surely this can only be the first step in a general reorganization of the government of this province so that we may grow to face the 1970s with the administrative machinery that will ensure better government in Ontario.

Mr. Speaker, we are told that when Sir John A. Macdonald—a personage more often quoted on the other side of this House than here—received complaints about his Cabinet, he was fond of remarking "If you want a better Cabinet, send me better wood."

The Premier of this province (Mr. Robarts) can surely take this view to heart, because no leader of a government could expect a thicker pile of timber than that which has been sent to him from along the north shore of Lake Ontario.

In the past election campaign, this party called for reform in the administration of our province. We called for a reorganized inner Cabinet, a larger role for a group of Parliamentary assistants and a clear definition of lines of responsibility for programmes.

We are informed that there are thirty-five or more overlapping sets of regional maps that cover our province. Each department and board and commission apparently has a differing geographical division. No wonder that co-ordination is lacking. No wonder that inter-communication is non-existent.

If the concept of regional government is to have any long-term meaning in our province, then let this government first put its own house in order.

We need to have regional economic development based on the ten economic regions of Ontario that now exist or on some new reorganization of similar-sized areas that are economic units. Let us as well have our provincial departments reorganized on the same basis, with possible sub-division of a department within a region as may be necessary.

Let us decentralize our mechanism of meeting with the public. In each of these regions there should be one building or

complex of buildings where any citizen can go to meet with any or all government departments. Even more important, these locations would ensure that government departments could communicate and work together from one site. This would allow a proper planning in the development of their region or of one or several of the areas into which their region may be subdivided.

In economic planning, there is never any need to nationalize a business by the taking over of the ownership of its shares. The power to tax is the power to destroy, if it is used as a part of a plan of deliberate attack.

Similarly, this government has other powers which it may use to destroy individual rights. With more than a hundred boards, commissions, societies and agencies, this power is ever near the surface of our daily life. I believe that the decentralization of these portions of government apparatus would preserve all of our rights to the full.

If my proposal has any merit for the ordinary departments of the government, then I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that there is even more validity when the tasks of many agencies and boards in this province are looked into. These all appear to be self-perpetuating, and they expand in function and policy and staff and interference every day.

My colleague from Waterloo North (Mr. Good) has removed from our old riding three townships which are some of the finest agricultural lands in Ontario. These are the "lands of the Black Walnut", as one of our local historians has named them.

But while these townships are no longer in my riding, our industrial city of Kitchener is ever mindful of the needs and valid claims of our local farmers. In a city where three large packing plants are in constant operation, we are clearly aware of the necessity to build a solid agricultural base in co-operation with industry so that all of us as consumers may benefit from an expanding economy.

I have been given the responsibilities for consumer affairs in the Opposition caucus. It is in this area that I as an urban member of this House feel the strongest sense of community with those rural members who are attempting to obtain fair farm prices for their constituents' products. One way to bring this about, is to allow the marketing of agricultural products to face both the light and the heat of the open market. Surely the removal of the unnecessary friction of subsidized and controlled marketing schemes would do much to intelligently rationalize the market on a simplified system of supply and demand for products.

Processors, retailers and consumers must join equally in the deliberations of the producer-oriented marketing boards. In this way, a fair deal for all of us as consumers will replace the present ordeal for many of us.

Mr. Speaker, The Premier has been called to account for his statements on bilingualism. What the *Globe and Mail* of February 29, referred to as the "Bilingual Backlash" is sweeping away many of the cherished comments and convoluted sentences that members of this government have made while they posed as the saviours of Confederation. I quote from the article as it appeared:

> The Premier on Tuesday night told the Legislature that Ontario wanted to treat its French-speaking citizens equitably, but contrary to what many believed, Ontario did not agree at the federal-provincial constitutional conference to make the province officially bilingual. Queen's Park sources said yesterday that backlash from English-speaking people in the French areas and from parts of old rural Ontario could have been a factor in the tone of the statement by Mr. Robarts.

In Kitchener, bilingualism means an ability to speak German or Polish or Italian as well as English. We have now some French-speaking citizens from northern Ontario and from Quebec coming into our city, and they are of course most welcome. But for us generally, we are removed from the politics of hemi-semi-demi-bilingualism as it is preached in some parts of this province and practised in others. For this we are grateful.

One of the major strengths of our city is the activity and perseverance of our chamber of commerce. Industrial growth, business activity, increased job opportunities and good city government all aid in a community's development. Since May, 1886 our then Berlin board of trade has successfully led the way along the path of explosive growth that has faced our city. Committees of the chamber of commerce have been active in developing tourist and convention facilities; in aiding agricultural, manufacturing and business growth; and in providing information and education to our citizens. In addition, local interest in taxation, municipal affairs, and federal and provincial affairs has been stirred up by the chamber.

These activities are all a prelude to my discussion of the types of urban growth and renewal as we see it in Kitchener.

The Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. McKeough) has met with several delegations from our city in order to review the problems of annexation in our area. An earlier request for annexation of 1,942 acres was approved by the Ontario municipal board last December, and this land is within our boundaries so that the development of the Conestoga college of applied arts and technology can proceed apace.

A further application for 7,500 acres has been effectively blocked by the decision of the board to stop all added annexation while our Waterloo county local government review continues.

Our problem in Kitchener, is that we are all out of serviced land suitable for any large industry that wishes to locate in our area.

To wait for the report of the commissioner, and then to proceed in some fashion or other and allow annexation or reorganization of municipal boundaries on a borough approach will take three or four years.

It surely cannot matter in the slightest what the eventual name will be of the municipality that develops this land, or how this municipality may some day be governed. We must act now to develop these lands so that the growth rate of this area will not be further impaired by our failure to have serviced land available in the next several years.

The present approach of the provincial government seems to be simply to say "Stop growing." This administration cannot stop the clock from running, no matter how it may wish to do so.

We are in need of some future well-planned regional development and of a working system of regional government. I plead with this government not to overlook our present and future welfare in the city of Kitchener because we must be the pivot and heart of any future development in Waterloo county, if proper balanced growth is to result.

If development in Kitchener is held back, a much wider area beyond our municipal boundary will eventually suffer.

Mr. Speaker, we now have a population forecast in our area of 284,000 by 1987. From 60,000 persons in 1950, Kitchener-Waterloo has grown to 119,000 in 1965: a growth of 98 per cent. By the year 2000, we may well have 500,000 persons in our twin cities. These people must have jobs and homes and educational facilities, and their needs must be planned for now.

While this annexation of 7,500 acres to which I have referred has been stalled in Kitchener, an annexation for the town of Preston of 1,500 acres from the same Waterloo township is proceeding.

The chairman of the Ontario municipal board has given the reason for this seemingly illogical move in Waterloo county as being that Preston has less effect on the surrounding community than Kitchener, and would thus not interfere with the local government review now in progress.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that if the chairman seriously believes this, he should be replaced because his powers of reasoning have become seriously impaired.

There are those of us who might well equate this favoured annexation with the visit of the Premier to Preston during the election campaign just past, on the very day that the plans were announced for this large housing and general development.

Well, it would now appear that further thought and consideration is being given by the Minister of Municipal Affairs to this situation, and I welcome most sincerely his intervention and interest in our serious land problem. It is impossible for Kitchener to stop growing, and unless we have co-operation and encouragement from the officials of this government, the development of Waterloo county will be badly compromised.

In Kitchener, we are concerned deeply with downtown urban renewal. We have located the areas of need and have prepared a study of a 445-acre area which surrounds our commercial core. The urban renewal scheme which will result will examine all the influences creating physical, social, economic and functional blight, and will recommend action to both eliminate the blight in the future, and to prevent it from spreading now. The financing of these studies is supported by a 25 per cent grant from this government, and with 50 per cent being paid by the federal government and 25 per cent being paid for by the city of Kitchener. These funds are indeed well spent, and when we resolve the functions which the present core should play, we can go on to develop an even better city than the one which we now enjoy.

We know that reform is needed badly in the system of getting an urban renewal programme under way. A mass of government red tape faces anyone who wishes to have approval received for changes which must be made.

Effective reform in this area would enable all of the municipalities in Ontario to get on

with the tremendous task of renewing our cities and towns.

A renewed and revitalized downtown area with up-to-date shopping, social and cultural appeal is the goal of every community on the move. In Kitchener, we will achieve this goal.

Effective partnership between the levels of government and enlightened private interests is essential to the success of such a venture. As part of our redevelopment, a $8,500,000 convention and theatre complex is being planned for Kitchener. An 1,800 seat theatre, art gallery facilities and convention space are all projected. This is the pace of thinking in our city, and I suggest to this House, Mr. Speaker, that growth and pride in like measure is available to all of our cities if this government will only continue to encourage our citizens.

I had referred earlier to the Conestoga college of applied arts and technology. This exciting new approach to education should receive the encouragement and endorsement of all of the hon. members of this House. The hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Davis) can be justly proud of the start that has been made in this area.

Our college is really built to serve the counties of Waterloo, Wellington, Perth and Huron in area 14 of the scheme. As the college in its courses adds to the educational development of our two local universities, we can readily see the future population pressures which will arise in the twin cities, as persons arrive to take advantage of these facilities. This development like many others will encourage people to move to Kitchener. However, without industrial land to develop, and without solution to our housing needs, the good flow of growth will slow to a trickle.

The type of post-secondary education which this college can develop can serve many of our young people far better than a university education might serve them. If the planned degree of excellence is achieved, then these unique institutions will well aid in developing the numbers of technicians which our community will require in the 1970s.

In the two and three year diploma courses now being offered, many of the gaps in our present educational structure can be closed. The 200 students already in attendance at Conestoga have embarked upon a challenging new task. This administration must pursue this task without delay in order to have the programme achieve the success which is expected of it.

My colleague, the hon. member for Waterloo North has referred to the problems which we face in Waterloo county with respect to the proposal of a county-wide board of education. The figures, once again, show a student population of 58,785, with 43,846 of them in the public system. A general proposal has been made which favours a development of a three board system in our county. The student population is such that placing our county in the same kind of system as other counties with vastly smaller populations of students is inequitable.

The majority of school board officials in our county favour this view of a three board division. Even if this plan is not immediately acceptable to The Department of Education, we ask you to give us at least the right to become a designated area.

The major metropolitan areas of Ontario are all able to be designated to allow for their growth as separate divisions. We see Hamilton, London, Ottawa and Windsor, as well as Metro Toronto all being set apart from the remainder of the province.

There is no other county in our province which has three rapidly growing cities in Kitchener, Waterloo and Galt, and as well the town of Preston which may soon attain city status. In addition the towns of Elmira and Hespeler, and five active townships all make our situation unique.

To arbitrarily decide to lump us in with other less populated areas seems to me to fly in the face of our present Waterloo county area local government review. To put into effect such a programme as this which would amalgamate our educational facilities in Waterloo county before the report from the review is received, would be most short-sighted.

Monies spent on this approach, which may be greatly changed by the results of the review, would be completely wasted.

In view of our population, our rapid development and the projected future of our county's economy, there must be strong reservations as to the benefit in our county becoming one educational unit. This present policy may well serve many areas which have slower growth rates. This policy will not serve Waterloo county well, as it now stands. Our population gives us every right to have an exception made, when all the facts have been studied. We ask for a fair look into our situation, and believe that we deserve this courtesy.

I am not suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that we in Waterloo county must not change or that we can wait and do nothing. We must co-ordinate our educational efforts in Waterloo county and intelligent steps will be taken to do so.

The first report of the Waterloo county interim school organization committee is dated February 21, 1968. Within three weeks of the Minister's announcement, representatives of the 17 boards in our county had met to co-operate on the proposed changes.

This report assumed the following principles:

1. That every child ought to have the same opportunity for a good education provided by the most favoured school systems,

2. that the student population must be adequate,

3. that the tax base must be sufficient,

4. that a board of education having the jurisdiction over public and secondary schools will be elected in each school division, and

5. that the board of education must be sensitive to the needs of its ratepayers and must be put into a position to be able to satisfy these needs.

Larger units in our fine system of education are needed from kindergarten to grade 13. There are, however, serious problems and grave reservations in my riding in that the present approach by this government may not be the wisest, or that the proposed size of the board may not be the most economic for us.

In Kitchener, we are in the midst of an expressway development known as the Conestoga parkway. This will become the core of our future transportation system. In a projection of our needs for the next 20 years, we are informed that we require eight major east-west roads and ten major north-south roads.

All streets have been classified by the study, and capacity requirements for 1970, 1980 and 1990 have been projected. Arterial road development will be needed if our city is to grow and remain vital.

We are not unmindful in Kitchener of the costs which must result from this development. The sum of $38 million has been suggested as the eventual cost of the Conestoga parkway alone. Surely, the costs of putting down the arterial roads to which I have referred will probably be as much again.

We know of the regional highway study being made by The Department of Highways, and hope that it will indeed be available by early 1969, if not before. Our needs are great here, and the ties to both Stratford and Guelph will lead only to an ever-further circular development of roads in the golden triangle area.

To slow down the proposed expressway construction, as might be the result from the present Budget will have serious effects on our growth pattern in Kitchener. Provincial involvement is 75 per cent of the cost of this 14-mile route. In addition, 100 per cent is paid of the cost to build connecting links to Stratford and north to Highway 85 near St. Jacobs.

The pace of construction must be continued in order that this road will be finished by 1971. No slowdown can be countenanced, and I trust that the completion of this vital road will be accomplished on time.

At present we are completing a massive 295-bed addition to our Kitchener-Waterloo hospital. Of the overall cost of some $16 million the provincial and federal governments will provide two-thirds, or some $10.7 million. This development will increase greatly the health services to our citizens, and innovations such as a psychiatric wing and a two-level parking garage will be most useful to our community. My city of Kitchener will be responsible for three-fifths of the municipal portion of the costs of the structure, with the city of Waterloo and the county of Waterloo each providing about one-fifth.

This construction can only be the start of a development which must eventually lead to our own medical school. The strength that the University of Waterloo has shown in its ten years of science teaching must make this ideal a reality in the 1970s. We have 14 medical schools in Canada, with five of them in Ontario. It is apparent that there is a shortage of physicians in Ontario. The future increase of strain on the medical profession by the additional requirements of medicare needs no amplification by me. In the twin city area there are some 181 physicians to serve 125,000 people; a ratio of about 1 to 700 which is the common ratio in Ontario.

We have in the brief of the Kitchener board of health to the Waterloo county local government study the following comment: "There is definitely a shortage of general practitioners or family doctors as well as some of the specialists". If we have a medical school developed in Kitchener, this situation would improve. As well, a return of interns because of teaching facilities, would be most useful to us. As well as a medical school, we

need further development of facilities because the addition to which I have referred will be more than balanced by the increase of population growth by 1970.

Consideration must be given to the establishment in our area and throughout the province of both cancer and heart disease detection clinics. The benefits of preventive medicine are clear, and many can be helped if detection occurs in time. The growth of our hospital facilities must include such areas, so that our population in Kitchener and in our area may have these benefits.

I have referred to the lack of industrial land in Kitchener, and to the population growth which has occurred. The problem of providing adequate housing for many of our citizens is one to which I would now like to turn. The housing and tax policies of this government have been criticized at length both here and during the recent election campaign.

Our citizens wait with growing impatience for some sign of a solution to this problem. As an editorial in the Kitchener-Waterloo *Record* of April 28, 1957 stated:

> The industrial welfare, and future of the nation requires a competent reasonably contented work force. The first requirement for this is not the factory or labour conditions but the home in which the worker and his family are to find that most important of all necessities outside of food, which is shelter.

Construction costs can be reduced. The use of smaller lots and a lowering of city standards of servicing can be accepted. Greater amounts of multiple family housing with attractive surroundings, good parking and playground facilities can be encouraged.

On June 22, 1967, the Minister of Economics and Development stated in Kitchener, that our growth rate of 24.2 per cent is the most spectacular urban expansion in Canada. This pace has not slackened in the past nine months.

This government has begun a programme, but the philosophy behind present approach is inadequate. The Minister has touted his HOME programme as a great and grand panacea for our housing needs. There is a credibility gap between his views and the facts of our problem. One might say that if the hon. Minister had been the captain of the *Titanic*, he would have told his passengers that the ship was stopping to take on some fresh water.

In our county, land developers are fighting a losing battle to supply homes for even the middle-income group. Part of a long term solution is the adoption of the national building code by the government of Ontario. The standardization of all building, fire and safety regulations must be a priority task before we can intelligently tackle this problem. The hon. members of this House have had the opportunity to debate the resolution which the hon. member for Halton East (Mr. Snow) has brought forward. I urge this government to adopt the views of the private members in this matter, and to immediately implement this code. This will give Ontario a strong base from which to move towards the solution of our housing problem.

The opinion as to our local needs has been clearly expressed by Mr. Russell Howald, the president of the Kitchener-Waterloo house builders association. He was reported as having said the following, and I quote:

> We can expect to see some aluminum houses, more town houses, more semi-detached houses and more apartments. There will be more public housing put up and we might even see a trailer park opened in Kitchener. You'll see builders using new materials and trying new designs and methods. But despite this multi-front attack on the housing shortage, you won't see enough houses. The shortage will continue.

This is the story in Kitchener, and throughout this province generally. A government such as this which prides itself on economic maturity and claims a quarter century of achievement has failed miserably to solve this problem.

Library development in our community has always received favourable support from our citizens and from all levels of government. With a budget of some $550,000 our Kitchener library board is attempting to provide to our people the type of service which all communities wish to have. In spite of this attempt, we share the concern of many other library systems which do not have sufficient support to provide the reference and general reading needs of the people.

If education for the intelligent use of leisure time is to be preached by this government, then the practice must come in aid to the growth of libraries. Libraries are an essential tool in education, and their importance grows with the explosion both of knowledge and of the means of communicating that knowledge.

In 1965, the report of Francis R. St. John, a New York library consultant followed a 13-month study of library services in Ontario for the Ontario library association. One of the recommendations made dealt with the creation of a province-wide system of regional co-operative libraries and reference centres linked by modern communications to a centre in Toronto. In our area, the mid-western regional library system is well established to serve the counties of Perth, Huron, Wellington and Waterloo. Co-ordination of library services is most important, and smaller and rural libraries will benefit from the full use of such a system. A network of libraries with standard practices will result in greater efficiency and faster service to the individual library and therefore will better serve the public.

The present government has now made a step along the road of intelligent use of our libraries. Now it should go the whole way to really plan for the strengthening of our library system. The rewards and benefits to be gained as more of our citizens have leisure time to continue their own education, are virtually immeasurable.

The type of regional organization for libraries in our area is matched by the mid-western Ontario development association. This group covers the same four counties as the library system; which is a rare example of contiguous boundaries for regions.

This type of co-operation for industry, municipal development and tourism is an example of what can be done. Regional development must be clarified by this government. There has been much confusion over the recent moves made in this area. It is apparent that there exists duplication of services and of regional planning studies between The Department of Municipal Affairs and The Department of Economics and Development.

One major problem that faces midwestern Ontario, as well as the rest of Ontario is the problem of pollution. In 1967, a report entitled, "A Strategy for a Livable Environment" recommended that the United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare spend $2 billion during the next five years to curb and to cure pollution. This government has moved too slowly in attacking this problem. We cannot delay action until all the answers or even better answers are available.

There are ten immediate goals recommended in the report. One is to have by 1970 an air quality restoration effort to start in 75 areas abatement plans to reduce plant stack emissions by 90 per cent, and to set national standards to reduce vehicle exhaust emissions by 90 per cent from the 1967 levels. Another is a waste disposal effort which by 1973 would aid programmes for solid waste disposal in localities, and would aid research to integrate solid and liquid waste and air quality control.

In our twin cities, an air pollution control office will not be set up for more than a year. Co-ordination by The Departments of Municipal Affairs and of Health could resolve the situation in many towns and villages which do not now have effective pollution control. Expensive equipment and trained personnel are needed, and a training programme as well as bulk purchasing to reduce unit costs would be a means of pressing ahead with the work to be done.

Air pollution in downtown Kitchener has increased so sharply in the last year that it has reached almost to a level considered excessively high. In 1966 the rate was 106 micrograms of particles in every cubic metre of air, while the excessive level of 125 was passed when the rate reached 194 in November of 1967. One air sample measured last August was 638, more than three times the excessively high level. Not only will persons with respiratory problems have a greater hazard to their health, but as well the whole of the city has its appearance harmed by grimy buildings. Many of the downtown industrial plants are reluctant to resolve the problem which they have created, and prosecutions under a model bylaw which The Department of Municipal Affairs could draft with some teeth in it, seem to be needed now.

The second area of responsibility which I have been given is as critic in our party for the provincial Treasury, Mr. Speaker. We have just heard the Budget speech of the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. MacNaughton) and there will be opportunity soon to go more deeply into his proposals for the coming year. The budgetary deficit of the election year just passed was $162 million. The coming year is to see us a further $252 million into debt. To counter this we have a piecemeal Budget that terms itself with some understandable modesty as "mildly expansionary".

I suggest that this Budget shows the Provincial Treasurer to be following the approach of Christopher Columbus in his financing. You will recall, Mr. Speaker that that man started out not knowing where he was going, arrived not knowing where he was, and returned home not knowing where he had been;

and he did it all on borrowed money. Parkinson's law is with us as the hon. Minister's department is to be cut in two like a jungle plant; to be replanted in two large pots where it can luxuriantly grow and spread and fill all the space available to it.

Mr. Speaker, as one of the younger members of this House, I feel that it is especially important for us, as politicians, to encourage the involvement of youth in the activities of the public service. Certainly service to others which ranges across the daily lives of many, can become a valid goal for youth. The idealism and enthusiasm of young people is one of the most precious resources of this province. The leader of the Opposition (Mr. Nixon) has already called for a wide-ranging student summer service programme to ensure that young persons can find worthwhile and interesting employment during vacation periods with private business, the provincial civil service and in other areas of community service. This kind of a programme would give to all of us untold benefits. The ability to do something of value and to learn about others in Ontario would give us better citizens in the future, more able to cope with the changes of the 1970s that will be thrust upon them.

If we can encourage this involvement, our future in the challenging life of tomorrow's Ontario will be secure.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): Mr. Speaker, it now being 10:20 p.m., I wonder if this would not be an appropriate time to adjourn the debate and let us go home. It has been a long day.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Gisborn: Mr. Speaker, I want to join with other hon. members of the House in congratulating you, sir, in your position as Speaker of this House. Of course, Mr. Speaker, as it applied to your predecessor, there will be times that we will notice that you will be somewhat favourable to the government's side of the House in making your many rulings during the session of the Legislature and I am sure that we, on this side of the House in this party, will accept that with friendly understanding because I am sure that in the near future when the New Democratic Party nominates the Speaker for this House, the same will prevail and the Conservatives on this side will also understand the human elements in being a Speaker of the Legislature and will understand that no one can lie down on any bed without picking up some lint.

Mr. Speaker, prior to 6:00 of the clock, the hon. member for Eglinton (Mr. Reilly), the government whip, referred to the exercise in parliamentary democracy that took place in this House a week ago last Thursday and Friday, and during his remarks, he took it upon himself to dictate a lecture to the hon. member for Algoma-Manitoulin (Mr. Farquhar), the whip of the Liberal Party, and to myself the whip of the New Democratic Party, akin to the headmaster at Eton dictating a lecture to some of his students. And I want to say through you, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. government whip, that I do not accept nor need a lecture from him in my function as the whip for this party.

What took place was quite within the rules, and it is my understanding that it is the government's responsibility to control and direct the House. And it is not our part to be complicit in their failure to do so. I want to clear up a point that I do not understand, in the two occasions, the one on Thursday evening and the one on the following Friday morning. It might be a misprint; it does not quite follow in my estimation. On the Thursday evening, regardless of the confusion that prevailed before the vote was taken, we subsequently came to the position of voting on a motion to adjourn the debate, and the hon. Mr. Speaker, said: "The motion has been put, and I declare that the motion has been carried."

And of course it was then a division of the House, caused by the Opposition and the members were called in. But if we recollect on the Friday morning, when the hon. member for Lakeshore (Mr. Lawlor) moved the adjournment of the debate, Mr. Speaker put the motion and declared that the motion was carried. It was five members of the government who rose to call for the division of the House—to call in the members—and I may remind you, Mr. Speaker, and it will be up to you, sir, if it is considered necessary to correct the *Hansard*, it goes like this, and I quote:

> Mr. Lawlor moves the adjournment of the debate.
>
> Some hon. members: No.
>
> Mr. Speaker: Call in the members. As many as are in favour of the motion please rise. As many as are opposed, please rise.
>
> Clerk of the House: Mr. Speaker, the ayes are 38, and the nays 52.

Now all that I want to draw to your attention, sir, is that in putting the motion to adjourn the debate, it is not recorded in *Hansard*.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): That is a serious omission.

Mr. Gisborn: And I think that Mr. Speaker should pay attention to it and if he feels so, it should be corrected.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to extend my welcome and best wishes to all of the new members of the Legislature following the election of October 17, 1967. I do that because I feel that I might be termed as an old timer at this point, and I also extend my best wishes and welcome to all the other members, even the old timers who have returned to the Legislature. I want to extend my congratulations to the hon. member, the lady member for Hamilton West (Mrs. Pritchard) for her return. I assure you, Mr. Speaker, that it was because of the redistribution of the ridings, the hon. lady's riding was moved further west into more secure Conservative territory, and for that reason she has received a reprieve and will serve with us for the next four years. I assure you that this will be corrected after the next election.

To the hon. member for Hamilton Mountain (Mr. J. R. Smith), I extend my sincere congratulations for his victory. I know that he put on a very vigorous campaign and his success was due to his own efforts and application, and I do not want to infer that I would cry sour grapes about our party losing any election. We take the responsibility for our failure to put on the type of campaign necessary for us to win. But I do congratulate the hon. member for Hamilton Mountain for bringing around him during the campaign a very large group of teenagers and students and I think that this is good—to bring the young people into politics. There is no better place for them to start, than working in a campaign. But I think that there was some harm done there too, because I feel that when this large group of teenagers get their eyes opened to what the Conservative Party stands for, and they become disenchanted with it all, it is going to take the New Democratic Party some time to reorientate them and to get them to understand that there is an alternative. At that time we will have them working with us, and they will have some real purpose and some real intent.

As well as our failures in applying ourselves properly in that campaign, and in our failure to win it—we had hopes of course—there was also another element that contributed somewhat to the success of the hon. member for Hamilton Mountain and that was the very, very, weak campaign that was provided by the Liberal member for that riding. It became evident in the last two or three weeks of the campaign that the Liberal canvassers were pumping and pushing as hard as they could for the Conservative candidate.

It was quite obvious that they were saying to themselves, if we cannot get elected ourselves, for goodness sakes do not let the NDP in; we must support the Conservative member.

Mr. Speaker, I also feel very proud to welcome the new members to our caucus. The member for Timiskaming (Mr. Jackson) has made his maiden speech, and I am sure that he has indicated to this House and to his constituents that he will well account for his stewardship in this Legislature.

Mr. Lewis: I bet he can hurl northern invective.

Mr. Gisborn: I understand that he had an important position in a large mining industry in the north; he was on the management staff, and I understand that he had to apply for leave of absence to conduct his campaign with the proviso that if he was successful, he would have to terminate his employment with that company. I am sure that there should be some sort of regulation to protect the persons who want to put themselves forward in this democratic process, and become a member, if he has some indication that he has some public support. I would ask the government to give some consideration to mandatory leave of absence for a person in industry that might have to sacrifice a permanent livelihood in regards to the unpredictables of politics.

The hon. member for Sudbury East (Mr. Martel) will of course make himself known to the people of his riding and of the province. He has indicated already in his maiden speech, and his questioning of various Ministers that he is able to apply himself well. Here again, he deserves the best congratulations of all of the members of the House in putting himself forward as a candidate to come to this Legislature, because I understand that he is a public school principal, and that he will face a financial loss in looking after his job in the Legislature.

I am not crying for the hon. member. He knew what the score was when he made himself available, but some of these things should be pointed out. The hon. member for Thunder Bay (Mr. Stokes), an active trade unionist, I understand he has one of the largest ridings geographically in the province, and he also has indicated that he will represent his riding very well.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there has been some reference to the operation of this party by the hon. member for Sudbury (Mr. Sopha) in his speech last evening and I want to say a word about our party myself. I am proud to sit behind the hon. member for Riverdale (Mr. Renwick), the knowledgeable corporation lawyer; I am very proud to sit on the left of the hon. member for Scarborough West (Mr. Lewis); we all in our caucus enjoy and support the drive and the radicalism he contributes to our caucus, the way he is able to bring about the co-operative work that has to be done in a driving party and have no doubt about it he is developing the co-operation that is necessary to be decisive and carry out your work in a proper manner.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Gisborn: Mr. Speaker, when the hon. member for Sudbury last night during his remarks recited to the House his opinion of the operations of our party, I am sure there was a hidden expression of jealousy because of the—

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): It was not too hidden.

Mr. Gisborn: —because of the lack of cohesion and sense of direction in his own party. I also, Mr. Speaker, am proud to sit on the right of the hon. member for High Park (Mr. Shulman). Some people seem to think there is something wrong about one being financially fixed and supporting the New Democratic Party.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Nothing wrong with it at all.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Gisborn: Well, let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, in all of my interest in politics, and it goes back quite a few years, not directly into the legislative field but in the trade union movement, I have never envied those who are better off.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): Oh?

Mr. Gisborn: I know for a fact the New Democratic Party does not envy those who are able to drive around in gold-plated Cadillacs or to smother themselves in mink furs. We never objected to that, but what we do object to very strongly are those and all the others who place all the obstacles in the way of some of the things that are needed to be done in this province. We object to those.

Mr. Sopha: Does the member remember the day we voted ourselves a 50 per cent increase in our allowances? He did not say anything about minimum wages that day.

Mr. Gisborn: I thought that after last evening the hon. member for Sudbury would have run out of words. He did not say very much but he spent a lot of time at it.

Mr. Sopha: Do you remember the day we voted the increase for the judges?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Gisborn: Well, I was very careful the night we dealt with the vote on the increase for the judges. I opposed it, and my words were I would not support an increase of income to someone whom I felt was making a decent income at this time, and I think the judges are making a decent income at this time. And I was quite surprised that the Liberal Party did not support that on principle at least. They are talking now about minimum wages but they would not support our party in trying to force an increase of the minimum wage in this province.

Mr. Sopha: The day we voted the pay increase in this House, did the member talk about minimum wages that day?

Mr. MacDonald: Sure we did.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Gisborn: I was very honest the day we voted on the increase of the indemnity, as the hon. member for Sudbury knows. He has a short memory, you know.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Gisborn: At that time I was convinced we were not receiving a decent pay to serve as a member of this Legislature and when the next time comes I will take my position whatever it might be then, regardless of the position of the Opposition.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. C. G. Pilkey (Oshawa): What would the member for Sudbury do?

Mr. Gisborn: Mr. Speaker, we object to those who oppose an effective and efficient medicare programme. We object to those who oppose decent and adequate housing. And we object to those who oppose adequate income and care for the sick and aged. One has to start and look around this province. I

do not know whether my riding is extraordinary or not but people are going further behind in trying to make ends meet in a very serious manner. We have homes for the elderly there, I visit them, and they are in a worse position now than they have ever been and we have to do something about it.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to have been here for 12 years, I am now going into the 13th year. I can remember when I sat in the 25th Legislature from 1955 to 1959; there were three of us, and we were often referred to as "three men in a boat". I also remember, Mr. Speaker, sitting between 1959 and 1963, the 26th Legislature, and I am proud of that. Five members. And our leader was often referred to as leader with five heads.

Mr. Lewis: A 66 per cent increase in one election.

Mr. Gisborn: I also remember sitting from 1963 to 1967, the 27th Legislature, with eight members.

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Seven first.

Mr. Gisborn: Yes, a byelection came along. Nevertheless, seven or eight. That is the year we provided effective Opposition for this Legislature, without any doubt.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: What happened between 1948 to 1951?

Mr. MacDonald: Oh, are you rooted in the past?

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): There is Conservative thinking, 20 years behind the times.

Mr. Gisborn: We go back, Mr. Speaker, to 1955 session.

Mr. Sopha: Go back to '45, how many members did you have then?

Mr. Gisborn: I remember very well and I paid quite a lot of attention to it, when the new leader of the CCF at that time, the member for York South, felt it was necessary to expose and delve into the corruption and wrongdoings in the development of the northern Ontario natural gas pipeline.

Mr. Sopha: Oh, do we have to raise that?

Mr. Gisborn: It needs raising, Mr. Speaker, because—

Mr. Shulman: The Liberals do not like that.

Mr. Gisborn: The Liberals sat quiet all during the piece, maybe because of some simple implication or other reasons, I do not know why, but they sat quiet all through the situation. And I can remember quite well, Mr. Speaker, the smearing tactics from the other side of the House as the hon. member for York South was developing his case, which finally was proven, and brought about the downfall of three Cabinet Ministers and implicated others. It is not a nice thing to do but it has to be done.

Ours is a different party, Mr. Speaker, and something has been said about that today.

There have been remarks about the efforts of the hon. member for High Park in his professional area. When he decided—

Mr. Sopha: Which profession? As a writer, doctor or what?

Mr. Gisborn: —something was wrong and he made up his mind he was going to expose it and clean it up. I think it was necessary. You see, there is something different in our party because we are convinced that in public life it is the responsibility of an elected member—if he knows or believes that something is corrupt or there is wrong doing—it is his responsibility to expose it as strongly and as vigorously as he can.

Mr. Sopha: No matter how many he hurts.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Right or wrong?

Mr. Sopha: Well let us have the answer, we have not heard it yet.

Mr. Gisborn: Because if we do not do that, Mr. Speaker, then you become part of that corruption and wrong doing and then the cancer sets in and this is what brings about deterioration of our democratic system of public life. And it has been proven many times in many countries.

The member for High Park has done what he thought had to be done. I am sure that the results had the support of the majority and will benefit the majority and if some faces were red, that it about all that happened. I do not think that he did any harm to any senior official in this government and I think that senior officials in public life have to be prepared to stand their ground and face these kinds of issues. I do not think we have to bury anything because of the fear of extreme embarrassment.

I say to the hon. member for Sudbury, after his invective tirade last night in the

guise of entertainment, he should take his party and form a coalition with the government across the way.

Mr. W. Newman (Ontario South): That is coming. That is coming.

Mr. Sopha: Get back to medicare.

Mr. Gisborn: Well, Mr. Speaker, there has been much said about medicare in this House in the last few days.

Mr. Sopha: Now he is on safer ground.

Mr. Gisborn: The hon. member for Sudbury has quite a habit of getting his mouth in motion before his brains are in gear.

Mr. Sopha: That is me. He really flattered me.

Mr. Gisborn: There has been quite a lot said about medicare in this House in the last few days and I am sure there is going to be much more said about medicare before this session is over. I thought I had heard speakers from the Liberal side of the House tell us how important it is to have a real comprehensive medicare programme in this province, in line with the—

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): That is right!

Mr. Gisborn: —federal programme and I have heard them talk about the province of Saskatchewan. When I found out what has happened in Saskatchewan in the last week or two, well, I am getting a little more ashamed of the Liberals every day.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex Kent): That is not difficult for the hon. member.

Mr. Gisborn: I understand that what they have done in Saskatchewan is apply to the basic insurance premium a deterrent cost. They are saying to the people in Saskatchewan, the Liberals through Mr. Thatcher, you have a basic premium to cover you for hospital insurance, but if you dare get sick and go in the hospital, for the first 30 days it is going to cost you $2.50 a day for 30 days—that is $75. And if that does not cure you and give you some impetus to get out and you stay longer, it is going to cost you $1.50 a day for the next 60 days.

Mr. Lewis: "Liberalism," Nixon style!

Mr. Gisborn: So talk about rubbing it in to the sick, I have never heard of such imposition on the rights of people in my life. It is a shameful imposition on the sick, perpetuated by that so-called Liberal government in Saskatchewan.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That Thatcher is a great boy.

Mr. Gisborn: Yes, Mr. Speaker, there is a difference in the New Democratic Party from the other two parties. The New Democratic Party is a crusading party; and please note I do not feel the slightest shudder at the medieval connotation of the word crusader.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Gisborn: I wish someone would give the hon. leader of the Liberal Party a can opender and a large spoon.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): He may flip those tomatoes—look out.

Mr. Gisborn: Yes, Mr. Speaker, the New Democratic Party is a crusading party. Please note I do not feel the slightest shudder at the medieval connotation of the word crusading, since I consider it one of the more gentle terms of warfare. In other words, it is a party possessing a moral dynamic that can be and is successfully communicated to the electorate.

The message is that policy is more important than office, and there is no substitute for political philosophy. Social justice and fair economic opportunities are primary goals. We feel that our society is still a long way from the first of these, and even farther away from the second. We differ essentially from the other parties in our concept of social justice in that we assume that certain basic essentials of the good life should be enjoyed as a right, not as a privilege or benefit conferred in pity and charity by those who are more fortunately endowed. The real spirit of charity in this 20th century recognizes the inherent dignity of every human being and rejects the means test principle of social legislation.

We are not just dreamers as some people would like to think, Mr. Speaker; I suppose that is their way of dismissing a bogey. They do not reckon, however, with the fact that we are pragmatists, too, who want very much to put the parliamentary system to effective use and who, most of all, want a chance to test our philosophical concept for practicability.

Mr. Nixon: Why did the member vote against the rules committee?

Mr. MacDonald: Right, and we are getting there.

Mr. Nixon: The member is inconsistent, as usual.

Mr. MacDonald: Not the kind of half-baked idea that usually emerges from the Liberal view.

Mr. Nixon: Incredible.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Gisborn: Mr. Speaker, certain crises have occurred in the affairs of our nation and many people are beginning to question the values of this so called affluent society. Are we producing the right kind of things for human needs? Are we really making it a more comfortable and satisfying life for all?

People are questioning too, the efficacy of our political system, which was described by the president of the Canadian union of students in Montreal last April as a ceremonious sham. The government, he said, is made up of people in power sitting around deciding what are the most minor adjustments they can make to keep in power. Well we have been saying that for a very long time now.

Mr. MacDonald: That is a good description of a Liberal government.

Mr. Gisborn: "But I am convinced that a little radicalism, judiciously employed"—

Mr. Nixon: No, not judiciously.

Mr. Gisborn: —"might go a long way towards dispelling the cynicism and disillusion evoked by our body politic in this centennial year of 1967."

Mr. Speaker, I felt those things had to be said. Now, I want to get down to—

Mr. Nixon: I am glad we got the introductions over.

Mr. Gisborn: I want to get down to what I consider a very serious indictment on The Department of Health, and of course, this government.

I want to quote, at length, from a report to the Hamilton *Spectator* by Doctor Wells, the Hamilton deputy medical officer of health, and the article says this:

> The city's 23 nursing homes do not comply with provincial regulations, mainly because of staff problems. But, he added these things will get better, "of that I am certain."
>
> Among faults found in homes by city inspectors were: Delays in getting doctors in emergencies or when new residents were admitted; lack of qualified nurses; inadequate records; faulty drug and medication control; overcrowding and lack of sitting room space; substandard menus and poor food preparation and storage.
>
> Dr. Wells told the health board yesterday that all the homes had been recommended for provisional licenses for 1968. He said The Nursing Homes Act did not give the city authority to close homes not complying with regulations.
>
> Dr. Wells said today: "Operators of the homes are fully co-operating and progress is being made towards meeting standards. Generally speaking, he said, Hamilton was short of people willing to work in old people's homes. This caused problems of keeping records, preparing the right kind of meals and controlling drugs and medications."
>
> He added, "I blame the province for a lot of our problems. You see, there are two kinds of homes, one which provides a nursing service and one which merely gives sheltered care. The province has the power under the Act to classify homes in this way. So far it has failed to do so. This means that there are qualified nurses working in homes giving only sheltered care where they are not really needed. We need those nurses in places providing a nursing service. These places are very, very short of good nurses."
>
> About the delays in getting doctors to homes he said:
>
> "This is one of our biggest problems, and I do not want anyone to think I am dissatisfied with the medical professioin. The problems here are very clearly defined. There are too few general practitioners these days. There are also few doctors available for service in old people's homes. This is not something new because the general public has difficulty in getting doctors."
>
> Dr. Wells listed other faults in the homes:
>
> Lack of safety provisions such as handrails and grab bars in bathrooms.
>
> Overcrowding. But here operators are doing their best. I must say that we have

had the fullest co-operation of home operators and that is the way we like it.

I cannot agree with the deputy medical health officer of Hamilton inasmuch as we are doing all we can do. If this is the position, Mr. Speaker, it certainly makes us wonder about the mockery of such an extensive Act as The Nursing Homes Act.

I raise this question tonight and appeal to the Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond) to make a thorough investigation to clear up some of the iniquities in the nursing homes of Hamilton, because the time of this report indicating a lack of doctors was just the time when the flu virus was quite prevalent, and I do not have to remind the hon. members how one suffers with that ailment if they do not get some kind of medication. You can imagine the aged being left without the kind of medical attention in these circumstances.

Faulty drug and medication control—certainly this should be investigated immediately and corrected, and certainly there should be some effort to provide a team of doctors in Hamilton who will make regular calls and look after the people in these homes.

I will leave it with the hon. Minister. I hope that he has noticed the report—he has likely received a report. I would like some answers to the problem. I know that you cannot take the people out of those homes—I agree to that point with the deputy medical officer in Hamilton. But certainly we have to make sure that some of these things are looked after. Maybe a crash programme is needed to provide the proper facilities; an expansion programme to make room for them and to see that they are getting the proper attention.

Relevant to this situation, Mr. Speaker, I want to quote from another article in the Hamilton *Spectator* and it reads as follows:

UNABLE TO CUT TOENAILS, ELDERLY OFTEN CRIPPLED

I do not expect the snickers that prevailed in the House when I read the last report regarding the nursing homes in Hamilton because I think this is a serious situation. For our medical profession in this province to let this kind of a situation prevail I think it is ridiculous:

> Uncut toenails could be costing city taxpayers hundreds of thousands of dollars and shortening their bearers' active lives by up to two years.
>
> These startling, if down to earth statistics were revealed yesterday by David Ambrose at the social planning and research council of Hamilton and district committee of the whole.
>
> He suggested the council might do well to put its best foot forward and find out exactly how many old people are becoming shut-ins and bed-ridden because of lack of proper foot care. Mr. Ambrose said it was one of the biggest problems of the aged. He thought hundreds of thousands of dollars could be saved if old people were kept on their feet.
>
> The shortage of chronic hospital beds would be eased, and the old people themselves would be able to enjoy their independence longer. I think it is a bit embarrassing for an old person, unable to cut his own toenails to ask someone else to do it for him, he said.
>
> Mr. Ambrose said that the result was that many old people were suffering from ingrowing toenails which eventually crippled them so badly they were unable to walk.
>
> Miss Pearl Clark, a member of the council's committee on aging agreed there was no chiropodic service available for old people at present.

And there is a footnote:

> Dr. Eope Schwenger, associate professor of public health in Toronto, has said his own studies showed that nearly half of all elderly people have foot problems. Sometimes, he said, it is merely that they cannot cut their own toenails, and the resulting thick, claw-like nails are disabling.

Now, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. MacDonald: This is one of the problems of the people that you do not even know about, you see. You look puzzled and amazed.

Mr. Gisborn: To find out what is going on in some of the nursing homes demands immediate attention by The Department of Health in this government.

Mr. Lewis: Yes, I am not surprised you are laughing. That is in character for the Minister. It is your department.

Mr. Gisborn: Mr. Speaker, there is on the order paper a resolution standing in the name of the hon. member for Humber (Mr. Ben) and I would like to say at this point, Mr. Speaker, that we are all aware of the illness suffered by the hon. member for Humber and I personally offer my wishes for speedy recovery to him.

The resolution follows:

That in the opinion of this House, until such time as a minimum income is guaranteed to every citizen of Ontario, this government should forthwith introduce a comprehensive scheme of disability payments to guarantee an income to those citizens incapacitated by ill-health and who qualify for neither unemployment insurance nor disability payments under The Workmen's Compensation Act.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the member for Humber for putting the resolution on the order paper. I certainly wholeheartedly endorse that resolution and want to say a word or two about it tonight.

I have in my hand the programme adopted at the founding convention of the New Democratic Party in August, 1961, and of course it was followed by the second federal convention in Regina August 6, 1963. In it is the section covering this particular subject—sickness, pay, survivor and other benefits.

When the breadwinner of a family dies or is not working because of sickness, the needs of a family for which he provided must still be met. The New Democratic government will introduce a programme available to both employees and self-employed providing income during illness or accident which is not covered by workmen's compensation.

The programme will include maternity benefits. Benefits will be paid dependent survivors on the death of the breadwinner, and the government will sponsor a term life insurance plan for the annuities branch on a voluntary basis for supplementary coverage.

Then it goes on into other areas.

Mr. MacDonald: It took the Liberals seven years to pick that up.

Mr. Sopha: There was a great convention at Regina in 1932.

Hon. J. Yaremko (Minister of Social and Family Services): Why did you drop it in 1966?

Mr. MacDonald: He did not drop it. He has had it on the order paper as he will tell you for years.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. MacDonald: We did not drop it. We do not have to repeat everything in our policy every year.

Mr. Gisborn: In the programme for Ontario for 1959, the CCF programme, sickness and accident benefits. The New Democratic Party's programme for medicare will protect the people against medical, hospital and other similar ills. Still remaining, however, will be the problem of the loss of income suffered by breadwinners who are unable to work because of sickness or accident not covered by The Workmen's Compensation Act. This, too, is a problem that can best be handled federally, but failing federal action, a New Democratic government of Ontario would give serious study to a provincial plan. The main features of such a plan would be that:

(a) Benefits would be on the same scale as workmen's compensation benefits.

(b) The plan would cover all employees, all employed persons and would be financed by contributions from employers and employees.

(c) Farmers and other self-employed people would be able to obtain coverage voluntarily by making the necessary contributions.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Why was that dropped from the 1966 programme?

Mr. MacDonald: It was not.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Well, read the 1966 one.

Mr. Lewis: Do you read our programme so carefully?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I read everybody's programme carefully.

Mr. MacDonald: That is where the government gets its ideas.

Mr. Gisborn: If it was dropped from the 1966 programme, and I am not sure, it might have been because of the expectations we had from the federal Liberal government when they started to talk about the need for a guaranteed income in this country, and if we were to establish a guaranteed minimum income, some think that we would not need this kind of a programme. Well, I do not agree. I think there is more need for this kind of a programme now, even if they establish a guaranteed minimum income across the province. But the same plan was implemented into our programme for the last provincial election.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there are several complications in this kind of a programme and I would like to try and explain in my way the need for it. At the present time, the labour force in the province of Ontario is some

2,825,000 and out of that there are 600,000 in the organized trade union movement. If we take a third of that as applying to executives and professional people, it would amount to about 741,000, and that leaves us with 1,484,000 who are not in either one of those groups.

Now I grant you, out of that figure many have some coverage, because there are many large industries which are not in the organized stream and have weekly indemnity coverage. But, I would hazard a guess that we would still have about 1,000,000 people in this province who have no coverage when they are off work, not covered by weekly indemnity and of course, as we know, they finally end up on the municipal welfare rolls.

Now the many types of coverage, Mr. Speaker, are various, and we know that in the organized groups there are plans that start and pay from $15 a week up to as high as $65 a week, to my knowledge.

An hon. member: Where did they get the money?

Mr. Gisborn: And they vary in length of coverage from three months to a year and a half—called the weekly indemnity, and of course there are other types of supplementary coverages in some of the organized groups.

Now if we look at those who are trying to get by on the minimum wage established in this province, of one dollar an hour, and they worked within the confines of the 48-hour week legislation, we find that they were making something like $2,496 a year and what we understand and what we know is this group are forced to do what we call moonlighting, working in the services, serving beer, cleaning offices, and so on, and they supplement this income up to around a total of $4,000 a year. So it would follow that if we establish this kind of a programme and they were off sick, receiving 75 per cent of their wages and if we took it on the basis of the 48-hour week, with $2,496, they would only have an income of $36 a week, and certainly this is not what we are trying to provide. What we have to provide is the minimum floor of a guaranteed minimum income up to around $4,000 and implement the insurance plan to pay 75 per cent of their wages, whichever is the higher.

Many will be aware, Mr. Speaker, that we in this party, when we were talking about the Canada pension plan, were in favour of a wage related pension plan, with premiums to be paid on a ratio in accordance with income. It is a principle that one's income standards should not be too badly disturbed when he is forced to retire through illness or normal retirement, or what have you, and we can sympathize, Mr. Speaker, with the family man, even if he earns $10,000, $15,000, or $20,000 a year, and has to reduce his income by 50 per cent through sickness or unfortunate accident, having to reduce his standards in relation to that.

If he takes a 50 per cent cut and he has—this happens in a lot of cases—he can sell maybe one of his two cars, or two or the three cars, his boat or his trailer; he can sell his summer cottage, he can do away with a maid or a gardener and quit his favourite club and he will suffer some losses in this change of course.

This is understandable, but he certainly will be able to continue to eat well and have sufficient shelter. But if this kind of a reduction in standard happens to the man in the $4,000, $5,000 and $6,000 income, he is in a different position. He has no disposable assets to take up the slack and act as a cushion. They cannot eat the furniture or the house—and I see in my notes, but I do not like to be facetious—he might live on the grass for a while, if he has any grass in his backyard.

I say, Mr. Speaker, that we are going to pursue the government for consideration of this kind of a programme, because the need becomes more evident every day in meeting people who have problems getting by.

I do not think that there is anything that disturbs the harmony of family life more than when the pay cheque stops coming in, when the breadwinner is off sick. And if we believe in the principle of unemployment insurance which provides an income for the breadwinner when he is laid off work; if we believe in the principle of workmen's compensation, which provides an income of 75 per cent of his wages, then why not believe in the principle of providing an income on an insurance basis for one who is off sick or injured and not covered by either one of the plans?

Of course, even when they are on the short-term plans provided by some of the industries, there are many, many cases where they use up their term of indemnity. They have to go on city welfare and, of course, this disrupts the whole family life and there is no calculating the social impact on the family when one is reduced through a long period of sickness to seek charity. The social impact

is beyond comprehension, regardless of the need of money to provide the necessities of life.

So I would ask the government to give serious consideration to this kind of a programme.

I would just like to refer to *Hansard* of March 25, 1959, page 1752 where I had a similar resolution on the order paper at that time, and I quote:

Clerk of the House: Notice of motion No. 5, by Mr. Gisborn.

And Mr. Speaker, I might remind the hon. members that this was the year when we passed the Ontario hospital insurance plan. I continue:

Resolved,

That it is the opinion of this House that there be established a sickness and accident benefit plan to give wage and salary earners security against loss of income when they are off work due to sickness or accident not covered by workmen's compensation.

The hon. Mr. Frost replied:

Hon. Mr. Frost: Well, Mr. Speaker, I would say to the hon. member that I do not think this point was discussed in the estimates. My recollection is that it was not. But I would say that the same reasoning would apply when it comes to getting into insurance of this kind, when the province is already engaged in the insurance plan—the largest ever attempted in Canada—involving about $250 million a year. Perhaps the hon. member will agree that it would be wise to let the people have a little bit of breathing time in order to catch up on some of the things that have been undertaken.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Wentworth East): Well, Mr. Speaker, if it takes as long to get this plan started as it did the hospital plan, I suggest that now is a good time to get it introduced. We had better get going on it.

I went on, Mr. Speaker, to document my reasoning for the resolution; and I would like to say in a somewhat better fashion than I have tonight.

I am pleased, and will further agree, that when the Liberals want to borrow any of these worthy ideas and plans of the New Democratic Party—the CCF at that time—we will commend them for it and encourage their support. I hope they will not drop this one when the issue comes to a point when we can have a vote on it. I do not know whether it will be this session, but at some time we will bring some reason into the private members' hour so that we can stand up and be counted and find out where we stand on some of the social measures.

We are told continually by the government that we are hare-brained, that these programmes that we put forward will not work, there is not enough money and the public is not ready for them. Well let us give it a test some time. Let us take some votes in this House on the many measures we have put forward and let us find out once and for all whether the public is really ready for some of the real measures that this province deserves.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. L. Bernier (Kenora): Mr. Speaker, in view of the late hour, I would like to adjourn the debate.

Some hon. members: No, no!

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): Go ahead.

An hon. member: Go ahead.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: After all that applause?

Mr. Bernier: Thank you very much.

Mr. Speaker, on arising to express a few words in this Throne debate I would like to join the other members who preceded me in congratulating you on your election as Speaker of this House.

I have followed your career with tremendous interest for the past few years and have noticed the tremendous contribution that you have made to this province in the past. It was with pleasure that I learned of your appointment as Speaker of the 28th Parliament. Certainly your actions to date and the manner in which you have guided and directed this House clearly indicate to me that you will continue to add prestige and dignity to this Legislature.

Mr. Speaker, we in northwestern Ontario, or rather our Indians, would refer to you as "Nishishin Ogemah" of the 28th Parliament.

It was just one short year ago that I myself had the honour of entering this House, and to hon. members on both sides and all new members I would extend a very warm welcome. I can assure these new members that their first year will be one of extreme interest and satisfaction, especially to those members sitting on the government benches.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): I would have given the member the Mines portfolio.

Mr. Bernier: While I am in a congratulatory mood, Mr. Speaker, I could certainly like to extend congratulations to our three new

Cabinet Ministers. I cannot help but recall the remarks of an Opposition member when he said to me that the Prime Minister has surrounded himself with the strongest and most able group of men in this province.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, to have been elected by the voters of Kenora riding to represent them during the centennial year was an honour, but to be returned for a four-year term a year later is a still greater honour. The majority I received is certainly indicative of the faith and the confidence that my people have in the Robarts administration.

In my remarks last session, Mr. Speaker, I took the members on an imaginary tour of the great riding of Kenora. While I have no intention of repeating that tour today, I would like to remind the old members and, of course to inform the new members, of the great distance that this House lies from my riding. This is a tremendous province and I doubt if many of the members really realize its size. It is interesting to note that the town of Kenora, the tourist mecca of the great northwest, is exactly 1,165 miles from this building. Mr. Speaker, we are closer to British Columbia than we are to the capital city of this province; and as a further example of our size, Halifax, Nova Scotia, is closer to Toronto by 50 miles than is Kenora.

I have the privilege of representing one of the larger constituencies in this province, Mr. Speaker. It consists of 153,000 square miles, 250 miles from east to west boundary and more than 600 miles from north to south. We have approximately one voter for every seven square miles and one resident for every three square miles.

While we are large in size, we are blessed with an abundance of natural resources and our potential, Mr. Speaker, is unlimited. In stressing to the members of this House the size of this great province, it is my hope that the new Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Brunelle) will see fit to organize a members' tour of that great part of Ontario, as this is the only practical method of grasping the magnitude of that area, its present wealth and certainly its vast potential.

Mr. Speaker, for the past few months we in our area, particularly following the election campaign, have been treated to that familiar old song that our part of the province should secede to Manitoba or form a new province. Now this is not new, we have heard it on several occasions. And I would like to read into the record tonight a text of an editorial that recently appeared in the Dryden *Observer* on this very subject. And the caption read: "Thanks anyway, fellows". It goes on to say:

> It's popped up again: the silly idea that northwestern Ontario should secede and join up with Manitoba. This time it's a switch. Winnipeg's Mayor Juba and Premier Weir of Manitoba are reported to have raised the question.
>
> Right nice of our Manitoba friends to extend the welcome mat, but they should know that secession is simply out of the question. For one thing—and facetiously —it would take away the only threat that some of us are able to use when our own Ontario government seems to forget us. Hardly anybody in northwestern Ontario ever takes secession seriously.
>
> Few people realize the enormous size of northwestern Ontario, and in the past when cross-country travel was by rail most Canadians passed through a good deal of this area during the night. Furthermore, only a part of its industrial development can be seen from a railway car or the trans-Canada highway.
>
> Northwestern Ontario now has a population of roughly 250,000 people. Its manufacturing output in 1965 amounts to $320 million. Forest industries account for $260 million and mining $120 million. Total labour income alone is $280 million. Retail trade amounts to $275 million. The figures are impressive and the best is yet to come, for northwestern Ontario is rich indeed in natural resources.
>
> Tremendous iron ore deposits already known across the area north of Lac Seul await only the demands of the market. In this one mineral belt alone, according to estimates by knowledgeable people in the industry, sufficient ore exists to eventually support a regional community of 80,000 people. Northwestern Ontario has other treasures in the bank. They, too, are in safe-keeping, awaiting only the call of the market as the needs of the population increase.
>
> The government of Ontario, the prosperous province of which we are an important part, is wise enough, if not to say shrewd enough, to realize the tremendous value of this area. Our province is also rich enough to provide the essential resource roads and services required of such a promising young giant, the northwest.

> If we are less than happy with our budget share at times, we are not alone. It is true that our numbers are few in relation to the great size of our section of the province and that as a result, too few voices represent us in the Legislature. Incredible as it may seem, at the Lakehead we recently voted out a well-qualified Cabinet Minister.
>
> But it would not be fair to lead on Mr. Weir and Mr. Juba to believe we're ever serious about leaving our home province. We have a very warm spot for our Manitoba neighbours, but any mention of secession must be viewed as idle talk—much to silly for serious consideration.

So said the editorial.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly feel that the editorial written by Mr. Fred Marshall of the Dryden *Observer* expresses our feelings very well throughout all of northwestern Ontario. In fact, following this editorial I had the pleasure of attending a chamber of commerce meeting in Kenora. And on the agenda of that meeting was a discussion on this very idea that northwestern Ontario should secede to Manitoba. I am pleased to report to this House that not one argument was presented to support such a move by the 90 businessmen present that evening. So this speaks well for the Robarts administration and the province of Ontario.

Mr. Speaker, the voters of my area expressed their faith overwhelmingly in the Robarts administration last October 17, and I assure you that they know they will not be disappointed.

During the past few weeks, several people in this Legislature, all of them on the Opposition side, have enjoyed spreading adverse reports concerning general economic growth in northwestern Ontario. Sometimes, Mr. Speaker, it made me feel like a pauper. They seem to enjoy fanning the flames of dissension and dissatisfaction. Now, let me place on the record a few interesting figures and statistics that disprove these.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): The member has changed his mind since last year.

Mr. Bernier: The aggressive community of Dryden with a population of 6,700 happy souls saw expansion last year to the tune of $2.7 million, including 72 new dwellings, costing nearly $1 million. Kenora, the tourist mecca of the northwest, is especially active with $2.2 million being recorded in new buildings. And just last week, Mr. Speaker, I had the honour to accompany the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Connell) to Kenora to assist in the official opening of that community's new sports arena, costing well over $700,000.

Industrial, commercial, institutional and residential development in northwestern Ontario in 1967 exceeded $36 million in that year. The Ontario housing corporation will spend $375,000 for the construction of 16 senior citizen units and 14 low-rental units for the lower income families in Kenora. Sioux Lookout and Hudson will receive six such units. And the Opposition said we would never get it.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Is this the same area you fellows were talking about?

Mr. Bernier: Dryden will receive ten senior citizens' housing units. Balmertown has received six OPP housing units and, Mr. Speaker, the granddaddy of all the projects in northwestern Ontario is the development at Ear Falls. Most of the residents here will be the permanent workers at the New Griffith mine at Bruce Lake, the massive iron ore development which is a $65 million investment.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): When are they going to process it up there?

Mr. Bernier: They are processing it now. The pellets are there.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bernier: A total of $80 million, Mr. Speaker, has been spent in this particular area, and the Ontario housing corporation is completing 100 low-rental units in Ear Falls. This mine will produce 1.5 million tons of iron ore pellets annually. And, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to report that the first shipment of iron ore pellets reached the Lakehead just last week.

Mr. Stokes: How many jobs did the government export instead of milling and manufacturing in the north?

Mr. Bernier: It is further estimated, Mr. Speaker, that here are seven potential mines under development capable of producing 17 million tons of high grade iron ore pellets worth more than $250 million a year, providing 5,000 additional jobs on a payroll of $25 million a year and an increase in population of the great northwest of some 40,000 persons.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): If the member had made that speech last year he would have been Minister of Mines.

Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, the new industrial incentive loan programme recently announced by the government has certainly taken its effect. I believe it was this morning, the Minister of Lands and Forests in conjunction with the Ontario-Minnesota Pulp and Paper Company, announced that a new sawmill and chipper plant would be constructed on the border of Keewatin, a town that was down and out.

We in northwestern Ontario are sometimes impatient, and while there is still much to be done great things are happening to our highways in northwestern Ontario. The Department of Highways for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1967, expended in the districts of Fort William and Kenora something like $20 million. Projects included work on the trans-Canada highway, the Lakehead expressway, the complete reconstruction of the Red Lake road, and 26 miles of hard surfacing on Highway 72 into Sioux Lookout, with construction crews busy on several sections of Highway 71 between Kenora and Fort Frances. This province's most northerly access road which will eventually link Pickle Crow and Red Lake, a distance of 265 miles, is well under construction. Seventy miles have been completed out of Pickle Crow, and nine miles of highway clearing at the Red Lake and is well under way at this moment.

Mr. Speaker, we are expecting great things from the government's announcement in the Throne Speech that an access road to resources programme will be instituted for the north. And let me remind you that access roads in our area are not an expense, they are an investment in your future and mine.

Things are not all that bad in northern Ontario, Mr. Speaker, but we know that the long term future of the area will be determined by the amount of investment that is directed to the task of developing the area's tremendous wealth of natural resources. I believe that one active and prominent industrial leader summed up the situation very well when he said: "For a population of less than 250,000 people, the industrial growth rate for northwestern Ontario reflects the gratifying picture of economic health."

I would like to remind the members of the House, and particularly the leader of the Opposition, I was quite impressed with his remarks when he opened up the Throne Speech and referred to all the promises that were made in the Kenora riding. I would refer him to the Kenora *Miner News* of September 13 which read:

> No Promises—Robarts tells PC Election Rally
>
> They talked about the sewer and water in Red Lake—we have it, it is done. Three new bridge structures in our riding—they are completed. A new Ontario Provincial Police building in Kenora—completed. A new provincial building at Red Lake—completed.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on and on and on.

While we are aware of our great potential, the opportunities in the field of investment are unlimited. We, in northern Ontario are looking forward to the second century with confidence and eagerness. Anxious for the challenges backed by the riches of unlimited potential and people of strength, determination, vision, and faith, we have already turned an empty land into a dynamic area. Surely an inspiration to the rest of this great province.

Our leader once said that the future is now in the north, and it will be so for the next 100 years. I agree with this statement very much, Mr. Speaker.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bernier: Now, Mr. Speaker, in the next few moments I would like to discuss our Indian people. The magnitude and complexity of their plight requires much patience and understanding. Yet to date, little research has been conducted to understand the deep psycho-economic need of the Indian in this large region of northern Ontario.

It should be realized that the problems here are different from the rest of the province because of the vast distances involved, and the isolation of population centres, and the limited surface transportation routes. Administration policies for Indians and programmes by governmental agencies or independent organizations are not always adequate or applicable in northwestern Ontario, despite their success in other areas.

The concensus in northwestern Ontario is that too often policies and programmes are based on ideas originating in the administrative centres of Ottawa and Toronto, and lack the residents' insight into the problem. The difficulties encountered and the failure rate of such policies and programmes would attest to the validity of these views.

In 1966, the province of Ontario signed an agreement with the federal government affecting the community development of the registered Indians living within the boundaries of the province. Once again the government of Ontario took the lead in facing its responsibilities towards the original inhabitants of this province.

Until a few years ago the concensus was that federal authorities were responsible solely for our first Canadians. New light has been projected on this question since a recent study made by the Hawthorne-Tremblay commission into our Indian affairs department argues that the absence of political activity is more a matter of policy than a question of constitution.

One has simply to consider that the natural resources most needed for community development are controlled by the province, and not by the federal government—land, timber, minerals, game, water, fish, hydro power and all their by-products. The provincial authorities are also in a better position than the federal government to attend to community development concerning a definite group of people living in a restricted area of the province.

Under the existing agreement, very little authority has been transferred from the federal to the provincial government. The transition is difficult, but one may question if there is enough effort being made at the provincial level to speed up this process. Mr. Speaker, during the last few years in the district of the Lake of the Woods, large amounts have been spent on the community development of our Indians, but a good percentage of this money has been squandered.

Our Indians are still plied with relief cheques, while we have failed to train them for local employment. This failure is due to several factors, but two will be identified as briefly as possible in my following observations. They are, the lack of acceptance by the Indians themselves of what is being planned by the white people; and the present jungle being created by too many government officials trying to better the life of the Indians.

On the first one, the lack of acceptance, this reaction of our Indians is rooted in history, and is a normal consequence of the heritage left by the establishment which ruled our Indians for over a century. One has to realize that since the invention of the reserve by the white man, the Indians have a profound and pervading mistrust for white people, and especially government officials.

This point was well illustrated by the research carried out by the Canadian welfare council on Indians in Law, 1967. They found that in all regions of the country, government officials were not considered friends, but rather enemies. The Indians of our district fear the intervention of the province in their affairs, since they think that it could result in losing their rights under treaty. To confirm their suspicions there are sad examples whereby their legal rights in hunting and fishing activities have been curtailed through provincial government regulations.

No doubt, the transfer from federal to the provincial can be made without the loss of rights, but very little has or is being done to alleviate the legitimate fears of the Indian people.

The various Christian denominations have also played a part in the past, a negative role in the community development of the Indians of the area mentioned previously. There are some areas where the Christian denominations have played and are playing a magnificent role in community development. However, it has unfortunately not been the case in all sections of our district.

For too many years these Christian denominations were engaged in un-Christian battles for statistical advantage of their records. The astute Indian played the market adhering to one denomination or another, according to the best offer, and getting involved personally in the petty dissensions of the church.

The situation has also reflected against the white people.

The last section of the "establishment" is the band council in its present form. In our area, these band councils are bound and sheltered by a number of traditions and taboos which prevent them from acting in a positive way to assist in community development. Those changes in The Indian Act which would give the band council the legal authority to assume the responsibility required in community development will be profitable in some parts of Canada, but not in our area, because the councils lack the educational skills and the administrative knowledge required.

The second item is the present jungle. Up to a few years ago, Mr. Speaker, the average Indian had to face just the Indian agent with a limited staff of two or three people. All his problems were channelled through that Indian agent. These Indian agents, or superintendents, reached their

position through their personal experiences in the field and with the attribute of a lot of good common sense.

With a very limited budget at their disposal, they succeeded in keeping the Indians alive. Now consider the situation of an average Indian—and let us call him Nitchi—living on a reserve near Kenora, who has to face a regiment of government officials, of both the federal and provincial governments in the field duplicating and, in many cases of community development, triplicating the services.

The Indian affairs branch has developed their administrative section on the basis of a large corporation, manipulating hundreds of millions of dollars. Each aspect of Indian life is under the supervision of a definite government employee with a title whose meaning passes right over Nitchi's head. He is required to fill out an increasing number of forms. As a result, there is a multiplication of identical surveys being carried out.

At the provincial level, Nitchi has to face another series of government employees. Since it is not clear in his head what the roles are of the federal and provincial governments, it adds to more confusion.

To give you a typical example, in the course of the same week, Nitchi may have separate visits from the federal community development officer, the provincial community development officer, the representative of the company of young Canadians and the federal economic development officer, the four of them, exclusively interested in community development with different approaches and aspects of community development.

In between, Nitchi may have to meet another half dozen or so of community officials, either federal or provincial.

Now, Mr. Speaker, Nitchi is a man of responsibility on his reserve and once in a while he hears vaguely, that the white people in Ottawa have voted more millions of dollars to help him and other Indians. Nitchi looks around his shack, lacking what white people consider the barest necessities of life. He is unable to obtain employment, which would give him pride and confidence in being able to find himself, and conscious only of the multitude of forms he has signed and the promises made by the various government agencies, and he wonders what it is all about.

Is it not another trick of the white man on the pretext of creating more jobs for the white people? Now, lately Nitchi has started to misuse alcohol. When he was asked the cause of his weakness, this was his answer: "I am getting so confused, perturbed and fed up with all these visits and plans from government officials, that I get drunk to forget about the whole thing for a few hours."

Evidently, Mr. Speaker, the above example does not apply to all our reserves or to all our Indians. Nevertheless, it does exist in my area and it is urgent that all concerned in the interests of our Indians get together and co-ordinate their plans.

As a suggestion, since the provincial government has instituted the Indian development branch, why not use this vehicle more extensively and centralize the maze of all government services through one agency?

Now in the periphery of Kenora, special community developments for Indians have taken shape during the last few years. They have typical Indian names – Widjiitiwin, Pawitik, Sabaskong corporations and Amik association. The basic role and function of these organizations is to reverse the role played by the Indians toward the white man, when the latter set foot on the North American continent. At that time, the Indians were partners to the white man. We survived and developed this country with the skill and knowledge provided by Indian manpower and by his generous and unselfish sharing of his natural resources. The partnership was ended, Mr. Speaker, when the country was subsequently discovered, surveyed and assessed by us. We then placed the Indians on the reserves and forgot about them. Consequently, through no fault of their own, they have missed the benefits of natural progress in our particular area of Lake of the Woods.

The corporations which I mentioned previously are organized to re-establish the partnership between the Indians and the non-Indians in a specific area, at the local level. The patnership is established with the Indians through the band members and councils, and they solicit the knowledge, skill and the general services of a voluntary, non-profit citizens' organization called Amik, organized to help and guide them in the world of the white man, and in the activities of a free enterprise system.

Amik, Mr. Speaker, is intended to serve only as a transitional function, until the Indians will be able to progress entirely by themselves in the mainstream of our national life.

The Widjiitiwin corporation is fulfilling a tremendous function in a new community near MacIntosh, just west of Dryden. This project is truly something to behold, a co-operative employment movement assisted only by the Oblate fathers. Under the direction of Father G. Paris, this movement has provided its 109 members with decent homes and regular year-round employment.

In the past 14 months they have produced over 6,000 cords of pulpwood and realized a profit of over $25,000 for the corporation. This group of Indians, who come from all sections of northwestern Ontario, have proven that they can provide a better way of life for themselves in a non-Indian world if provided with leadership, guidance and encouragement.

Now these corporations are independent and must remain so, far from the paternalism of government agencies and religious or financial organizations. The Indians have the freedom to drop the partnership whenever they judge it necessary, and in this partnership of community development, the corporations attempt to tap all sources of knowledge, skill, leadership and money which are available from government agencies, universities, companies, foundations and advisory committees. Now even though the provincial government has only recently entered the field of community development, the Indians of our district are grateful for what the province has already accomplished under the agreement with the federal government. Our provincial community development officer in that area is performing his duties very well.

Mr. Speaker, very briefly I would like to explain the structure and inter-relationship of these organizations. Amik association operates under a federal charter granted in 1964. Its directors are from non-Indian and Indian extraction. The non-Indian directors have already proved their capabilities and are eager to help Indians to get into the stream of non-Indian environment. The directors of Indian extraction are appointed by a majority of the directors of Amik. The Indian corporations have been formed at the request of the Indians themselves and their affairs are managed by a board of five directors. The chief of the band is the first director. Two more directors are elected by the people who have joined the corporations and the other two are appointed by Amik.

The provincial government, with a fresh approach to the Indian question, has taken the initial steps in involving the Indian people and their non-Indian neighbours in the process of finding solutions to their more persistent colleagues. In the case of the Indian corporations, Pawitik and Sabaskong and their advisory body, Amik association, the provincial government has seen fit to provide a grant to cover the expenses of Amik association's business manager.

Our Indians, Mr. Speaker, have now identified some of their problems and mapped out a programme of action. The directors of Amik have studied and approved the projects. However, funds in the form of long-term loans have to be made available to these organizations. Here is the opportunity for our provincial government, as guardian of our natural resources, to return to the Indians generously and unselfishly, a very small percentage of what the Indians turned over to us a century ago. All will agree that it is extremely important that initiatives, stimulated by the community development activities, bring some tangible results. Otherwise, it becomes another frustration or meaningless dream.

Resources should reach the community at the right time and in the right measure. Community development synchronization and sequence are vital in overcoming apathy. It becomes urgent to establish a fund quickly accessible, independent of the usual government red tape and operating under the authority of a responsible body, aware of the existing jungle which I described earlier.

This fund could be called an Indian development fund and the board administering it should be responsible directly to the final authority. Amik and its present and future subsidiaries are in a position to develop natural resources where they are, and to serve as the vehicle for Indians to enter our stream of life.

Second rate Indian education failed them at the most critical phase of their transition. These people went, they saw and returned home frustrated. It is apparent at this time that the Indian people in this part of northwestern Ontario will soon demand parity in economic and educational matters. The non-Indians of the province must be made aware of the necessity of granting this parity. This reflection of provincial government involvement is but a start and the necessary role that government must play if any lasting effect is to be realized. The Indian people are well aware that the ability to become an integral part of our society rests on the cornerstone of education.

Mr. Speaker, it has been said that the Indian people must strive toward autonomy, but little has been done by leadership training at the community level to direct the people to such a goal. The statement that we should help the Indians to help themselves is often quoted, but few realize that its meaning can only be fulfilled through the development of Indian leaders that can communicate effectively in both cultures.

In the isolated regions, poverty and its accompanying problems are a uniting force. The main problems are those relating to education, communication, subsistence and the lack of administrative knowledge. Many of these people are aware of the opportunities available to them as Canadians living within Ontario. Therefore we must hasten the leadership training of the individuals and recognize the leaders of the Indian communities, and we should strive to make these Indians effective in both Indian and white groups, and we should ensure that they are constantly reminded of their responsibilities to all Canadians. This can only be done through a co-ordinated effort aimed through leadership development within the framework of their cultural desires.

Mr. Speaker, the magnitude and the complexity of improving the living standards of our Indians is growing each day. In 1956, approximately 4,000 Indians resided in my own Sioux Lookout Indian agency.

In 1966, just ten years later, this figure rose to approximately 6,000 Indians, an increase of 51 per cent. Now, if this same population increase trend is maintained, the population in this agency by 1986 will be over 14,000.

How can a start be made to correct some of these shortcomings? I would say to transfer the obligation of looking after the Indian people from the federal to the provincial governments. There have been some transfers already, Mr. Speaker, in the field of education and welfare, but a complete transfer of all obligations and, of course, federal monies should be made to the provinces.

If this were done then we would have nine or ten small problems to be treated separately instead of one large cumbersome one to be solved in Ottawa far from the scene of action. There are almost as many difficulties to be solved as there are reserves. The reserves close to the city and those in the far north cannot be helped by the same means, or integrated at the same speed. Some partly integrated reserves will have a simple solution, but several generations of work will be needed for the more isolated ones.

If the provinces take over, there will be a closer-to-home interest and an attitude of a family affair to settle. I feel certain that the provinces will vie with each other to give the Indian very good treatment because they are a minority group, and as such will pull at the heartstrings of the body politic. Their treatment, Mr. Speaker, will have a far greater impact on provincial politics than it could at the distant federal level.

I realize, Mr. Speaker, that there is no simple method of helping the Indian people, which can be applied right across this vast nation, or even within the boundaries of our province. But the measures that I proposed will be an important step in the direction of improving the present situation.

Before closing, I would like to express, Mr. Speaker, my grave concern about the recent directive which has gone out from The federal Department of Health and Welfare, and I asked a question this afternoon of the Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond). This directive went out to all Indian chiefs and councils of this province advising them that health services to their people will be reduced.

Beginning April 1, we are told, Indians and Eskimos will be required to pay for their own medical services. In previous years, the government paid 95 per cent of all medical costs of these people. Now apparently, an Indian or an Eskimo must be declared indigent before becoming eligible for federal assistance. What this means, Mr. Speaker, is that Indians in my constituency and throughout Canada will be forced to wait until members of their families are seriously ill before seeking medical assistance, and thereby jeopardize the lives of those concerned.

The federal government, by cutting back on expenditures in this fashion is reducing the health services to the least affluent of our citizens, to those that need it the greatest. I believe that the new federal regulations will also put some outpost nursing stations in moth balls and it will end specialist care for Indians and Eskimos as well.

Mr. Speaker, since this is clearly a federal responsibility, I think it most important for the federal government to review this situation immediately, to ensure that health serv-

ices are available to our Indians and Eskimos and will be improved, rather than reduced.

The government of Ontario has the facilities within this province and could, I believe, assist in this programme, providing that the federal funds now being used were made available to our Department of Health.

Mr. Lewis moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we will continue with this debate and it might be that we will continue it on Thursday. At its completion we will commence the Budget debate.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 12:00 o'clock, midnight.

No. 31

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

First Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Wednesday, March 20, 1968

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1968

5

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Wednesday, March 20, 1968

Securities Act, bill to amend, Mr. Rowntree, first reading 1003

Ontario economic council, bill to establish, Mr. Randall, first reading 1003

Presenting the 1968 "Municipal Directory", Mr. McKeough 1004

Statement re the Homes for Retarded Persons Act, Mr. Yaremko 1004

Question to Mr. Bales re settlement at the Don jail, Mr. MacDonald 1005

Question to Mr. Robarts re OHSC premiums, Mr. MacDonald 1005

Questions to Mr. Wishart re divorce matters, Mr. Bullbrook 1005

Questions to Mr. Wishart re fingerprint records, Mr. Bullbrook 1005

Question to Mr. Grossman re the Don jail, Mr. Bullbrook 1006

Questions to Mr. Wishart re post mortems, Mr. Shulman 1007

Questions to Mr. Wishart re Canadian Oil takeover by Shell, Mr. Shulman 1007

Questions to Mr. Robarts re parking garage in Yorkville, Mr. Trotter 1007

Question to Mr. Rowntree re junior stock exchange, Mr. Burr 1008

Question to Mr. Gomme re Highway 11, Mr. T. P. Reid 1008

Question to Mr. Dymond re tuberculosis incidence in the Kenora area, Mr. T. P. Reid 1008

Question to Mr. Wishart re use of firearms by police, Mr. Peacock 1009

Question to Mr. McKeough re resignation of Windsor building commissioner, Mr. Peacock 1009

Resumption of the debate on the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Singer 1009

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Singer, agreed to 1039

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to 1039

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 20, 1968

The House met at 2:30 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: Today we have as visitors: In the west gallery members of Locks United Church, Huntsville and students from Parry Sound high school, Parry Sound; in the east gallery members of Christ Lutheran Church, St. Catharines; and in the Speaker's gallery, the women's art association of Toronto.

I am sure we welcome them all here this afternoon.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

THE SECURITIES ACT

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Securities Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Mr. Speaker, apart from housekeeping items, a number of significant changes are being advanced through these amendments.

One deals with the so-called scholarship plans or trusts, which are clearly brought within the Act by a change in the definition of security. Those selling such plans will be obliged to meet the licensing requirements of the Ontario securities commission, while those being asked to buy will, through a prospectus, have adequate information on which to base their decision.

In a further step to carry out the government's declared intention that the Ontario securities commission is to be independent insofar as is possible, while still retaining the desirable measure of Ministerial responsibility to the Legislature, the requirement under section 21(2) is being removed from the Act. Section 21(2) required that Ministerial consent must be obtained before investigations by the Ontario securities commission could be instituted.

The amendment to section 66(2) provides for the use of modern data processing methods by the commission.

Other amendments provide for the addition of two more working tools to aid the commission in carrying out its protective role.

The first, which may be used in substitution for or prior to prosecution depending on the nature of the conduct, would enable the commission to make application to the courts for an order to restrain further violations of the Act or requiring compliance with the Act. This can be done more quickly than prosecution, and can thus be more effective in many cases. At the same time, it does not leave the stigma which many people attach to conviction under the penal sections of the Act.

The second working tool provides the power to stop trading in particular securities by registrants when the market price of shares appears to be badly affected as a result of unfounded rumours or lack of information.

ONTARIO ECONOMIC COUNCIL

Hon. S. J. Randall (Minister of Economics and Development) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to establish the Ontario economic council.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Speaker, by way of explanation, the Ontario economic council has operated on an order-in-council for the last six years, dealing with other councils and other jurisdictions that are based on legislation. We find some difficulties and for that reason we recognize, in dealing with the economic council of Canada and other federal agencies, that it would be desirable to be established by legislation. After six years I am quite sure that the hon. members will recognize that there have been some changes and we want to bring the council up to modern day methods and enable them to deal with these other jurisdictions and other bodies that are established by legislation.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): I wonder if the Minister would permit a question on that, Mr. Speaker?

It was my understanding when he changed the name and functions of his department that he shucked off the economic responsibility onto the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. MacNaughton).

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): The bill has not passed the House yet.

Mr. Singer: Oh, the bill has not passed the House yet. Well, all right. Just keep us guessing as usual. Do not tell us what the government is doing.

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day I would like to draw the attention of the members of the House to the 1968 *Municipal Directory* which has been placed on their desks, and which will also be mailed to their homes.

I think I might say, Mr. Speaker, that those of us who have come of late into the public service are sometimes prone to criticize the slowness of government. I would draw attention, I would hope often, to cases where this is not true, to myself as well as to others. The 1968 *Municipal Directory* incorporates the very latest information as of January 1, 1968, and indeed changes were made up until the middle of February, so it is a very current book of reference and I think many people in the province make use of it. I would say we can only do this with the co-operation of a great number of municipal officials and we thank them for this help.

Hon. J. Yaremko (Minister of Social and Family Services): Mr. Speaker, I should like to announce to the House that regulations under the new Homes for Retarded Persons Act have been approved, bringing into effect higher provincial subsidies for the private organizations administering the homes. Under this Act the Ontario government supervises and supports these non-profit homes which provide residential care usually in connection with a school for mentally retarded children and adults.

The new regulations authorize an increase of governmental subsidy from 75 per cent to cover 80 per cent of the cost of the day-to-day operations of the homes. Adult residents who have incomes, such as a government allowance, and are paying part of the costs of care may retain a pocket allowance of $15 monthly. All necessities and comforts are usually supplied by the home.

For the purpose of paying the subsidy a daily average cost-of-care is established upon which the province pays the 80 per cent grant. Under the new regulations, this daily cost will be based on the last three months' period rather than upon the previous calendar year as formerly.

The homes will benefit financially since the subsidy will now take care of increasing expenditures quarterly instead of annually. The largest subsidies are payable to the homes from April 1, 1967, from the time when The Homes for Retarded Persons Act was proclaimed in force. This Act renewed the age limit for residents so that Ontario government support was made available to residential homes giving care to retarded adults as well as children.

A provincial capital grant of $5,000 a bed has encouraged an increasing number of associations for the mentally retarded to undertake construction of homes. There are four homes in operation in 1968. At least three more homes are scheduled to open and the prospects are that homes for retarded persons will be established at the rate of four to five a year. Capital subsidies from the province will be about $250,000 annually and the present operating subsidies of $100,000 will likely increase by $100,000 yearly.

The purpose of these homes is to provide a residence where retarded persons, particularly children, can stay while they are receiving education, training and whatever treatment will improve their capabilities. The aim is to develop to the utmost, the abilities of the child with the hope that he will eventually be able to fill a useful and satisfying place in normal society.

We certainly do not wish to see children spend a lifetime in an institution. The homes exist to give retarded children the fullest opportunity to progress to a stage where they can live happily and successfully in the outside world.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I have several questions.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order! I thought you had a statement; the member has a statement here.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the northwestern Ontario municipal association and myself I would like to thank the Premier (Mr. Robarts) and the Cabinet for the meeting we held this morning in the Cabinet room. I would like to thank the Cabinet and the Premier for the courtesy they extended to the delegation from northwestern Ontario and I would like to

inform the Premier and the Cabinet and this House that they are going back to northwestern Ontario very happy with this meeting.

Mr. Speaker: The member for York South has a question.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, I have two questions. My first is for the Minister of Labour.

Since officials of The Department of Labour were deeply involved in the recent settlement reached at the Don jail, what is the department going to do to ensure that the agreement is not continuously violated by management as detailed on the front page of this morning's *Globe and Mail*?

Hon. D. A. Bales (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I hesitate to comment on the basis of press reports, nor do I have any information that the agreement has been violated. But according to press reports, I understand that the union proposes to take up this matter with another department. At any rate, they have not been in touch with me, and I have no official information.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Prime Minister.

An hon. member: Too late for that!

Mr. MacDonald: My colleague asked "Which is the other department?" So rather than ask the Minister, I told him "Reform Institutions", and if I am wrong perhaps the appropriate Minister will correct me.

My second question is to the Prime Minister.

Now that the OHSC premiums have been increased by 69 per cent, is the government giving consideration to a complete or partial subsidization of premiums for those in lower income groups, comparable to the procedure under OMSIP?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, that matter is not under consideration at the present moment.

Mr. Bullbrook: Mr. Speaker, my first question is directed to the hon. Attorney General.

1. In view of the recent divorce legislation, is the Attorney General of the opinion that the province has the constitutional right to assign jurisdiction in connection with divorce matters from superior court judges to judges of the county courts?

2. If the answer to the above is yes, will the Attorney General recommend such assignment?

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I am sure the hon. member is aware that this is a basic constitutional question. A matter upon which there is much jurispudence. Without offering a definitive opinion at this time, I think I would say that our opinion is that judges of the county and district courts could be given the jurisdiction to hear divorce matters. But the manner by which this would be done would need very thorough and very careful consideration, and I would say that the matter is under consideration. This would be in the area of the new Divorce Act which is being processed at Ottawa.

Mr. Bullbrook: Does the hon. Attorney General consider that this would be efficacious in connection with the administration of justice throughout the province?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: The hon. member is very persistent in trying to get an opinion from me. I think there have been comments made by some very eminent people in connection with the administration of justice, that this would facilitate our administration in this area. I am favourably inclined to that view.

Mr. Bullbrook: I commend the hon. Attorney General for that answer and that attitude, thank you.

The second again to the hon. Attorney General.

1. Do the Ontario Provincial Police maintain on file the fingerprints of innocent citizens, and I might interject, sir, I mean by innocent those people not previously convicted of an indictable offence, of the province of Ontario?

2. If the answer is yes, approximately how many innocent citizens would be classified in this way?

3. Is the Attorney General in agreement with the Canadian civil liberties association that such records should be destroyed?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, the Ontario Provincial Police files do retain fingerprints of persons who have been arrested on indictable offences. These prints remain on file regardless of the disposition of the charge. This procedure is in accordance with The Identification of Criminals Act, Revised Statutes of Canada, chapter 144.

As to the second part of the question, it would be impossible to give a figure as to the number of prints that fall into that category.

The third part of the question, as to my opinion again, Mr. Speaker, I would point out that the civil liberties association takes a

position that would not permit police to keep any fingerprints of this kind, that is of persons who have not been tried or convicted. The case which caused this question, I think, is one where a man would have been buried as unknown if identification had not been established by past files.

I think that there are cases where fingerprints are of no value to police, but they may be of value for identification purposes in certain circumstances, such as in this case. I would point out that The Identification of Criminals Act is a federal statute and is one outside the jurisdiction of this province. At the present time, the Ontario Provincial Police and other departments are following the Act, which does provide for this retention of fingerprints, but I think that I should also point out, Mr. Speaker, that where a person is not convicted, or the case does not go to trial, then they make application to the police and the fingerprints are returned.

Mr. Bullbrook: I have a supplementary question for the Attorney General. In view of the fact that the statute is cited, as he has mentioned, an Act respecting the identification of criminals, and in view of the fact that these people are not criminals and in view of the fact that this Act does not speak out relevant to the destruction of this identification subsequent to the withdrawal or acquittal of the charge against an accused person, and in view of the fact that constitutionally, civil rights is a provincial matter, could the Attorney General assure this House that he is going to give some consideration to carrying forward a position of protection to people who have been charged and not convicted?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I think, Mr. Speaker, that I could certainly say this—I have been aware of the question that has been raised by the civil liberties association. I have not really had an opportunity, since this question rose very suddenly, to consider the Act, but it certainly is one that deserves consideration. I will be glad to give it.

Mr. Bullbrook: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to read into the record at this time a question directed to the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Davis). In view of the statement by the Minister that many thousands of individuals in the province are involved in education, and it would be impossible to hear representations from so many in connection with the new school boundary legislation, will the Minister assure the representatives of the established interested groups —I am sorry—of groups interested in these changes that they will be able to present their viewpoints before the standing committee on education? Thank you.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Bullbrook: He has not. If the member reads *Hansard*, he has not.

A question, Mr. Speaker, directed—I see that the Minister of Tourism and Information (Mr. Auld) is not in the House—to assist the member for York South, a question of which notice has been given, directed to the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions: In view of the reports in the newspaper this morning that the Don jail guards will strike again, will the Minister tell the House what steps he is taking to avert further strikes?

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): Mr. Speaker, in view of the apparent intent of some of the staff at the Metropolitan Toronto jail, as was reported in the news media, to send me a letter outlining their grievances—I might say that I have received no such letter as yet. I have initiated a preliminary investigation. I am advised that at the present time, three staff grievances are being processed, and in accordance with grievance procedure, if they are not resolved to the satisfaction of the employees concerned at the departmental level, they may, of course, at the discretion of the employees involved, be presented to a public service grievance board for independent adjudication.

Mr. Bullbrook: Mr. Speaker, with your permission I would like to read the question directed to the hon. Minister of Tourism and Information.

Mr. Speaker: The arrangement in the House, I would like to inform the member, is that when a Minister is not present the question is withheld until he is present. This week, due to the educational convention at which the Minister of Education is forced to attend, I obtained his permission to have them read in so that the answers could be prepared and given at the earliest possible moment. So the question will not be given.

Mr. Bullbrook: I take it, Mr. Speaker, that I would be entitled to direct the question if the hon. Minister comes into the House prior to the end of the question period.

Mr. Speaker: At the end of the question period I will see that you are given that opportunity.

Mr. Bullbrook: Thank you.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of personal privilege. I normally do not attempt to correct errors in newspapers—they are reasonably common—but in today's Toronto *Telegram* there is something more than an error and I wish to set the record straight.

Yesterday I asked the hon. Attorney General a question about the Rider case and I would like to read the quote in today's *Telegram*:

> Police and coroner's office officials had discouraged Mrs. Rider from looking at photographs because the body was badly decomposed, but Dr. Shulman was obviously not worrying about upsetting her.
>
> Dr. Shulman (NDP, High Park) told the Legislature yesterday that he had shown Mrs. Rider the photographs, and she had claimed they weren't those of her husband.

I wish to say for the record that, of course, I did not show the photographs to Mrs. Rider. I never had the photographs in my possession. The facts are that Mrs. Rider was called to police headquarters where they were shown to her by senior police officials.

I would also like to point out in defence of the Attorney General, and this is not going to happen very often, that the last paragraph in the article reads as follows:

> The Attorney General said that Mrs. Rider had been in touch with him over the photographs, and so he wouldn't take any further action on the case.

As I understood him to say it, he said exactly the opposite.

Mr. Speaker: Would the member please place his questions while he has the floor?

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, I have two questions for the Attorney General.

First, Mr. Speaker, will the department make a scale available so that in future post mortems in Orangeville bodies can be weighed?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, no, I do not undertake that we will make a scale available in Orangeville. I should point out that when the hon. member for High Park was chief coroner for Metro Toronto, I understand there was no scale available for a good deal of the time.

A scale, I may say, in that situation has been ordered for Metro Toronto. I would point out that the weight of a deceased, I am informed by doctors, is not of great value in post mortem examination, because weight varies very quickly, I am told, after death. It is useful where the bodies are badly damaged for the purposes of identification. I presume that we will get to the business of properly equipping all our autopsy areas or morgues as quickly as possible, but I do not think I should undertake in this specific situation, to order a scale right now.

Mr. Shulman: Will the Minister allow a supplementary question?

Is he aware, or could he find out for me how many scales are available throughout the province at the various medical pathological labs, or if there are any?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I shall attempt to do that.

Mr. Shulman: I have a second question for the Attorney General.

Will forgery and/or other charges be laid by the Attorney General in the Canadian Oil takeover by Shell?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: No, Mr. Speaker, I do not contemplate any such charges at this time.

Mr. Shulman: Would the Minister allow a supplementary question?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I will accept the question, I will not undertake to answer it because I think we are pursuing a matter that is very ancient really, and I am not sure I will be able to give an answer offhand. I will accept the question.

Mr. Shulman: In the Minister's reply to my first question, he said he would not be laying charges at this time. Does that mean that at some future time charges may be laid in this case?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: No, it does not mean that, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Premier. I gave notice March 18 of this question.

Has the Cabinet received from the city of Toronto an appeal to overrule the decision of the Ontario municipal board to deny the city permission to build a $1,277,500 parking garage in Yorkville?

If the answer to that question is yes, will the Premier indicate what consideration is being given to such an appeal?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, the answer is no.

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Highways.

Has the investigation in the Timmins section of the New Liskeard area into the irregularities in connection with the department equipment rental operation been completed? If so, when will the report of the investigation be available, and will it be tabled in the House?

Hon. G. E. Gomme (Minister of Highways): Mr. Speaker, the investigation is not as yet completed into the apparent irregularities relative to equipment rentals in the Timmins area. It is not known when the investigation will be complete.

Mr. F. Burr (Sandwich-Riverside): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Economics and Development.

In view of the Ontario housing authority's recent letter to the Windsor city council expressing willingness to consider facilities for a day nursery centre in public housing projects of a suitable size, will the Minister indicate:

1. What is considered a suitable size?

2. Whether present projects in Windsor can qualify for these facilities?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Speaker, I received this question too late to get the information today. I will take notice of it and get the information for the hon. member later.

Mr. Burr: Yesterday, Mr. Speaker, I had a question for the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs.

Does the Minister intend to follow through the suggestion made by Mr. Murray Watts at the convention of the prospectors and developers association last week, that a junior stock exchange be established where independent prospectors might raise capital for development of new mines by small companies?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Well, Mr. Speaker, I think I should remind the House of the inquiry currently being conducted by the securities commission; and the committee of that commission, chaired by Mr. Beatty, one of the commissioners. That inquiry has to do with the financing of mines and mining properties.

This committee has been holding public hearings in various parts of the province to look into the problems concerned and involved in mine financing. I gather that it is in connection with those current hearings that Mr. Watts delivered his remarks and suggestion at the convention of the prospectors and developers association last week.

There, therefore, will be no comment from me or my department until Mr. Beatty's committee reports on their findings and recommendations.

I think I should, however, tell the House, Mr. Speaker, that about 35 or 40 years ago in Ontario, and located in Toronto, there were two stock exchanges. There was the Toronto stock exchange and another one, called the standard mining exchange, and whatever the conditions were at that time, we know that the standard exchange was taken over by the Toronto stock exchange and formed a section of the Toronto stock exchange which constitutes today's operation of stock exchange matters with respect to both industrials and mining shares in this province.

It is of some interest to note that the suggestion of reviving a separate exchange having to do with mining financing has been raised by several groups who have made their representations to the Beatty committee. What the pros and cons of that suggestion are, I am not in a position to state. I think we will have to watch the proceedings of that committee, which are being reported quite fully in the press and are of some quite great interest to the public, I might say, and we will have to wait until the committee brings in its recommendations.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Highways.

Is the Minister aware of the deplorable and dangerous state of disrepair of that section of Highway 11, from Atikokan to Niobe Lake, a distance of some 20 miles?

Secondly, does the Minister's department have any current plans for repair of this section of Highway 11?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Speaker, the department is aware that this section of old Highway 11 has a fairly large number of frost heaves at this time of year. The department has no plans for immediate rebuilding of this section, but will be carrying out extra maintenance to help alleviate this condition.

Mr. T. P. Reid: I have a question for the Hon. Minister of Health, notice of which has been given.

In today's *Globe and Mail* an article states that 19 cases of tuberculosis have been diagnosed in the Kenora area, and that this area has the largest incidence of tuberculosis in the province. Can the Minister advise what

number of these 19 cases were Indian and non-Indian? Can the Minister advise why this area should have the highest number of tuberculosis cases in this province, and where are these people sent for treatment?

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, seven of the 19 cases were Indian, and 12 were non-Indian. The reason for the high incidence is the high incidence of tuberculosis among the Indian population. For the non-Indian population, the rate is not very much different from that of the rest of Ontario.

These people are usually seen first at Sioux Lookout hospital run by The Department of National Health and Welfare. They are then transferred to our sanatorium at Fort William for treatment.

Mr. H. Peacock (Windsor West): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Attorney General, and with your permission I would like to change the last word of the question. When I drafted it it did not contain the word which is used in the question that has been transmitted to the Attorney General. I think you will understand why I request your permission to change it.

Mr. Speaker: If the member would read his question as it was submitted and then—

Mr. Peacock: I will do so, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: —and then make the suggestions as to the change.

Mr. Peacock: In view of the shooting of a 14-year-old Windsor boy in a police chase, as reported in the Windsor *Star* will the Attorney General now introduce province-wide regulations governing the use of firearms by the Ontario Provincial Police and local police forces in the apprehension of—and the word as transmitted reads "criminals" —and my draft, Mr. Speaker, reads "suspects". I hope that the Attorney General will—

Mr. Speaker: I have no objection to it being changed, but I would suggest to this member and others that a great many of these errors would be overcome if the member himself would check the question before it comes down to my office. This obviously has never been done and it makes quite a bit of difficulty. Will you please proceed?

Mr. Peacock: I accept your advice, Mr. Speaker, and will endeavour to check the questions before having them sent down to your office.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Before considering the introduction of regulations, Mr. Speaker, I would want the matter to be fully investigated. This matter is now being investigated thoroughly and will be brought before the local board of police commissioners headed by the chairman, His Honour Judge Bruce McDonald. I would expect a further report from the Ontario police commission so that the matter may be most thoroughly investigated.

I would say, in addition to that, that the use of firearms is governed quite rigidly actually by standing orders which are promulgated and in effect in almost every police department in this province. The answer to the question is that the whole matter is being investigated and after that I would consider what further action might necessarily be taken.

Mr. Peacock: Mr. Speaker, my second question is for the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

1. Has the Minister received the petition of Windsor residents and property owners requesting an enquiry under section 320 of The Municipal Act into the resignation of the city's building commissioner?

2. If so, would the Minister indicate if he will agree to the request?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The answer, Mr. Speaker, to the first is "yes"; and to the second question, the matter is under consideration.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The 1st order, resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the amendment to the motion for an address in reply to the Speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor at the opening of the session.

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Mr. Speaker, may I begin, sir, by saying through you, to colleagues in this House who occupy the Cabinet benches that I hope to deal with various of their departments from time to time through the course of the afternoon. I therefore hope they will drift in from time to time during the same period.

As I rise, Mr. Speaker, to wind up this Throne debate for our yoeman group in the House, I shall dispense with some of the formal pleasantries. Congratulatory odes shower upon the divinely chosen from all sides and need no embellishment from yet another fellow in this dubious chamber.

Mr. Speaker, with certain exceptions I want to note, and I think there are many who would agree, that by and large the calibre of this Throne debate exceeds anything, certainly in my modest memory. As an ancient member, encrusted with years, sometimes weary, not always venerable, but ever spirited, Mr. Speaker, I must say that my blood was stirred by several engaging contributions.

Now, albeit the contributions came exclusively from this side of the chamber. It is sad perhaps for the government but immensely fortunate for the Opposition. Comparisons, gentlemen, are invariably invidious but I think that all in the House, including my colleagues, must agree that for the Liberal Party the member for Sarnia (Mr. Bullbrook) in his Throne debate was particularly impressive. I much enjoyed his contribution along with his colleagues from Rainy River (Mr. T. P. Reid) and Kitchener (Mr. Breithaupt). There were many others—they will form a telling triumvirate in the House.

As to our group, Mr. Speaker, as you well know, no praise is sufficient. I shall not tarry, no, I shall not tarry on the fitting of medals and epaulettes. I shall only say to you, sir, that one of the realities which has emerged in a pronounced fashion so far this session is clear and unequivocal.

Our party is no longer a rump group. We will not play the role of clown to the establishment. We will not join in that bi-partisan corruption of self. We are in this fight for the prize and we now have the resources to achieve it. What was a skirmish, Mr. Speaker, is perhaps presently a battle.

I think one of my colleagues said that politics was war without bloodshed, and we so serve notice, amicable notice, gentle notice, friendly notice, but unmistakable notice. Mr. Speaker, we are going to achieve the heights of power, I want to say to you, under the leadership of a man who, in the context of what prevailed before, was the most successful politician in this province in last October's general election.

Another reality, Mr. Speaker, I shall deal with in a few moments, but first a related observation. Just last Friday the member for Huron-Bruce (Mr. Gaunt), I think it was, in a friendly, ideological foray asserted that while the government had moved to the right so we had moved to the left. His analysis of where that placed the Liberal Party in the scheme of things was rather less definitive.

Two nights ago the member for Sudbury (Mr. Sopha) rose in his seat to, perhaps, put it in perspective. But before I deal with what came by way of an aside—which I am sure the member for Sudbury will appreciate—I want to take my hat off to him, Mr. Speaker, as that member who has managed the role of press agent for the member for High Park (Mr. Shulman) with a quality which cannot be challenged. It was—

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Has the book gone up?

Mr. Lewis: It was, Mr. Speaker, perhaps the finest promotional public relations job that this Legislature has witnessed. I am told that you cannot buy for love nor a million a copy of *Anyone Can make a Million* in the city of Toronto at the present moment. It absolutely exhausts the imagination—

Mr. Sopha: Does the member agree that the title of the book is ethical?

Mr. Lewis: —the versatility of the member for Sudbury.

Mr. Sopha: Does the member agree that the title of the book is ethical?

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, let me deal with the title.

Mr. Sopha: Tell me, does the member agree it is ethical to put a title like that on a book?

Mr. Lewis: Let me deal with the title, Mr. Speaker. The invention of the man is quite breath-taking, that from a title Mr. Speaker, from so inconsequential as ingredient as a title, one could fashion such a bonanza of sales. Yes, such a bonanza of sales. I must say, Mr. Speaker, that to invoke a paragraph which, if the member for High Park will forgive me, I hope I do not offend him—a paragraph which merely states one of the notable truisms about the investment market and to fashion from that paragraph and title such a public relations job is really quite first rate, Mr. Speaker. I congratulate the member. But I am gently suspicious—

Mr. Sopha: The member agrees with the "Buy American."

Mr. Lewis: I read in the last several weeks that Pierre Berton's book, *The Smug Minority* was having difficulty in the market place and I am gently suspicious that perhaps —dare I say it?—perhaps the member for Sudbury has again fashioned another coup in that direction.

I was told that on an up-coming Pierre Berton programme the member for Sudbury is to appear to debunk *The Smug Minority*—

Mr. Sopha: At $1.60 a word!

Mr. Lewis: Right!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: At any rate—back to the ideological realities, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Sopha: I am demolished, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Lewis: Not yet.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lewis: Two nights ago the member for Sudbury rose in his seat to explain things for the member for Huron-Bruce—

Mr. Sopha: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. A message has just been received that Cole's book store have a whole shelf of *Anyone Can Make a Million* at 99 cents each!

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

An hon. member: Now the member has got us!

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to deflate the member, but yesterday the price was 95 cents each!

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Today it is two for 95 cents!

Mr. Lewis: It was a stirring performance on that occasion, Mr. Speaker.

I cannot pretend to recapture it—eyes glowering, finger jabbing, arm cocked in that ferocious legal style, cheeks fairly quivering with passion, shoulders listing slightly to port, body rocking, left fist sweatily clenched and voice commanding the errant attention of this entire chamber, the member for Sudbury purported to put to the House what he felt was obviously the weight of human knowledge, from Genghis Khan to Queen Elizabeth, summed up in one single revelation.

And it was a mind-boggling revelation, Mr. Speaker, it was a mind-boggling revelation. In the breathtaking silence of this chamber it came forth—the member for Sudbury said, "This is a changing world—"

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lewis: "—wherein all things are given to change."

Well, Mr. Speaker, as cute a piece of self-awareness has not been offered in this chary chamber in many a year, and more than that, as perceptive a commentary on the Liberal Party as we are likely to receive this session. But between the right and the left, Mr. Speaker, there lies the ever-shifting middle ground, and I am sure that everyone recalls that couplet: "They have no shape because they never take sides; And they have no sides because they are never allowed to take shape."

But more of that anon, Mr. Speaker, more of that anon.

I cannot challenge the left-right polarization of this Legislature. I suggest that it is the healthiest development in decades. It is true that the New Democratic Party in Ontario has moved left; more radical in its analysis, more militant in its language. The government knows, because withal, the government understands that this is no idle posturing. It is a position which must be dealt with precisely because it has no ephemeral qualities. It is rooted in an avowed set of social convictions whether expressed, Mr. Speaker, in the philosophic musings of my colleague, the member for Lakeshore (Mr. Lawlor) or the set of descriptive axioms from the member for Sandwich-Riverside (Mr. Burr) or the no nonsense dialectic of the member for Brantford (Mr. Makarchuk) or the Freudian context of my colleague, the member for Beaches-Woodbine (Mr. Brown). We adhere to those things, Mr. Speaker, and we shall not equivocate.

Now somehow we certainly touched the Tory inner core. They see the confrontation; we welcome it. Never can one remember so —I suppose "sophomoric" is the most charitable word for it—so sophomoric an outpouring of pro-private enterprise anti-socialist vitriol. That side of the House, Mr. Speaker, is moving so far right so rapidly, it is almost beyond the pale of realistic political discussion, and in its place they offer an incessant invocation to the last rites of the Tory ritual. I want to repeat it for the record just to set the stage for what I later want to say.

The hon. member for Hamilton Mountain (Mr. J. R. Smith) early in the debate said:

> I feel, Mr. Speaker, that Canada's steel industry has demonstrated in a very real way the innate superiority of the private enterprise system as the creator and distributor of wealth and as a provider of jobs and security.

He was followed by the member for York East (Mr. Meen), who talked about all that has been achieved by utilizing private enterprise, the initiative of our citizens and, in every case, stimulated by the "prospects of

reward." There is an enticement for the social mores of a society, the prospects of reward!

The member for Quinte (Mr. Potter) reverted to the form that we have heard in other sessions and said:

> In Canada today, and in every other country in the world, there is a group of people ever increasing in size who unwittingly, perhaps, and without sinister intent, are determined to destroy all individuality and to establish a state-controlled society. More and more we see our governments being influenced by this group to offer us increasingly socialistic policies. By socialistic policies, I refer to services rendered by the state and controlled by the state to everyone, regardless of need, ability to pay, or the individual's own wishes.

The former chief whip for the government, the member for London South (Mr. White) talked in his Throne speech about the "totalitarianism" of the New Democratic Party. The member for Fort William (Mr. Jessiman) expressing admirable intuition for the unhappy defeat of the previous member for Fort William said that it was an expression by the voters against his association with a "band of stereotyped, unswerving, dogmatic, political evangelists whose main interest in the north was to tear it down, rather than build it up".

And the finale, I suppose, was offered by the member for Ontario South (Mr. W. Newman), who played the role of lackey to the Bell Telephone corporation in a way that this House has seldom seen.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is significance in all of this. I want to suggest to you, sir, that the endless expression of fealty to free enterprise is the last refuge of disintegrating Bourbons. That is what is happening in this Legislature.

Well, it has a comic aspect; it has its own frail humour. For us in this party it is a pleasure that we have become such a focus of preoccupation for the government. That pleases us greatly. And curiously, Mr. Speaker, and curiously—in fact, extraordinarily, if I may spare them for a final moment, for the official Opposition as well—I shall not spare them many moments in this debate. There are more important things to do; but I think this should be put on record.

Perhaps we do not take it with appropriate grace, to be so courted, to have such attention lavished upon us requires for us some political adjustment. Throughout the Throne Speech, Liberals, too, have shifted dramatically to the right. A not so accidental place in the Tory sun, Mr. Speaker, as I shall shortly demonstrate. And let me remind the members how. The member for York Centre (Mr. Deacon) and I quote:

> The climate for investment must be favourable in order that securities can be readily marketable and a basic requirement is that a company must be of substantial size. So continually attacking corporations because of bigness is defeating our objective. I am as ready as anyone in this House, and I have done it plenty of times in the past, to attack poor corporate citizens, but the freedom for individual initiative, the high standard of living of our free enterprise system, is to be cherished, not irresponsibly attacked.

Well, let the member for York Centre ask the member for Parkdale (Mr. Trotter) about housing in this province for the high standard of living in our free enterprise society; and let him ask the member for Huron-Bruce about the farmers in this society, and let him ask the member for Scarborough East (Mr. T. Reid) about the class system of education in this society.

Then the member for Essex-Kent (Mr. Ruston) joined the debate and talked about the "destruction of the initiative of a small group of producers to temporarily guarantee the success of the majority, which smacks too much of rank socialism which farmers would rather starve than accept".

And the member for Port Arthur (Mr. Knight) talked about the bitter venom of sarcasm, slander and calumny, and so on—I need not repeat it all.

And last night, Mr. Speaker, last night the member for Kitchener, and I have said before, a very able maiden speech it was, indicated that he had been given the responsibility for consumer affairs in the Opposition caucus, and I quote:

> —and it is in this area that I, as an urban member of this House, feel the strongest sense of community with those rural members who are attempting to obtain fair farm prices for their constitutents' products. One way to bring this about is to allow the marketing of agricultural products to face both the heat and the light of the open market. Surely the removal of the unnecessary friction of subsidized and controlled marketing schemes would do much to intelligently rstionalize the market on a simplified system of supply and demand.

Adam Smith and John Wintermeyer resurrected in the Ontario Legislature! It was, I am sure, to the Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. Stewart), virtually unbelievable. The Minister is no reactionary slouch, but he could fair not believe what he heard from the official Opposition.

I suppose we had our crescendo in the words from the member for Grey-Bruce (Mr. Sargent) who came to his peroration in his Throne Speech commenting that:

We must get back to things like free enterprise and this system is the only answer. We must, I think, Mr. Speaker, get the area of big business to do things for this country, give big business some elbow room and get them into the act.

Well, so be the tenor of debate from the Liberal Party, Mr. Speaker, a preoccupation with balancing budget that is older even than Ricardo; a series of observations in Throne Speeches which move dramatically to the right, and a hybrid admixture of those constituent parts to qualify for 90 per cent under medical care which none of us in this party could comprehend; a general movement which is all the more significant in terms of what it means, because it was a prelude to the denouement which followed two nights ago.

You see, and I can be no more direct in the rest of my speech than I am at the moment, Mr. Speaker, a most unusual element has entered the legislative atmosphere this session.

I would not deal with it if it were not so significant. We in this caucus consider it to be of the utmost importance. It is for the most part just a feeling on occasion it is a telltale nuance. Sometimes it is even indirectly expressed. But the Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) has caught it, Mr. Speaker. The Prime Minister is a discerning, and sensitive man, never to be underestimated. He has caught it with that deft for which the Prime Minister is noted. His antennae have quickened to the most curious revelation of this session: consciously or unconsciously, the official Opposition does not want to become government. They have opted out of the process. They have made formal application to the club, to that wholesale gentlemen's agreement. They will mute their criticism, they will play the court jester for the eminence grises on the Tory benches. They will share the knowing winks and the cultivated glances, and like all memorable fairy tales, they will live happily ever after.

So it takes little imagination to see the figurative meeting between the Prime Minister and the member for Sudbury. "Elmer," says John, "Casey having struck out, and the rest of our team being unequal to the task, won't you please step in and do the job? After all, Elmer, what else is friendship for?"

"Very well, Mr. First Citizen"—always formal—"what you command, I shall perform," said the humble and retiring member for Sudbury.

And that is what it was all about, Mr. Speaker. It was the first public demonstration of the incipient coalition for 1971.

Mr. Speaker, with our childlike innocence, we recognized that the emperor on that occasion had no clothes. I just want to make note.

I do not mind reactivating the coalition, Mr. Speaker, but I wish that it would wait for a year or two, it would be much more pleasurable.

I shall not dwell on the performance. I had thoughts, and I share this with the member for Sudbury, because aside from other things, he knows the respect that I personally have for him.

The debunking of prayers is self-evident. I have missed prayers in this chamber for five years without calling a press conference to announce it. The derision for emblems and flags, Lieutenant-Governors and the monarchy is not unpalatable to me, although I think that it is a grand political diversion which effectively obscures all the gut issues.

This feeling that you can somehow establish a national identity by the constant repetition evades me. I have a little poem by Frank Scott, entitled "national identity" and I thought that I would read it to the House, because I thought that it had some relevance at this point. It deals with a major conference at which Frank Scott was a delegate.

> The Canadian centenary council,
> meeting in the Reine Elizabeth
> to seek those symbols
> that will explain ourselves to ourselves
> evoke unlimited responses
> and proof that something called Canada
> really exists in the hearts of all
> handed out to every delegate
> at the start of proceedings
> a portfolio of documents
> on the cover of which appeared in gold
> letters
> not
> "A Mari Usque Ad Mare",
> "Dieu et mon Droit",
> not
> "Je me Souviens",
> not
> "E Pluribus Unum";
> but
> "Courtesy of Coca Cola Limited."

The reverence for Charles de Gaulle is perhaps quaint, although to attribute to him enlightened colonial policies is a considerable distortion of history. In any event, why become rhapsodic about the querulous senility of an aging autocrat?

Even the attack on Pierre Berton, while extreme and unwarranted, is, I suppose, marginally fair game. Mr. Berton will write more

books, and produce more TV programmes of excellence, will recite further radio commentaries, with or without the admonitions from Sudbury. Mr. Berton can defend himself. And, Mr. Speaker, so can the member for High Park.

He will do so now as a private member, just as he will four years hence as a Cabinet Minister. The arrows of outraged fortune bounce off with comparative ease.

Mr. Sopha: Get my ticket to Mozambique!

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): I will pay for it!

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, we are pleased to accede. Two observations might be noted, Mr. Speaker, just to close the record on this, point.

I suggest to you that it sits not well with the member for Sudbury to so righteously defend Royal commissions, when his attacks on the judiciary last session were sufficiently provocative that the Prime Minister at one point—a memorable point that all of us remember—rose in his seat to express reservations about a further judicial appointment lest it be attacked again by the member for Sudbury.

It sits not well with the member for Sudbury to judge levels of invective and innuendo, when last session, one day before prorogation, during the second reading of the University of Western Ontario bill, he accused the Minister of University Affairs (Mr. Davis), of denying a student seat on the board, in direct return for an honorary doctorate from the University of Toronto.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Innuendo eh?

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, the government was not thumping at that point. I am reminded of the Churchillian aphorism that it is wise to look before you thump. The use of intemperate language is not without precedent anywhere in this House. I may say that the member for Scarborough West is often at fault. Extremities of language are, at times, the by-product, surely, of heated exchange.

Just last Thursady, the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs (Mr. Rowntree), at a peak of debate, invited me out into the hall, where one ssumes that the whimsical would have become the physical. And, I note, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Sopha: The member would have fixed it.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, I did not have confidence in my pugilism and I stayed in the House. If the Minister had been willing to slander me outside the House I would have acceded to that; but to other things—no.

I also note in a column by Douglas Fisher and Harry Crowe for the Toronto *Telegram* of March 8 last, that they quote an observation, apparently coming via the member Grey South, (Mr. Winkler), saying that one Minister had pointed a finger across the alley at Stephen Lewis and shouted, "I hate your bloody guts"—

Mr. MacDonald: The Provincial Treasurer.

Mr. Lewis: I am not sure who it was, Mr. Speaker. As a matter of fact, I must say I have not yet found the identity of my affectionate devotee. I do not really know who it was and I say Mr. Speaker, I have no particular objections if the Ministers want to ventilate their repressed aggressions that way, so be it. They are better directed against members of the NDP than the citizens of the province of Ontario.

However, Mr. Speaker, reference to these various Ministers does bring me to my focus. There in the two rows, not overflowing I note, sit the finest of the grey. A tattered crew, tired, timorous, testy and toppling. The end of the era has arrived, Mr. Speaker, and I urge you not to accept my evaluation. I want to read to you from one far more prescient than myself—one skilled in the ways of perception to the like of which I could not aspire. Don O'Hearn in the Windsor *Star* of March 2, writes "Weary Government Now Failing to Cope" and I shall read some paragraphs:

> If this government is not an administration that could be heading for eventual defeat, the writer's 20-odd years in observing politics have been completely wasted.
>
> As of now, you wouldn't, or at least I wouldn't give the Robarts administration one chance in five of winning the next election when it comes three or four years from now.
>
> The session has been under way now for two weeks and the outstanding impression it has left is that the government just isn't with it—can't cope with the problems it is facing today. It is tired. It reflects tiredness. The Premier has given one major speech . . . it was a tired speech delivered in a tired manner. It was a speech of a man either too wearied or too complacent. If the government does go down a few

years from now its loss will be mostly due to strangulation based on lack of decisiveness and an attitude of defeatism.

Defeatism, Mr. Speaker, there lies the key, and how could it be otherwise? The government is riddled with inadequacy. One department after another is showing gaping holes in its administrative structure or in its policies. I cannot deal with them all, Mr. Speaker, but some of them are worthy of note. And curiously—if I may offer this to new members without presumption—there are several incidents this session, chiefly those in question period, which illuminate the character of Ministers and of their departments and which allow members of the Opposition to measure that which may come in the next several months.

Now there are some Ministers about whom I wish to say nothing.

The Minister without Portfolio from Scarborough North (Mr. Wells)—there is nothing to say. The Minister from Stormont (Mr. Guindon)—I think he knows that we wish him well. He is a new member of the Cabinet and he has the fond regard of this House. I am sure he recognizes that. Public works and tourism have been reduced to nondescript functions which merit little comment.

Municipal Affairs—a Minister who upholds the right wing of Cabinet pretensions but in my mind, if I may be allowed an observation, an able Minister, Mr. Speaker. I was rather saddened by the newspaper editorials which followed the appointment of the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. McKeough) and which faulted his ability simply because he is a neanderthal.

Now, Mr. Speaker, because a Minister holds to fossilized beliefs does not mean that one must fault his ability. I suggest, and the House should mark, that the Minister will make his impression felt on this Legislature. He is a man of ability. His department may go nowhere, Mr. Speaker, but it will go nowhere with ability.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Mines (Mr. A. F. Lawrence)—that was indeed a stunning appointment. And I want to take a moment out, if I may from the time of the House, to try to prick the mythology because the Minister of Mines was never really an outspoken dissident. The reputation, Mr. Speaker, came during that period of Bill 99. What the Minister of Mines did on that day as a private member was not a matter of criticism. It was a matter of rescue, for which the government should ever be grateful and for which the reward invariably followed. The Minister of Mines has always been a very cautious Tory, constantly nurturing the anxious portrait of heresy.

Now, Mr. Speaker: what a come down. The heresy has been absorbed by the promotion.

And what about the portrait, Mr. Speaker, what about the portrait? Well, during the election campaign, because within the riding he represents there exists that extraordinary place called Yorkville, the Minister of Mines had printed a psychedelic portrait, the like of which no member in this House has seen. I am sure, the like of which no one in this Legislature has ever viewed before. It was really quite compelling. It won the Yorkville vote en masse and right on Yorkville, Mr. Speaker, at one of the important intersections of that street stands the portrait of the Minister—the psychedelic portrait of the Minister, pasted against the dividing wall of the Mynah Bird, Toronto's only topless nightclub.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Brunelle) is newish and impressive; a good Minister we feel, taking a grip on his department. The Ministers of Highways (Mr. Gomme) and Energy and Resources Management (Mr. Simonett)—dare I say it—compassion precludes analysis. But for all the rest the record speaks and it reveals a persistent theme, not only indecision and occasional duplicity; but also the constant presence of class. A class-based party with a class-focused view as though there were some need to underline the New Democratic Party analysis.

I want to deal with some of those departments, Mr. Speaker, and what they indicate by way of the session thus far.

The first I want to deal with very briefly because it is not exactly my field, I admit, is The Department of Agriculture and Food.

Now there is just no question that the Minister is a superb stump orator and a fiercely partisan man in the House, which at times, accounts for the vulnerability. The focus of the session in The Department of Agriculture and Food, as members opposite well know, has been the Canada and Dominion Sugar Co. and the incredible though predictable saga on the way in which the government has handled that issue.

Throughout we had protestations of dismay and innocence. There was even invective and all kinds of promises of assiduous efforts to solve the problem. Back on February 16, when the Minister announced it in the House, he said that he had to confess

that his reaction was one of stunned disbelief that this could have happened. On the same day in answer, I think, to the hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Nixon), the Minister said:

> —there are many alternative suggestions; expropriation might be one consideration; however, we are looking at all these alternative possibilities.

On March 5 he said,

> —there were many alternatives discussed at our meeting in Ottawa; there were suggestions made, all of which are under consideration by us; however, at the moment I have nothing further to report other than to say that we are giving very serious consideration to the suggestions that were made yesterday by the suger beet producers marketing board.

On March 8, he said to the House:

> I regret to say that no decision has been reached as yet. The matter is still under consideration.

On March 12, the farm and country sugar trustees were apparently under consideration by the Minister. Finally, on March 14, the obituary of Ontario's sugar beet industry was read in the Legislature by the Minister of Agriculture and Food. A complete and total and unremitting capitulation to corporate interests.

Mr. Speaker, all of this, despite the tragedy, perhaps the mortal blow, for some 900 sugar beet farmers; despite the sowing plans for spring; despite the 20,000 acres that were planted last year; despite the company's verbal assurances of a five year guarantee before this kind of thing was even contemplated, let alone enacted; despite federal-provincial efforts at intervention; despite a decision of a board of directors whose board comprised seven non-Canadians and five Canadians, as the Minister himself indicated; despite the absence of any alternative and equal cash crop for income. A total and ignominious capitulation.

Again, Mr. Speaker, we have corporate dominion. Again, the government would not expropriate; the government cannot guarantee the machinery will be bought; the government caved in, and when the chips are down class loyalties will inevitably triumph. What price 1,000 farmers for an international cartel?

If the Minister, and I say to him perhaps whimsically, but I say it nonetheless, if the Minister has to, and he has to, he will run off to Vic Tanny's in order to bring himself into the physical shape necessary to produce the contortions when one prostrates oneself before big business. If the Minister has to, he will consult every dictionary that exists in order to find the verbal convolutions necessary to argue his way out of the impasse. Government will be debased, Mr. Speaker, to the extent that the corporate groups dictate.

Mr. Speaker, as though one required confirmation of it, we have also seen this session the entry in a rather typical way of the hon. Minister of Trade and Development (Mr. Randall)—I shall accord him the title of his new department—a man who provides succour through all of this for the government, the man who wheels and deals par excellence, a convivial and congenial Minister, who does on occasion reduce all argument to the level of a Rotary club quip and questionable humour.

This is one occasion, Mr. Speaker, where I suggest to you there is more bravado than performance, and it is evident everywhere. It is evident in the Ontario housing corporation, because no matter how many announcements and pronunciamentos one hears from the opposite side of the House, housing in this province remains a critical lack, with no solution in sight. When the Minister was asked—I think it was by a member of the Liberal Party—about the Ontario development corporation and what he had achieved in the session thus far in the year past, he indicated that ten loans were provided and that two of these loans amounted to $2,200,000. So much for industrial development under the Ontario development corporation.

Mr. Speaker, I raise these things because the hon. Minister of Trade and Development is the most serious continentalist in this chamber. With Messrs. Sharp, Winters, and most of the federal Liberal Party, he joins with his colleagues in the Treasury benches in bringing this country and the economy of this province firmly into the ambit of the United States. And for that, Mr. Speaker, there is absolutely no excuse whatsoever.

He repudiates Canadian sovereignty. The government mocks nationhood; this government ridicules concepts of independence. They have one mission—to turn all of Ontario into a branch plant economy and they pursue that mission with total preoccupation, and they reject the obvious truth that political domination follows economic servitude; and this Cabinet embraces a concept of corporate citizenship which seeks to place all obedience before any who would use or abuse them.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is a rather critical situation in the province of Ontario, because, of course, the province does not act independently. If the province would act independently, then it might be possible to cry "halt" to some of the drift that presently exists. The Minister does not understand the drift nor

does the rest of his department, Mr. Speaker. The Minister probably does not understand what has happened on the international gold market; the Minister apparently does not see the significance of international cartels controlling a variety of economies, and our economy is just as contingent upon those corporate decisions as any other.

When the crisis worsens, Mr. Speaker, when countries start taking restrictive measures to reduce the balance of payments deficit; when the interest rates go up and the cutbacks appear on travel spending; and they reduce imports and world trade slows down and unemployment rises; then we see the exposure of the most compelling fallacy of the capitalist system—a system which the Minister best projects—and that is, Mr. Speaker, that greed and avarice dictate speculation, regardless of the international consequences.

Now the gnomes of Zurich and Messrs. Winters and Sharp, and the Minister of Trade and Development, sir, form a rather unattractive cabal. And there is really no answer for this province's future, Mr. Speaker, in the field of economic development and in our capacity to remove control and domination from another source other than a complete substitution of that government. You cannot be a vassal in a corporate state. The nature of technological society does not permit of serfdom.

Mr. Speaker, we are all surely internationalists now—that is what bewilders members of this party. That is why, frankly, I placed the resolution on Viet Nam on the order paper, because of course behind the gold question and the deficit which the United States incurred was the enormous spending of the war in Viet Nam, and it seems to us in this party, Mr. Speaker, on frequent occasions that international issues, which directly affects what goes on in this province, have to be dealt with in this Legislature. This is true whether it is the pathology of a president, barbarism in South East Asia; the complicity of the Canadian government in what occurs, or the use of international bankers to abuse the gold market and to speculate for purposes of avarice at the expense of entire economies. Whatever the proposition, we are prepared to fight it, to protest. And we view this as the real issue in this country at this moment. It is not a simple, constitutional redefinition of Confederation which should concern us. It is all these other things which should concern us, or what is a nation for, if I may put it that way?

Now the third department that I want to take a moment to deal with, Mr. Speaker, has the Minister in the House, and I suppose it is a gentle comedown from international trade and Viet Nam to Reform Institutions. I must say of this Minister that he is often in the House, usually in the House, and we in the Opposition respect that fact. A resourceful Minister; but a trustee, Mr. Speaker, if he will permit me, of a wretched department whose singular vice is the inappropriate incarcernation of juveniles and adults. It is not that the Minister does not attempt to administer his department well, it is not that the Minister lacks capacity, because those of us who have watched him in debate and in repartee know of those capacities. It is simply that the department as a department should not exist; and it is the cruelest anomaly in the entire field of social reform.

To improve it—this may strike the Minister as curious—but to improve it as the Minister is attempting, is the most perfidious act of all, because it is wrong. It is wrong to attempt to erect a façade which then defends the indefensible. The Minister should dismantle his department entirely—dismantle his department. Let him rise in his place at the end of the Throne debate as he winds up for the government and announce the dismantling of his department.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): I am making note of that.

Mr. Lewis: All right, he is making a note of it, Mr. Speaker. I am delighted to see that and some of us will even twitch in his direction occasionally during his speech in return.

Now we will deal with most of his department during the estimates, Mr. Speaker, but I do want to say a word about an aspect which my colleague, the member for Beaches-Woodbine dealt with yesterday, and that was section 8 of The Training Schools Act—if the Minister will permit.

I had asked the Minister a question on February 22 about rescinding that particular section of the Act which, as you know, allows for the assignment of juveniles to training school, regardless of age. This is children and juveniles to training school without any particular charge having been laid.

Now the Minister invoked a variety of authority to substantiate the inclusion of the change in the Act. I say to him that many of us have consulted legal opinion and find that clause the most offensive to civil liberties in child legislation in this province. When the

Minister says, as he does in his statement, that no decision under this section can be directed against the child, and that the child has a right of appeal, then let me say, as the Minister knows, there is now a case pending in the county of Carleton on precisely that question of appeal, where the effort to work out the appeal, was so complex that one does not know whether the statute can even be brought in for the purposes of argument.

Now, Mr. Speaker, again, most of the legal opinion with whom we have consulted think this is an abominable clause. I point out to you, Mr. Speaker, that it allows a child or a juvenile in the province of Ontario to be consigned to a training school without charge, without having committed any anti-social act, without any history of delinquency, with no violation of the criminal code, simply because the child could not be appropriately handled.

Hon. Mr. Grossmon: May I ask the hon. member a question, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Lewis: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Will he agree that when I brought in this Act before this Legislature that he—and I quoted this the other day as a result of his question—I said this was a very "progressive, forward-looking Act." And it was precisely because we removed the stigma of delinquency from the child, that he approved of section 8. It has been considered by all correctional authorities as being one of the most progressive pieces of legislation in the juvenile field. He agreed with this at the time.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, I certainly harbour no objections to the intervention. I have two comments to make on it. One is that, as the Minister himself noted when he read the extract from my remarks at the time, I had a pretty serious caveat at the end—that the flaw in the whole system was the nature of the institutions to which children would be assigned. Now that does not entirely answer his argument, I will come to that in a moment.

My answer to his argument is that on appraisal, I find this section an offence to civil liberties for children and am quite prepared to revise my previous position.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member does not mind? The hon. leader of his party always says that he likes the cut and thrust of the debate—

Mr. Lewis: Is the Minister up on a point of order?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No, I am not up on a point of order. I am asking through the Speaker whether the hon. member minds my making a comment on the statement he just made. If he obejcts, I will sit down.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, I suggest that since the Minister follows me—

Mr. Speaker: I think the Minister would have an opportunity later to speak.

Mr. Lewis: I simply want to say that those authorities who thought the section adequate have now reejcted it. The children's aid societies are not happy with section 8. There are several juvenile and family court judges, some of them in Metropolitan Toronto who are not happy with section 8. Can I read, Mr. Speaker, from the report on civil liberties, Justice McRuer, at page 550 under juvenile and family courts:

> It is ludicrous that anyone should have power to send a child to an industrial training school for any breach of a city bylaw or of a provincial statute while an adult may be fined a nominal amount.

It is "ludicrous," said the report.

Now, in the year 1966, the year ending March, 1966—if my figures are correct and I think they are, Mr. Speaker—there were 171 youngsters in this province 12 years old or younger, who were consigned to training school, doubtless many of them under this Act. That brings me to the final argument which I believe to be conclusive and irrefutable. I am not going now to debate with the Minister the merits of training schools; he knows my position well. But I will say this to him—the Act only provides for consignment to a training school in the absence of a more appropriate facility.

The Minister knows as he sits in his place that there are no such facilities available under the aegis of government in the province of Ontario. So by default we despatch the children to training schools and then try to justify it retroactively. It is an anti-human business, Mr. Speaker, and it can be described in no other terms.

Mr. Speaker, I want next to deal with my warmest friend in the Legislature on the government benches, the Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond). I deal with him now because I relinquish that portfolio with the greatest of reluctance. It is a wondrous department, Mr. Speaker, a wondrous department. It is filled with an Alice in Wonderland credibility gap which is true of no other department. The

Minister is a fighter, as those who watched the bill establishing OMSIP going through the House will recall. One cannot gainsay that, but do not expect any progress, Mr. Speaker, do not expect any progress whatsoever.

My colleague, the hon. member for Cochrane South (Mr. Ferrier) asked a question about the Porcupine Ontario hospital back on February 19. It turns out that everything is still in process and it has not been open.

One of the Liberals in the House asked a question about doctors coming to Ontario and the Minister of Health answered:

> Generally, 1967 saw more doctors coming to Ontario than in any year for the past 10; 132 doctors, mainly from the United Kingdom, Australia, New Zealand and South Africa were admitted to full registration in Ontario.

I have no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that they were all white doctors in order to conform to the pattern of immigration in the medical profession in this province, which members of both parties have raised in the House before and from which there doubtless has been no deviation.

On March 5, I asked the Minister of Health about the per diem costs for children in Thistletown and he indicated that the treatment costs were $38 per day. That was for Thistletown and the children's psychiatric research institute in London. A couple of days later I asked him about the costs for research and teaching and he was unable to give them to me although they have been available in every other year, Mr. Speaker.

Let me tell you why he was unable to give them to me, Mr. Speaker: Because the Minister is afraid to demonstrate publicly what it costs for treatment of mentally ill children in the province of Ontario, because, under The Department of Health, it is $60 a day, or $22,000 a year per child. After all, Mr. Speaker, there are all kinds of other children's agencies that do training and research. That is not given simply to Thistletown and The Department of Health. And why not? And why should not costs sometimes rise that high?

I am personally astounded at the cost, because it is double almost any other children's institution in the province. But even so, why does not the Minister justify the cost, because it is an important field? If he justified it adequately no one in this House would take issue with him. But he does not justify that cost, Mr. Speaker, he does not justify it because he hides behind the famous white paper for services for children with mental and emotional disorders handed down in the House on January 27, 1967, some 15 months ago. Mr. Speaker, the surrealistic history of this white paper conveys such a critical default in services that it will have to be discussed at length in the estimates.

The Minister of Social and Family Services (Mr. Yaremko) referred to it the other day when he avoided a question I had asked on what happens to children's aid society deficits. He said the white paper will take care of that.

Mr. Speaker, if I may, I want to take a moment of the House's time to share with them the revelation of the last 48 hours. In the last 48 hours the white paper has been discussed publicly by a man who is a far greater authority than myself. His name is Dr. Garry Cormack and he is director of mental hospitals for The Department of Health. Now let me tell you what Dr. Cormack says about his own white paper 15 months ago.

First, the cost factor, Mr. Speaker. Under the white paper, the state undertook to pay the total cost for every child requiring treatment in the province of Ontario, and undertook to pay that cost precisely because they wanted to separate out non-wards from wards. They did not want the only children eligible for treatment to come within the confines of a children's aid society. They wanted any private citizen in this Legislature or out, who had a mentally ill or emotionally disturbed child to be able to go to an appropriate resource and have state funding available. The white paper guaranteed that. And in order to do it, an accreditation committee was set up to accredit certain institutions.

Dr. Cormack said the programme awaits provincial accreditation of facilities. Dr. Cormack said accreditation standards were completed a month ago. Detailed questionnaires will be distributed, and when these are returned the facilities will be examined by teams.

Four centres are anticipating examination, Dr. Cormack said, two of these are ready for survey by one of the four examining teams. Some or all of these four centres probably will be accredited by June. That is a year and a half after the public commitment to underwrite costs for the children involved. Four centres!

Now Mr. Speaker, there are 43 centres alone under The Children's Institutions Act which is governed by the Minister of Social and Family Services, and there is a plethora of agencies across the province, Mr. Speaker, which would bring the number seeking

accreditation into the scores. The accreditation committee, a year and a half after its commitment, is now just beginning to do the job.

Let me make it clear, as the Minister of Social and Family Services knows, what this means in the interim. It means very simply that if a private citizen in the province of Ontario wants to get treatment for a child, that private citizen goes before a juvenile court judge and says: "Your Honour, separate me from my child by law, place my child in wardship and provide payment via a children's aid society."

That is how the government is providing costs for treatment of disturbed children after the commitment of the white paper.

Then there was the question of facilities. There were to be eight diagnostic and reception centres across the province and they were named by Dr. Cormack, Ottawa, Kingston, Toronto, Hamilton, London, Windsor, Sudbury and Port Arthur. We have had so much irrelevant bravado about this subject that I heave a sigh of relief that it is now finally in the open. This is what Dr. Cormack said about each of those centres.

Kingston is expanding a children's service operated for 20 years at the Ontario hospital. That is not a new reception and diagnostic centre, Mr. Speaker. It is absurd to take credit for that.

Toronto has children's services at the Clarke institute of psychiatry, Thistletown hospital and Warrendale, and a mental retardation diagnostic centre at the Toronto psychiatric hospital. That is not new. Not a thing that is new.

London has the children's psychiatric institute divided about equally between emotionally disturbed and retarded children. Not a thing new about that.

Hamilton is developing out-patient and day-care services at Chedoke hospital for both emotionally disturbed and retarded children.

Port Arthur has some diagnostic facilities.

Sudbury has the physical facilities, but lacks professional staff; and Windsor lacks physical facilities to undertake more than a small programme which might possibly be established at the former sanatorium.

Mr. Sopha: The member is right about Sudbury.

Mr. Lewis: I put it on the record, Mr. Speaker, because only at Chedoke hospital in Hamilton have significant advances been made. Of the eight diagnostic centres guaranteed in the white paper of January, 1967, only one of the eight is even off the drawing board.

Mr. S. Apps (Kingston and the Islands): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. member a question?

Mr. Lewis: Yes.

Mr. Apps: The member mentioned the facilities at Kingston. I would like to take exception to what was said, because the Beachgrove psychiatric centre—

Mr. Speaker: Order! The member is asking a question. Will he please ask the question and not make a statement?

Mr. Apps: May I make a comment, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker: No, the member has asked the member if he will take a question and the member will put a question.

Mr. Apps: Well then may I ask the hon. member a question?

Does he not feel that the new facilities provided by the Beachgrove psychiatric centre in connection with the Ontario Hospital is a significant advance in eastern Ontario in this connection?

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, the facilities at Beachgrove, the use of the Kingston Ontario Hospital for psychiatric unit for adolescents, was promised a decade ago by this government. What we had in the white paper was a commitment for a range of diagnostic and treatment facilities across Ontario.

My colleague from Brantford reminds me that there is not any appreciable staff yet at Chedoke hospital in Hamilton, so perhaps I should not credit it too fulsomely. But in any event, Mr. Speaker, any minimal advances need not be overly appreciated by this House. It is 16 months since the announcement was made. In that period of time, $6 million should have been spent.

In this year's Budget, the money allotment has dwindled to $3 million, and much of that was for retarded children rather than mentally ill or emotionally disturbed children.

Well, Mr. Speaker, this subject has had much airing in the House in the past, it will have more in the future, but it is important to note that the white paper is as fraudulent as many of us have thought it to be.

Now, I want next to deal briefly with the Minister of Labour (Mr. Bales), and particularly with the workmen's compensation board.

It is an endearing kind of department at times, you know. The Minister is very earnest and intent, and I think on occasion has the capacity to take some of us in.

On March 7 he engaged in a not so clever diversion in the House, and I want to make a note of it. When the member for High Park had completed his Throne speech, the Minister of Labour rose in his seat and offered to take all the cases for the workmen's compensation board under his wing and look after them personally.

There, Mr. Speaker, we have once again the best example of Tory paternalism. You see, that is not the answer. I have no doubt that my colleague from High Park gave him the cases. There are others who gave him cases. But the answer, Mr. Speaker, is to vacuum the workmen's compensation board. That is the answer.

The compensation board plays recklessly with decisions as it is now constituted under the Act, and it is as much a fault of the Act as it is of the civil servants of the board in the lower echelons. The board frequently rejects any psychological factors. The payments are so low they are an affront to the recipients. It has an autocratic, almost military superstructure. Some of us alluded to that in this House when the present chairman of the board took office.

It is subject to endless complaints, and I say to the House, Mr. Speaker, be ye not diverted by the seductive blandishments of the Minister of Labour. Merely to take the cases from the workmen's compensation board under his own wing is an attempt to deflect the argument. The entire board so desperately needs an overhauling, root and branch, that this Legislature cannot wait to get to it.

Mr. Speaker, may I also take a moment to deal with the amiable Provincial Secretary (Mr. Welch). I say let the novice beware. I credit the Minister with that. The Minister is quite the comer, Mr. Speaker. Fluent, and articulate, given to the most animated recitation of the Tory mystique that this House hears, he has a pretty subtle way about him, and, at times, a quite devastating sense of humour.

However, and he will permit me the however, Mr. Speaker, I have no doubt that the tie to that mystique, the tie to that facile generality, is itself the Achilles' heel.

It is necessary at times to zero in on the department because with the Minister lies the corporate growth centre. With the Minister lies the corporations branch. I shall not explore his branch at length, he knows my limitations in this field, we have shared them before. But I do want to point out that when the member for High Park had occasion to ask a question this session about the Peller Brewing Company, the Minister answered as follows:

> The status of The Department of the Provincial Secretary in any of these proceedings is really no different from that of any other person. Where facts are brought to the attention of my department, which, if established, would constitute a violation of the Act which I administer, it is not the policy of the department to commence prosecution proceedings in respect of such violation unless the department is further satisfied that some public interest is being adversely affected by such alleged violation.

Mr. MacDonald: Funny kind of law!

Mr. Lewis: Well, Mr. Speaker, it is interesting that before the prosecution can take place, if such it is, or the investigation can take place, if such it is, by the department, the department has to judge whether or not the public interest has been adversely affected. So we get a two stage application of the law, and not only does it have to decide whether the public interest has been adversely affected, but it has to wait until the matter is brought to its attention. A careful scrutiny of the records does not cause some concern for the Minister? But be that as it may Mr. Speaker, something was brought to the Minister's attention. I shall not argue the merits of the case, I shall simply point out that it was brought to the Minister's attention that Peller Brewing Company has been closed, that apparently there was a transfer of over $1 million to a related company by way of a loan, that no interest—

Hon. R. S. Welch (Provincial Secretary): That was not the point brought to my attention by the question posed by the hon. member for High Park.

Mr. Lewis: It most certainly was, it was brought to the Minister's attention in the Throne Speech.

Hon. Mr. Welch: I am referring to the original question to which the answer referred to was relevant, namely an annual meeting.

Mr. Lewis: Well, now, one assumes, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. MacDonald: What do you have to do, send a registered letter?

Mr. Lewis: I was certain that the Minister read *Hansard* assiduously. How could I think otherwise? So he would know, Mr. Speaker, he would know, that in excess of $1 million

was transferred as a loan. That no interest was charged on that loan, and one asks therefore, what of the public interest? What of the shareholders? I pose the question to him, and I say to him that if he talks in this House about the public interest then he should deal with it. And we look forward to his dealing with it, Mr. Speaker, as we look forward to his dealing with other issues that will arise from time to time.

I want to talk for an unexpected moment of The Department of Transport. I have thought carefully about this, Mr. Speaker. I really do not know what one can say. Can we beseech the gods? Turn eyes to the heavens? Is this the time when one invokes prayer? Why is the Minister in the portfolio, Mr. Speaker? By what divine right of absurdity does it persist? And I must say, Mr. Speaker, that one bears no malice. If the Minister wished to apply his art in another portfolio, then by all means let him do so. Let him take a Minister without Portfolio for a time, and bask in the enlightenment and the intuition that that sometimes brings.

Mr. Speaker, it is a pretty critical situation in that department and it is an untenable position, we say to you. Now mind you, Mr. Speaker, I made little notes of this. Back on February 22, 1968, the Liberal member for Windsor-Walkerville asked about safety features in snowmobiles. It was slapped off with that cavalier precision, "It will be known to the House in the fullness of time" and I quote the Minister.

On February 23, my colleague from Wentworth (Mr. Deans) asked about re-grooved tires for use on commercial vehicles, and the Minister slapped it off with equally immaculate precision. He is carrying on a study which may include standards for re-grooved tires. On February 23, my colleague for Sandwich-Riverside asked about compulsory legislation for all trailer trucks to incorporate safety features such as anti jack-knife equipment, brakes on axles, and back bumpers. The Minister said that he was not aware of any contemplation being given to that matter at this time, although there was a study. On February 27, the member for High Park asked about mandatory periodic car safety inspections, and the Minister replied that legislation would come down and the members would be apprised of its details. The member for High Park said: "I thank the Minister for his elaborate answer." He then went on to say: "Have safety standards been established for dealers to follow in carrying out section 49, subsection 1 of The Highway Traffic Act." The Minister replied: "The content of the certificate is currently under review."

On February 29, we had a driver licensing question under The Highway Traffic Act, and the member for High Park said after the answer: "Did the Minister answer yes or no? I am sorry, I did not quite understand his answer." The Minister of Transport (Mr. Haskett): "The Minister did not say yes or no."

Well, Mr. Speaker, there may be about it a certain frivolity; there may be about it a certain humour. But the Minister does deal with the safety in this province, and it ill behooves him to rise in the middle of a debate on helmets for motorcyclists with an equally irrelevant and extraneous observation designed to break any possibility of legislation being implemented. Mr. Speaker, it is an intolerable department. And we have, on this side of the House, indulged him along enough. Charming, friendly, amiable servant of the Crown though he may be. He should be outside the Cabinet, gently elevated to neither positions.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to say a word on the Attorney General (Mr. Wishart). I would not wish the Senate on the Minister of Transport. I would not wish the Senate on any member of this House.

Mr. Speaker, I want to raise that matter of the Attorney General, and I am truly sorry that he is not present. Forgive these personal observations, Mr. Speaker, but they come after my crusted years in the House, and they are not meant to be abusive. The Minister of Justice and the Attorney General is a gentle and earnest and interested politician, most of us recognize that. He listens to most of us in the House with great forbearance, I have often thought, however, he showed little animation or heat Mr. Speaker, on occasion. I suppose that the man who occasions it most is my colleague from Riverdale (Mr. Renwick), and for that I offer him the congratulations of this House. My colleague does something with which the Attorney General cannot cope. My colleague from Riverdale, heaven bless him, violates the protocols and propriety of the way in which the legal profession puts its argument on occasion, and I am glad that such presence is now brought to this subject; it reassures me. Whether my colleague from Riverdale is discussing pickets in Peterborough and Oshawa, or the role of the coroner in Ontario, or expropriation proceedings in this province, he puts it in an unmistakable way, and the Attorney General, curiously enough, cannot comprehend how

one of his own could show so much passion, so much heat, so much fervor for a social issue. I have never seen the Attorney General more bewildered, than when the member for Riverdale rises and takes issue with him on some matter that demands all the delicacy of the gentlemen's club, and it is not forthcoming.

I have often thought that if we could transport this entire House back to the days of the Roman senate, and if we could envisage for a moment the Attorney General in the garb of Caesar, and that terrible act took place in the chamber, and as the Attorney General slowly sank in his place, I can see him turning around and saying: "*Et tu,* Renwick?"

Now the point of difference, Mr. Speaker, the point of difference is basically that the Attorney General sees the law as an arid set of legal definitions.

Other members of this House see the law as a social instrument designed for reform and there is an appreciable difference.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the only other point I would like to make is that the Minister is, on occasion, oversensitive about things. I thought of that, you know, when the poor Reverend Horsburgh came into the debate of this House. I thought to myself, why pillory the man? After all, he spent nine months in jail. He was hurt and uncomprehending. He had been acquitted. There were sexual aspects to the case which evoked every social prejudice and brought out every bigot from under every bigot stone.

He was maligned, I suppose, in a short period of time—more than most of us will be in a lifetime. He lost his job. He was ineffectually striking out at the Attorney General and Minister of Justice. I thought it was really a kind of pathetic spectacle. Why use the Legislature of Ontario to further pillorate this fellow? I did not understand it at the time and I say to the Minister, in his absence—perhaps one of his colleagues will report it—that he should not feel overly sensitive about those who see their function as bringing these things to his attention. It can surely be understood when one thinks so little about the history of that case.

But more important, Mr. Speaker, more important, to revert to the questions of arid legal definition and the confrontation in this chamber, I am reminded of the number of questions which have emerged during this session around bail.

The point that was made, I guess, by the member for Grey-Bruce, who first raised it about the 100 or 150 people—memory fails me for the moment—who were incarcerated in the Don jail without bail for a considerable period of time. Then one learns having probed this fact and offered it to the House, that this is the normal event in the course of a judicial day.

I must say I am not learned in the law, Mr. Speaker, but I am absolutely thunderstruck that you can clap 150 people in jail without bail, and without knowing why they were without bail in most of the instances.

It then emerged a few days later that some girl had been held as a witness to give evidence in a case for several days without apparent justification. I noticed just yesterday in the Toronto *Telegram*, in the "In The Courts" column under the heading, "Girl 16 cannot be free," the following story:

> Dorothy Janks, 16, is back in custody today. But that was small consolation to the tearful girl when they led her away yesterday. Her lawyer, Allan Mintz, expressed frustration that the girl was released from custody by a court order and put back in confinement by an administrative body which had not had a representative in court before.
>
> Dorothy spent three weeks in the Don jail without benefit of counsel. The Department of Reform Institutions seemed content to leave her there pending the outcome of her trial.

At one point she was, in fact, released and The Department of Reform Institutions who came back to the judge and explained to him it was a misunderstanding, that under The Training Schools Act she could be held without a warrant. So the training school people, the story says, who chose to leave Dorothy in the Don for those three weeks, were there to take her back to Galt yesterday because she was not supposed to be free.

Magistrate Hayes commented with tongue in cheek: "I am sure that those entrusted with her care will use the same good judgment they have heretofore used in the custody and control of this girl for a period of three weeks in the Don jail without counsel."

Mr. Speaker, surely that demonstrates that the bail system is rotten to the core. Surely, the McRuer report on civil liberties gives ample support to that. Yet the Minister of Justice and Attorney General stands in the House when the bail cases are raised and presents the criminal code as though it were the very "tablets" themselves.

Who is to be fooled, Mr. Speaker? Why not level with the Legislature? Why not agree that it is an abominable system and that he, the Attorney General, will either alter it personally and unilaterally, or that he will make the appropriate provision in his submission to the federal government to do so?

There is no use whatsoever in allowing the law to become so arid and so offensive in its application that people are incarcerated without justification.

I have driven the Minister of Social and Family Services away, I fear. This is the penultimate department I wish to discuss. I shall come to the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs, for a moment, later on. I am sure the suspense is not overwhelming.

I do want to say something about The Department of Social and Family Services, Mr. Speaker, and to say to the members of the House, some of the new ones, some of my colleagues, that it is a danger to ask questions of this department. You never get answers, and you are subject to such a flowered historical recitation, sometimes through centuries, that the answer to a question frequently turns out to lie in the third decade of the 17th century in the Ukraine.

Mr. Speaker, methinks the Minister doth protest too much in his department. His intentions may ever be beneficient, but one wonders ocasionally, one wonders.

I want to say to the Minister, through you Mr. Speaker, that we would be pleased to co-operate in many avenues if there was the slightest suggestion of something being achieved.

Just think back at what has occurred this session, Mr. Speaker. My colleague from Scarborough Centre (Mrs. M. Renwick), asked about adoption practices. The Minister announced the establishment of a committee, the chairman has been appointed, but the other four members as yet do not exist. I asked the Minister about the financial crisis for the children's aid society in their provision of treatment costs. He told me to look to the white paper. The white paper is obviously irrelevant.

I asked the Minister if he does not understand that the budget cut for the Metropolitan Toronto children aid society before the Metro Toronto executive two weeks ago spells down the drain for 40 children in this province? That is what it amounted to and, the question is, therefore, worthy of a reply somewhat more learned than that which he condescended to give.

Questions were then asked about day nurseries by the member for Humber (Mr. Ben) and the member for Scarborough Centre. We were told that anyone in need could find day nursery assistance, but that the Act was under revision.

Why does one pretend that anyone in need can find the facilities? Day nurseries are in a shocking state of inadequacy in this province. Everyone knows that. Why play games across the House?

On another occasion, a question was asked about "big brothers" and the Minister says, as he often does, that he was a barefoot boy back in the days when the big brother movement was growing, that he loved the big brother movement, that some of his best friends are big brothers, but that he cannot grant money to the big brother movement under the present situation.

Just let us take a look at that for the moment because it is illustrative. The Minister knows, because the Minister is a resourceful and intelligent man, that when asked a question about the big brother association it has much greater application. It has application to all the preventive social services.

It should be pointed out to him that we know that we have reached the peak in United Appeal, whether it be in Metropolitan Toronto or outside. If I may recite something pretty trite—charity is dead, Mr. Speaker. That is not a 20th century revelation in this House. Contributions will start to atrophy in the private charitable sector, and it does not just involve big brothers. It involves big sisters and it involves the family service association, it involves the Catholic family services association.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, it involves the whole range of preventive counselling services; that whole branch of prevention in the Minister's department; the effort to prevent the extremities which cost so much money, if one may appeal in economic terms.

Well, what do they do when you do not give $30,000 to the big brothers association in Toronto? They cannot expand their case load to some 200 children. So what happens to those 200 children five or ten years from now? Does the Minister think it is a worthy application of priorities?

The Minister himself in recent past knows the importance of the issue. Curiously enough, and it has some consequences I think in the whole spectrum of services to the people, the

only services without government subsidy are those of preventive counselling to children, adolescents and adults. No subsidy from government whatsoever except under The Child Welfare Act, but to none of the other agencies in this field.

In order to correct that, Mr. Speaker, the Minister introduced into his department last year a family counselling branch, a family services branch. He established that branch, because he knew of its importance—a case work unit of nine social workers to start to get around in this area.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the entire case work unit has collapsed. It will be a subject for discussion later in the Minister's estimates. Why it collapsed will be a subject, but the case work unit has collapsed, so now the Minister and his department have turned back to the private charitable sector. They say we cannot handle any of this area, you handle it for us, only we will not give you a penny to do so.

It is all the more reprehensible because not only could they provide these services with money under The Canada Assistance Act where they would receive compensation up to 50 per cent, or under an entirely separate act of this government, but because they also know that the people who are being served by all these agencies—big brothers, big sisters, family services association—are people who are also being served by government, like those mothers and children benefitting from mothers' allowance. There is something extraordinarily perverse in the Minister and the government refusing to grant subsidy to an agency which is bailing the government out of a position of imminent havoc.

As a parting observation, Mr. Speaker, I want you to note the sense of value, sir, and share it with me—$1.7 million to horse breeders in Ontario and a refusal of $30,000 to the big brothers association in Metro. Let the Minister think on it for a time—let him think on it for a time and we will welcome his statements with greater enthusiasm if he can alter the situation.

Hon. J. Yaremko (Minister of Social and Family Services): And $227 million also to social services.

Mr. Lewis: We will get to the misapplication of funds in the department under the Minister's estimates. He need not make a point of it now. The next department that I want to take—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Before the hon. member continues, what has the 17th century Ukraine have to do with the speech that the hon. member is making? Just elucidate. I did not quite grasp the significance of it.

Mr. Lewis: Pardon?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I did not quite grasp the significance—

Mr. Lewis: Well the Minister can read it in *Hansard*. I was making a crack about the Minister's interpolation of history into the charming and amiable answer which he gives on a variety of subjects—not as often I would say as the Minister of Social and Family Services as when he was the Provincial Secretary. But I am sure he can find other uses for the legacy.

Mr. Speaker, I want to take a moment, and obviously it cannot be too long because the Minister is not here, on The Department of Education and University Affairs, with its formerly impregnable fortress, smoothly running machine, the almost always unflapable Minister. One has learned in this House Mr. Speaker, that the only way to crack the shibboleth is by the way of direct confrontation, and that is precisely what we intend to do.

During the course of this session one very interesting event took place, and I suppose I could be allowed to discuss it. It was the event of the Ontario college of art. I shall not belabour it. I will remind you, however, Mr. Speaker, that it began with the Minister advocating a policy of non-intervention; it moved to a position of reluctant mediation; and it resulted in a finale of gracious capitulation. And it was right that the capitulation should come, and that the capitulation should come to student demands. What was at stake, Mr. Speaker, was precisely what we, in the Opposition, have raised on innumerable occasions. That was the question of academic autonomy, and it was important that the two teachers—lecturers—at the Ontario college of art be reinstated, because academic autonomy was at stake and so must it be when such things are at stake.

It also demonstrated, as the member for London South appreciates more than any member in this House, that student power is a very real phenomenon, and that it has implications for democratic university government. University government in this province is fundamentally and profoundly anti-democratic. It requires a pretty fundamental alteration in structure. Now I am not sure that we would be willing to intrude on the academic

autonomy of the university with so frontal an assault as the Minister intruded on the academic autonomy of the Ontario college of art. We would wish to pace ourselves rather more cautiously, Mr. Speaker, and tread rather more delicately than the bulldozing Minister of University Affairs. However, we accept the fact that there may have to be some structural changes in university government, and we are quite prepared to support them when they come by way of private members' bills in this House, whatever may subsequently be their fate. But there is more to student power, than the simple matter of reconstructing university government. There is also the fact that it expresses the intense malaise and discontent of my generation and those even younger, for this society, for its malaise and for what it consists of.

Mr. J. H. White (London South): Thirty-three votes is the total number of votes the NDP got out of about 350. The NDP got about 35.

Mr. MacDonald: We got 5,500 votes against the Prime Minister after a three week campaign and with a student as a candidate.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, these things are slow to filter through—they always are. We have given them another four years, Mr. Speaker. That will be sufficient time for the consolidation to take place. These are revolutionary currents and they are real currents and they are not to be laughed off by members of the House, and what is happening on the campuses of Canada is surely a matter of some significance. It is worth more, Mr. Speaker, it is worth more by way of response than this incredible paper from the committee of presidents of universities called "Student Participation in University Government". A more condescending, specious, and offensive document one could not imagine, and we will deal with it, I have no doubt, when we get to The Department of University Affairs. But it is good that the Minister of University Affairs has, for the moment, taken his stand on the side of revolutionary forces and we welcome that position, however extreme, and we will attempt to make him as comfortable in it as possible.

Mr. Sopha: Sitting on the side of revolutionary forces.

Mr. White: Hon. members opposite are the revolutionaries.

Mr. Lewis: The members of the assembly will note that I have missed the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. MacNaughton) and the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs, sturdy and astute politicians both, formidable adversaries. I say to the members who are new in the House, do not be fooled by the jovial mannerisms of the one and the quiet, tranquil chewing of chocolate of the other. When engaged, Mr. Speaker, they fairly bristle in debate and do it very well. Both Ministers have an aversion to this party and to its tenets, which allows at times for very direct and very important confrontation. But I want to make a quiet passing note, Mr. Speaker. I did not omit the departments because they are not worthy of discussion or because something could not have been said in the context of the session. I omitted the departments because it appears to me that those two Ministers are rather more important at the moment as party members than they are as Ministers of the Crown.

You see, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs, in conjunction with the Provincial Treasurer, formed the great Cabinet cabal to decide on the leadership following the present Premier. And in so deciding, they achieved something rather momentous. The Minister of Education and University Affairs has been gently shunted out of the running, and will have to find his higher offices in the federal Tory party. That is a coup of no small moment, Mr. Speaker. I venture to say that were one to put the succession to a vote across the province, the Minister of Education and University Affairs would win hands down.

Mr. Speaker, similarly, if one were to put the Liberal leadership to a vote across the country with Pierre Berton's evident support, Pierre Trudeau would win hands down. So one can see, Mr. Speaker, that these things have parallels. But the great cabal is to decide who gets the prize, and who, I guess the member for Beaches-Woodbine at this point would have said, indelicately, gets the skewer.

I recall, Mr. Speaker, Othello, act 5, scene 1, when Iago and Roderigo were trying to decide how to do Casseo in. Now my problem is that in the instance of the two Ministers of the great cabal, I do not know who is Iago and I do not know who is Roderigo—I do not know who occupies which position.

An hon. member: Neither one—they are a bunch of jesters.

Mr. Lewis: Not at all, the member for Sudbury does them a disservice.

But whatever the position, and I leave it for the fantasies of the members in the House:

Act 5, scene 1, Cyprus, a street, enter Iago and Roderigo:

> Iago: Here, stand behind this bulk, straight will he come. Wear thy good rapier bare and put it home. Quick, quick, fear nothing, I will be at thy elbow. It makes us or it mars us. Think on that, and fix most firm thy resolution.
>
> Roderigo: Be near at hand, I may miscarry it.

I am not sure which of the Ministers would be concerned about miscarrying.

> Iago: They be at hand, be bold and take thy stand.
>
> Iago retires and Roderigo then says: "I have no great devotion to the deed, and yet he has given me satisfying reasons. 'Tis but a man gone forth my sword", and out the man goes.

Out, out, sweet member of the Cabinet.

Now, Mr. Speaker, who inherits the mantle? At present, as the member for Sudbury has pointed out, the bets are two to one on the Provincial Treasurer. I want to suggest to you not to underestimate the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs. It will be an enviable battle when the convention comes, and it will come before the next election in 1971.

I was trying very very hard Mr. Speaker, to think of a way in which to fashion the context, and I wrote a little note on paper. Suddenly in the juxtaposition of names, the light dawned, because, you see Mr. Speaker at the next convention, when John retires, will the delegates have Charlie or will they have to settle for less?

Mr. Sopha: Will somebody go and get the Premier?

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): This is all news to him.

Mr. Lewis: It is certainly not news for the next federal candidate in Peel.

Mr. Speaker, that ends it for the moment, I have little left to say. We intend in this caucus, Mr. Speaker, to try to be powerful opponents to the government. Now that we all have the measure of each other, the House can settle down to the serious fray.

I want to say to the members opposite that we are simply not concerned about the taunts of 1945 and 1948 and 1951. We have matured a lot as a political party, Mr. Speaker, in the last 20 years; we have begun to learn what is involved not only in holding what you have, but even more, Mr. Speaker, in understanding that the Legislature is not the be-all and end-all of political existence, and that for those who think so, one sees an enormous self-delusion. So, out in the hinterland, as it were, our membership is growing, our workers are canvassing, our organizers are mobilizing, and we set our sights on the seat of power.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Speaker, as I rise to take my part in this debate, let me say sir I was rather disappointed in the remarks of the hon. member for Scarborough West (Mr. Lewis). He had remarked to me yesterday evening when we were waiting for the other speakers to finish up and for ourselves to get on with the list, that he was probably going to provoke us this afternoon, and that we should be there and pay close attention.

Well, I listened. I listened very carefully to what he had to say. In his introduction, the light part of his remarks—

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Provocation requires sensitivity.

Mr. Singer: The member for York South, Mr. Speaker, perhaps made a point, perhaps there is not the sensitivity to the type of provocation, Mr. Speaker, that has been coming forward. We have listened to this for so long, and it is so full of sound and fury, and signifies absolutely nothing, that is what was such a disappointment this afternoon.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Singer: To listen to that able young man from Scarborough West, who fell so flat in his introductory remarks insofar as this debate is concerned. His barbs at us in the beginning, really were not up to his usual standard, Mr. Speaker. He has done much better in the past, and I am sure he can do much better in the future.

How he attuned himself to the antenna—I think that was his phrase—of the Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts), and had ascertained what was going on in the minds of my colleagues and myself insofar as zeal and our desire, and the role that we have to play in this House, somewhat escapes me. It is with equal wonderment, sir, that I question his analysis in his last remarks about what goes on on the front benches opposite. It may be that he is a confidante of the Premier, and the Premier has indicated to him just when the day of retirement is going to come—

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Last night.

Mr. Singer: So be it, fine.

But I think the member for Scarborough West does make, and we all agree on this, a substantial contribution to this debate, and it was in the in-between part when he had many things of substantial merit to say. In contrast may I say, to the remarks of some of his colleagues during the course of this debate.

But periodically there was a tone that came out when he talked about the revolution, when he quoted authority, with equal invective, authority, as came from the member for Beaches-Woodbine (Mr. Brown) in that angry, angry speech of hate that he delivered yesterday afternoon, referring to Chairman Mao, and stating that politics is a bloodless war.

Well sir, that may be the philosophy of one party in this Legislature. We had it this afternoon repeated again by no less an authority than the member for Scarborough West. Let me say on behalf of my colleagues and myself, as bad as we think this government is, we do not really hate them. We think they are here to do as good a job as they can. I think they are subject to certain limitations. Their horizons are narrow, they are stultified in their thinking, and there are many other criticisms during the course of my remarks I expect to levy against them. But we do not really hate them. The venom does not drip to the same extent, nor should it.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Singer: Let me say we do not accept the philosophy of Chairman Mao.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Singer: We do not accept the idea that we have to carry on a war, bloodless or otherwise, with the government. We believe that we are here to play a role in the democratic processes of this province, and to the best of our ability that is what we intend to do.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): In line with the Tories.

Mr. Singer: There is no point at all in doing the percentage battle again. The fact is, that on October 17, the hon. members on the government benches got more votes than any other party in the province of Ontario. That was the decision of the voters, and we are here for the next four years to do our job, hopefully in bringing to the attention of the voters the sins of omission and commission that have existed in the past and, in our opinion, will continue to exist in the future.

I do not think we are concerned, we are not concerned at all, Mr. Speaker, about proud breast-beating and self-adulation and patting on the back, the sort of thing that the Attorney General (Mr. Wishart) trembles every time the member for Riverdale (Mr. Renwick) gets up. I know the Attorney General very well, and I have many criticisms to direct at him from time to time, but knowing the Attorney General as well as I do, I am quite sure he does not tremble, either from my remarks or from the remarks of the the member for Riverdale.

He is a good listener, he listens too long, he ponders too long, he acts too slowly, he is against, basically, against reform. But those are all different things. He certainly does not tremble just because the member for Riverdale gets on his feet.

Let me say, in this hate-filled speech that we heard yesterday afternoon, and I really do not want to spend too much time on several remarks that came from over there, but the suggestion, modified a little later, that lawyers and judges are all part of the cabal, that that was the sort of thing you were suggesting, who do no good for anyone in the community except themselves, I find is a particularly revolting one.

Here is a party that likes to believe it shows responsibility. Here is a party that mouths the words, at least, of fitting within our democratic process. And yet, as this debate has unfolded, we have heard, not from all of them, but from a few of them and it was repeated in gentler tones by the hon. member for Scarborough West the same sort of thing. "We are here to promote a revolution, we are not here to be satisfied to accept the democratic process. We lost the election, but it is not our fault, it is somebody else's."

Mr. Lewis: On a point of order—Mr. Speaker, we are, in fact, here to reconstruct this society by democratic means.

Hon. J. Yaremko (Minister of Family and Social Services): The member is in the wrong province.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, the public record will show by their words shall you know them. We have sat here for six weeks—February 14, March 20—and listened, listened very carefully, and it is interesting to

hear the variety of views. I do not say this about all of the members of that group, but certain of them have definitely and specifically decided that the war, the bloodless war, they call it that has to be fought in the province of Ontario, is a war of class.

There is a group over there, or a group over here or a group up there or a group up there, sometimes they are corporations, sometimes they are lawyers, sometimes they are people who pay their own way who have to be destroyed so that they can come to power.

I say we do not accept that philosophy at all.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Tories unite.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Singer: Just one more aside in so far as my friends on the left, or far left are concerned. They were awfully concerned about the speech made by my colleague from Sudbury (Mr. Sopha) and, in fact, several of them went out of their way to devastate, to lay about in the aisles, to destroy him, to obliterate him. Well he is still here, and he is still smiling, and he needs no defence from me. He can more than ably defend himself.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Singer: Now sir, let me turn to our task, and our task in this House is not to engage in endless philosophic battle with these gentlemen on the left. Our task in this House is to bring before the people of the province the problems of the province of Ontario, and to examine critically, and to suggest objectively alternatives to the programmes that we think are improper or have not been thought of, or that the government has ignored, and to present these in such a way that the people will be presented with a reasonable and logical alternative to this government.

I mentioned a few moments ago that here on March 20 we are concluding a debate that has gone on for some six weeks. With great respect to this noble institution, I would say that we have had six weeks when the business of the people has been completed, absolutely and irrelevantly ignored. We have accomplished in this six-week period absolutely nothing. One of the hon. members said a lot of hot air. I would say yes, we have had an awful lot of hot air.

We have had speeches read from the annual report of the Bell Telephone Company with great fervour and zeal, we have had speeches that took us through the hills and valleys of almost every riding in the province of Ontario and they were very interesting. But they really have not contributed very much to the well-being of the people of Ontario.

We have had speeches where pages and, in fact, chapters of John Kenneth Galbraith's excellent book was read into the records. Why, I do not know. We have had moral lectures from this side and moral lectures from that side, but I ask you, sir, look with me at the order paper.

Mr. MacDonald: And now we are getting another!

Mr. Singer: Look with me at the order paper and tell me what solid piece of business this Legislature has accomplished in this six-week period. The answer, is absolutely nothing. I have tried to determine why this in fact has been so, and I think the answer lies in the approach of the Prime Minister of this province to the affairs of this Legislature. He reminds me of the certain gentlemen who were prominent in a federal Cabinet in 1956, who put themselves completly out of touch with public ideas, public ambitions and public desire to know what had been going on.

The Legislature of the House of Commons, as they knew it, became an unnecessary bore, it just stood in the way of letting them get things done. They, the superior mortals, did not really want to take anyone into consultation with them, the ordinary people who sit in the House and who might have some views. I do not have any divining rod into the Tory caucus, or even into the mind of the Prime Minister, and I cannot tell him, as my friend from Scarborough West can of the day in which he is going to retire. He missed that, I am sorry.

Mr. Singer: I say, sir, that his philosophy is that—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Singer: Let, them talk, let the debate go on for day after day. We will hold off from the order paper any important pieces of legislation, if we have any, and that is questionable. If we have any we will bring them in towards the end of the session, the rush will be on and we will get them through with a minimum of argument, a minimum of discussion, a minimum of debate. But let

this go on while we, not govern the province, but administer the province. Arrogance, sir, at its best and arrogance—that was displayed in this country in 1956 and that story is unfolding here today—

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): The member said all this last year.

Mr. MacDonald: How right you are, a repeat of last year's—

Mr. Singer: That story is unfolding here today, and it is fascinating to watch how even within this context and with the majority of 21 members, that the government leader is unable to exercise control over his people, control sufficient so that things do not get out of hand.

Last Thursday night he was not here, but I am sure he got reports. I do not know whether the member for London South (Mr. White) came and said, guess what, as has been suggested, but I am sure he got a full report.

It is surprising to me that a government that has been in power as long as these people have, is not able to better order their affairs, to control their affairs and direct their affairs so that they never allow themselves to get into that kind of a situation.

That brings me to the very interesting remarks of the hon. member for Eglinton (Mr. Reilly) when he was preaching at us yesterday afternoon. He was explaining, I think, why the division bells rang so long, and he had discovered that he had given a commitment to certain of the front bench people over there that he would ring the bell for 15 minutes. I do not doubt the word of the hon. member for Eglinton for a moment, but if this arrangement had been made it was an arrangement that was unknown to anyone on the other side of the House. It was an arrangement that was trotted out just to suit that occasion.

Well, what was the occasion? The occasion was this. The hon. member for Grey South (Mr. Winkler), and I am sorry that he is not in his seat, chose to rise in his place and to cast a series of innuendoes, of unsupported charges against the member for High Park (Mr. Shulman). After that, debate went on for a bit and he was challenged in that regard. The accepted parliamentary procedure was discussed. The Speaker made a ruling, and after the Speaker had ordered the hon. member for Grey South to either retract his remarks or substantiate them, some genius on that side of the House, said, this is a terrible thing, let us adjourn the House.

Someone with super-intelligence over there decided then was the time to apply closure and that is what brought on the fuss.

I would not even have bothered to mention this in this House at this time, had the member for Grey South been an ordinary member. The member for Grey South came to us with banners blowing and bugles sounding. Here was the 300 header—the 30 goal scorer; here was the man from the big leagues coming down to lowly Queen's Park to tell us how to run things.

I have watched him with interest as he wanders around up in that corner. He rarely sits in his seat. He wanders around up in that corner holding great discussions with certain important people on the front benches, ordering the affairs of government because he was here to put things right. He was here to direct, he was here to order and he was here to slay all the dragons, the dragon from High Park.

Well, I am surprised and shocked that a member with all that experience, a member who had served in the House of Commons for how many years—10, 12—a member who had been given the high ranking position of government Whip, should not have known better, should not have realized that he, too, has responsibilities when he sits in any elected body.

The fact that that was allowed to go on, makes me feel sorry for the member for Grey South, that his experience in public life has taught him so little over the years. But the fact that that was allowed to go on, and the fact that the government allowed itself to be placed in that position, is an indication that someone over there has lost control.

Why was the Speaker not allowed to enforce his ruling? Why was the Speaker's ruling not challenged in effect by the government reversing him? Why was there a government motion to adjourn the House, which later turned out to be a motion to adjourn the debate? Closure, plain and simple. That is the only thing it was. The government played their game very, very badly. I say that for a government that has sat there for 25 years, that is supposed to be so knowledgeable and so experienced about running affairs, they are losing their grip.

These are the same signs of disintegration that appeared in Ottawa in 1956, and the inability of this government to allow the Legislature to play its proper role, that is what is going to cause its defeat in the next election.

This is an age when people are protesting. The university students protest, youngsters in Yorkville protest, all sorts of troubled disturbance, lack of understanding exists in this community. The open line programme, where people call up and complain. The demands for an ombudsman, someone who can protect the ordinary citizen of this community against big government. The columns in our daily newspapers, help wanted, and the one in the *Telegram* is "Action Line."

These are all symptoms of the same sort of thing. These are indications of a desire of people to communicate. They want to find out what is going on, and this government—and it cannot be better illustrated than by what is on this order paper—says: "We will tell you what is good for you in our own time. We are not going to put any legislation on the order paper in advance. We are not going to show you what reforms we are talking about."

The member for Eglinton waving our platform in his hand the other afternoon said: "Ho, ho, you wanted medicare. We got more votes so you are not going to have it. Ho, ho. You wanted more money given to education. We got more votes so you are not going to have it. Ho, ho, you wanted law reform. We got more votes so you are not going to have it."

And doing this, Mr. Speaker, the member for Eglinton gave the show away.

Mr. R. G. Hodgson (Victoria-Haliburton): Will the member tell us how long he has?

Mr. Singer: If this is the way the government wants to approach these matters, fine. Let them say so. Let the Premier stand up in his place and say with the member for Eglinton: "We won the election, we do not believe in medicare, you are not going to have it." Let him say that. "We do not believe in law reform, we do not believe in McRuer, we do not believe in Smith. You are not going to have it." Let them say so.

The trouble, Mr. Speaker, is that the government just does not believe it is worthwhile to come into this Legislature and to explain to us and to the people of Ontario and to the media what is actually going on. Let them battle, says the Premier. Let the time run. Let them wear themselves out, and in due course we will administer, we will get this session over. We will all go home and then we will not be bothered by that horrible Legislature for another year.

This is a very sad and unfortunate commentary on the way the affairs of this province have been going on, and for the next four years we are going to try and do something to rectify this.

Let us think for a moment about the Smith report. The Smith report was—well we started four years ago—five years ago—talking about methods of reforming our taxation system. And eventually it occurred to the government that Lancelot Smith should be appointed to conduct an inquiry.

Mr. E. Sergant (Grey Bruce): Four million dollars ago!

Mr. Singer: And in due course, and as my colleague from Grey-Bruce says: "$4 million ago;" and four years ago since they started their work up until now when their report came in, or last fall when their report came in.

Mr. Sargent: How much did it cost?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Well now, where did the member get the figures?

Mr. Sargent: I just picked it out of the air, the way the Premier does things.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): He followed the Prime Minister.

Mr. Sargent: How much did it cost? He does not know.

Mr. Singer: Whatever it cost, Mr. Speaker, we have that report. For the four years while it was in process of preparation, no matter what suggestion came from the Opposition benches, either the Premier or the appropriate Minister stood up and said—well that sounds like a good idea, but we would not want to embark on that kind of investigation or that kind of a new departure unless and until we get Smith's report.

Well, Smith's report arrived last fall, just in time for the election night. I would not want to suggest for a moment that the coincidence had any bearing on the election. Picked out of it were two little plums. One was the grant to householders—the basic shelter allowance. We have yet to hear, sir, and time runs on—March 20—how this is going to be applied.

There has been the suggestion from time to time that they have worked out the solution. There were big grins on the faces of several Cabinet Ministers the other afternoon when somebody suggested they had not figured it out. But if it has been figured out surely there is a responsibility with those gentlemen on the front benches to bring in that answer.

How is the basic shelter allowance going to be applied? What effect is it going to have on the economy of the province of Ontario? To what extent are the home owners who are about, again, to receive their municipal tax bill, what benefit are they going to get from this supposed re-thinking? No answer. I suppose again it is part and parcel of the programme of keeping all the knowledge over there, let the Legislature babble on and in due course we will administer, but we will not tell.

I was interested, the other day, in reading in the paper a report of a speech delivered by the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. McKeough) and he is a new Minister. He is eager. He has brought a new approach to that department, but he happened to express some views on the opinions of the Smith committee on taxation and this is what he said. He was very kind, he let me have a copy—and when I told him what I was looking for—he is a very co-operative Minister—he underlined the lines which appear on page 10 of his speech which referred to the problem that I have, and these are the lines that he underlined and I am reading from the second paragraph of page 10 of the copy the Minister supplied to me. He said this:

> The Ontario committee on taxation, the Smith committee, included in its recent report a chapter on regional government and recommended the provincial government complete a study of this question over the next five years.

Then he stopped his underlining. There is another sentence in there.

> The target date of five years hence to complete a study to rationalize local government in Ontario seems to be reasonable and attainable.

Well, sir, four years in preparation, two election promises and five years yet to go. That is the history and the expected future of taxation reform in the province of Ontario.

Mr. Sargent: Shame, shame!

Mr. Singer: I think this is a tragedy. The Minister has been getting some help. The Minister of Municipal Affairs has been getting some help. I do not know whether he appreciates it or not, but I notice that in the speech attributed to the hon. Minister of Tourism and Information (Mr. Auld) the other day, he promised the audience that The Municipal Act was going to be re-written—almost anytime now. When I asked the Minister of Municipal Affairs about it he had to admit that he had not quite heard of the progress that had been made in his, the Minister of Municipal Affairs' department, in this regard. Then the Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Randall)—no he has got a new title—he is about to have a new title, we can still call him Economics and Development. He got into the act and he spoke to an audience—they make their greatest speeches outside. They make their wonderful promises outside. He spoke to an audience—I think they have something to do with building—he promised a uniform building code modelled after the national building code in Ottawa, and I thought that that was a very interesting thing too.

News again to the Minister of Municipal Affairs under whose aegis this type of legislation might come. News again to this House, because when this very topic was called for debate, there was not an authoritative word to come from the government side. News again to all the building inspectors of the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto who are going off in a different extreme. All I say, sir, is this. If this government is serious at all, wants to be believed or thinks it can be believed about taxation reform and about municipal reform, for goodness sake put your house in order. For goodness sake leave a Minister in that portfolio long enough, though this last one was removed through no fault of his own, but put a Minister in there, give him the staff and the talent that will allow him to bring in reform if you really believe in it.

But, when you have a ten-year period—when you have a ten-year period before you can promise any real change, Mr. Speaker, I say that the government has no real desire, thought or intention of changing the system as it is.

What better example could we give, what better example could we give than the hurried and unthought out bill in relation to the consolidation of educational units? Over the years we have discussed, in this House, the importance of bringing about larger and more sensibly allocated regional forms of planning control, educational control in municipal government. The Premier has made great speeches about them. He had one beautifully bound, beautifully bound. "Design for Development" I think that it was called, and when it was referred to at some length the other day—

An hon. member: Put it on the record.

Mr. Singer: Well, no, I will not put it on the record again. I will just put on the record again, Mr. Speaker, what the Premier said in this debate and at page 70 he was kind enough to supply us with copies with various extracts. Page 70 says:

> I would like now to view two other matters of major concern—regional development and regional government. These matters illustrate the infinite complexity of the tasks of modern government.

Well one thing for this government, they know that their tasks have infinite complexity and one thing about them, they have no infinite solutions or finite solutions. They have studies. They have commissions. Commissions sit for many years and then they are going to study the commission reports for many years after that. The term regional government is easily misunderstood, because it is a concept in exercise and policy, co-ordination, in fact. Well I do not quite know what the sentence means except that the Prime Minister does not know what regional government means.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Why does the hon. member not read the rest of it?

Mr. Singer: If we are thinking of particular activities in advance, it is obvious that regional government is going on all the time in a multitude of ways in all regions of the province.

Well, it was my colleague from Kitchener (Mr. Breithaupt) who pointed out the other night that we have some 35 different kinds of regions for 35 different concepts of government, in the province of Ontario. So it is really a small wonder that the Prime Minister says the term regional development is misunderstood because it is a concept, an exercise in policy co-ordination, in fact. What does it mean? What does the Prime Minister mean by regional development? What does he mean by regional government and why, sir, when he might have appeared to be making progress—why sir—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I repeat: Read the rest of it.

Mr. Singer: Yes, I will read the rest of it. I have another portion marked here on page 10, I will be around to that in a minute. Why then, when he seemed possibly to be making some progress, when he had a blueprint—and it did not come from us: It was what we had said, but it did not come from us, Smith wrote it—when he had a blueprint which indicated a reasonable course of action: Why then, did he all of a sudden throw in this educational reform, based on the county boundaries?

Could you tell me? Could the Minister of Education (Mr. Davis) tell me? I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, could the Prime Minister tell, could the Minister of Education tell me the rationale behind the selection of these county boundaries?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, I will answer the hon. member's questions when we have second reading of that important piece of legislation which is on the order paper and which has been introduced in this House for study before it is debated.

During the debate on second reading of that bill, no doubt, the member can query the Minister as the member is doing in this debate, but I rather doubt that this is the place. I think the member's question is really rhetorical. He does not want an answer in this debate, but it will be entirely debated when that bill comes before the House.

Mr. Singer: Well, Mr. Speaker, technically as always, the Premier is, of course, correct and my question that I give to him is rhetorical except in this real sense. I say that when he chooses to use this floor to make broad statements of general policy; when he has commissioned and produced the Smith report; when he talks about design for development; when he seems to be moving in a certain direction, then I would like him to explain to the House, Mr. Speaker, why they apparently deviate. Why there is no consistency, why there is not a programme that has a logical series of developments and why, when in the select committee's report on municipal affairs, carefully worded paragraphs pointed out the dangers of wedding forms of municipal government, or educational administration to county boundaries, which in today's context, make no sense at all. Why, sir, the government chose to do it in this way—this is what we want to know. This is what the people of Ontario want to know. Certainly we, on this side of the House, do not oppose, in fact we encourage and favour better educational administration. We encourage and favour and do all in our power to bring about better municipal government. We believe one of the ways of achieving this is through larger units to make for economy; to make for efficiency, and all attendant benefits that go with it. But for the life of us, Mr. Speaker, we cannot understand the approach of this government which has a different approach for every problem,

which the Premier explains away in these broad generalities which say absolutely nothing. He asked me, Mr. Speaker, if I would read the rest—

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): The member can read the parts he wants to read.

Mr. Singer: Oh I will, I have no intention of reading the parts he wants me to read. He can read them again himself.

The Premier goes on, say, if we are thinking of particular activities and events, it is obvious that regional government is going on all the time in a multitude of ways and in all regions of the province. As my colleague from Kitchener said: "Certainly it is going on all the time in 35 different ways at least, with 35 different sets of boundaries; no order, no pattern, no intelligence behind it at all." They pick what they think at the moment looks good, and I doubt—and I have never quite been able to figure this out, and again I have not got my divining rod that dips into the Cabinet minds—I doubt, sir, if there was any more surprised person in the province of Ontario to find that we were going to have a county form of education than the Minister of Education, who is now going to be charged with the responsibility of bringing this about and convincing the House that it was a good idea.

Now, on page 10 he had some more remarks and I think these should be put on the record again. We start at page 9:

> In planning our affairs, the government is at all times mindful of its responsibilities to future generations; to look ahead is to guarantee that this province will continue to benefit from the mistakes and achievements of others, as well as from the lessons of the past.

Those responsibilities are well summed up by a quotation from "Canada—A Year of the Land" and he says, and this is his quote:

> There we must look to the land and its secret cargo to learn the meaning of the nation and all its hopes and fears. For the land in its abundance and its splendour, not the statute books and legal contrasts, has always held the nation together, the land and the strange things visible and invisible that we have built upon it.

That is a noble quotation and a very fine sentiment and I applaud the Premier for bringing that to our attention.

Then he says:

> This is the approach we set out in our design for development.

What is the approach that you set out in your design for development? We believe in land —is that what you mean? Sure, we believe in land, it is great that we have so much land in Ontario but what is the approach that he set out in his design for development? "This is the approach we are following."

What, Mr. Speaker, is the Premier's approach? What approach is he following? There are 35, 36, 37 different ways to organize sub-branches of government, sir, of departments, of organizations throughout the province of Ontario. Is this the approach? Let no one be mistaken about this and he was raising his finger, and I was interjecting at that point, Mr. Speaker, and I remember very vividly he said: "Aha, I am getting on to something and you know it and you do not like it."

Well, I wish he would tell us, Mr. Speaker, what he is getting on to. What is the Premier's plan for development of the province of Ontario, and surely after all these years we are entitled to know and the people of Ontario are entitled to know.

Now, sir, I want to talk for a little while about another document. I guess this is going to be referred to for a long time as "McRuer." It is going to be recited—there are two other volumes. I felt I could be just as effective hoisting one while I was speaking as waving all three of them at you. It is going to be quoted for a long time and it is going to be in the Premier's words—what did he say, Mr. Speaker? Let me try and paraphrase as best I can remember—it is going to be a guide to our future procedures in the province of Ontario. Some guide, is what he said. Some guide.

Hardly had he made his introductory remarks, when his colleague, the Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. Stewart), introduced a couple of very interesting statutes. One of them was innocuous enough on its face; Bill 19, An Act to amend The Provincial Auctioneers' Act. I do not think that we needed McRuer to tell us that The Provincial Auctioneers' Act as it previously stood was a bad one. That Act, as you remember, sir, allowed the Minister of Agriculture and Food to grant a licence to a person who, in his opinion, has the special qualifications, a licence to sell purebred livestock only by public auction on terms. Nothing very mysterious about that, except that as we have talked more and more in this House about the protection of individual rights, many of us, and I think the Premier, to give him his full due, is concerned about arbitrary rights

lodged in departmental people, even in Ministers of the Crown.

Well, they had this Act, and I do not think any one of us, until we read McRuer specifically, or listened to the Minister of Agriculture and Food, would have gone out of our way to discover The Provincial Auctioneers' Act.

The second provision that the old Act had was that the Minister of Agriculture and Food may revoke any licence under this Act at any time for cause appearing to him to be sufficient.

Well, that was bad enough, and Mr. McRuer specifically singled out this statute—specifically wrote suggested amendments to it in his book, and they appear here at about page 90. Page 97 has one particular amendment that he wrote in.

That was bad enough, Mr. Speaker, but what happens? The Minister of Agriculture and Food, and I suppose he does not live in the same world as those people who read McRuer or want to apply the precepts to the affairs of this province, he brings in two amendments. He has replaced himself with the livestock commissioner. So what happens? The livestock commissioner may grant and license anyone who, in his opinion, should have a licence and the livestock commissioners may revoke a licence for any reason that he deems appropriate.

Surely, sir, this is what McRuer is all about. Surely the whole episode involving Bill 99 was an attempt to remove from people over whom the members of the Legislature have no control, arbitrary powers that are unfettered by legislative review or review by the courts. The Minister of Agriculture and Food attempted to bluff his way through, and said: "Well I asked my people if there would be an appeal and they assured me there could." And he did admit a little later on, as we got into the Act a little further, that if there had been an appeal in the old Act, it would have meant an appeal from the Minister to the Minister, and even the Minister of Agriculture and Food admitted that was a little silly.

Well I say, sir, where are the people who are running this province when they bring in pieces of legislation as obnoxious to our theories of personal liberty, as obnoxious to our belief in the rule of law, as this Bill 19? Do they just pass these things through their Cabinet council automatically? Does caucus just let them go automatically? What is the explanation? Was the inquiry into civil rights worthwhile, and if it was worthwhile, why then, do they bring a statute like this before this House?

And the same Minister brings before us another statute, and it may be that this Minister just does not believe in civil rights. That may be his philosophy and if it is, hurray for him, but I would have thought that his colleagues would have kept him under a bit of control, because he brings in another bill, Bill 35, An Act respecting the marketing of cattle for the production of beef.

As you know, sir, I am far from being an authority, nor would I attempt to give any violent or opinionated thoughts insofar as the agricultural affairs are concerned in this province, but my concern is as a lawyer.

Mr. Sopha: The member knows a good steak.

Mr. Singer: I know a good steak and I enjoy one, yes. My concern is as a lawyer. My concern is as a civil libertarian. My concern is that there be on the statute books of this province, legislation that has within it adequate safeguards to protect the rights of the people of the province of Ontario, and the same Minister, within days of introducing Bill 19 brings in Bill 35, and what does Bill 35 say? Well, section 1 is the definition section. That is not very important.

Section 2 is a very interesting section: "Except under the authority of a licence no person shall sell cattle." Subsection 2 of section 2: "Every person who sells cattle shall be deemed to be the holder of a licence." That is good.

Section 3 says something—

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): It must have been a lawyer!

Mr. Singer: Section 3 says something about a board of directors, and section 4, and this is the important section says, notwithstanding section 3, and that is the recommendation of directors, because the Lieutenant-Governor in council can appoint directors who are going to run the whole show. Notwithstanding subsection where the directors can run the whole show—those are the directors appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor in council. The Lieutenant-Governor in council may make regulations, and there are twenty different heads of regulations that may be made. Fine.

Surely, within all of the concepts of legislative responsibility, the most basic one is, that when government comes to an elected body to ask for authority to carry on a certain course of conduct, they have in mind

what they want to do and they have to express as a sense of their integrity in the statute, the principles that are going to govern that power that they are asking for. And what have they done here? What is this Minister asking for? He is asking for carte blanche to do anything he wants to do under the guise of passing regulations by the Lieutenant-Governor in council.

Could there be anything that flies more in the face of the recommendations contained in McRuer than this kind of a statute?

What happens to McRuer? I would like the Prime Minister to tell us. When are we going to begin to pay attention to it? It is more important, I suppose now, since we have in these three volumes, the precepts—the many precepts—that we have been talking about for such a length of time, but when do we begin to pay attention to them? How long is it going to be before what McRuer has said becomes, in fact, part and parcel of the procedure in the province of Ontario?

The Attorney General brought in an Act. The Professional Engineers Act, Bill 42. Now the Attorney General had the good grace to admit, which was more than we got from the Minister of Agriculture and Food, that The Professional Engineers Act, although it is called The Professional Engineers Act 1968, has been in his hands for over a year. The drafts and re-drafts were prepared concerning it over a period of time, and it was prepared without knowing the recommendations that McRuer was going to make insofar as the organization of professional societies.

In his introductory remarks the Attorney General made particular mention of the fact that this had been done. I think he left the door open, and I hope he takes advantage of the suggestion that he left dangling there, that if there seems to be serious violation of the principles as enunciated in McRuer, that this bill could perhaps be withdrawn for the present time, another careful look taken at it, and possibly re-written with those concepts in mind. If that is what he meant, I commend him for it.

But if we are going to embark on an important piece of legislation like this one, which is going to involve the whole profession of engineering in the province, and if we have the advantage of this report, surely it is only the path of elementary common sense that we take some of the advice that we have paid for in dollars, and some of the advice that we needed so desperately because we were straying into such dangerous paths.

While I am on the same theme, let me point to a section of The Mental Hospitals Act. My friend the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond) is here, and this came to my attention particularly in light of a case that is presently before the courts. There was a comment on it in the newspaper this morning. I am not going to deal with the matter that is before the courts, because as you know that would be improper, but as a result of what had happened, I made certain inquiries, and I came across section 28 and section 30 of the The Mental Hospitals Act which allow a most unusual and unique procedure to take place in this case.

Incidentally, in connection with these two sections, I note that those have been repealed by 1967 chapter 52 of the Ontario statutes. For some reason that I am not aware, this repeal has not yet been proclaimed, so the law is as it stands under sections 28 and 30.

Do you know what sections 28 and 30 allow? They allow a justice of the peace on complaint by anyone who might convince him, to issue a warrant for the arrest of the person complained about. The person complained about can then be hauled off to jail; he can be lodged in jail until he can conveniently be brought before a magistrate; and the magistrate then is ordered by the statute to commit that person complained about to a proper place so that he can be mentally examined.

That is what that statute says, and that is what in fact happened in this incident and I say, very carefully, I am not talking about what was before the courts.

I am advised that there appeared before a justice of the peace of the province of Ontario two lawyers from one of the largest legal firms in this province, a psychiatrist, and I think, the former wife of the gentleman they were complaining about, all of whom suggested to the justice of the peace that the man they were complaining about was lacking in some mental capacity. Whereupon the poor justice of the peace—there are all sorts of recommendations in here about qualifications for justices of the peace—who probably had never before been attended by such august company, quickly wrote out his warrant.

The police swung into action because they had a warrant; they were charged to; they went and arrested this man; he was lodged in jail over the weekend; he was brought before a magistrate the following day; and the magistrate had to order him to go to

an Ontario Hospital to be examined; and there it was.

Surely in this day and age, we must be concerned about this kind of an invasion of civil rights. Surely, sir, we have to begin to wonder about the authority that we give to justices of the peace. Surely, we have to wonder about the authority that magistrates have; and surely, we have to worry about protection of the individual.

Perhaps some time during the course of this session the Minister of Health is going to be able to explain to us why these sections in The Mental Hospitals Act which repeal these obnoxious sections have not in fact been proclaimed.

Surely, he can stand in his place and justify to the people of Ontario why there is a right to have a citizen appear before a justice of the peace. If I can convince him, Mr. Speaker, that I had some doubt about your mental capacity, with little more than that, a warrant could be issued, you could be carted off to jail, and you could be sent off to Whitby for a mental examination without a by-your-leave or anything else.

That is what the statutes of the province of Ontario say, and that is what is happening, and I think it is high time that this government began to set its house in order.

Now, I want to talk for a while about a subject that came up in private members' hour dealing with the law of landlord and tenant. It appeared in the form of a resolution standing in my name and in the name of the hon. member for Lakeshore. We got into another row—that was the Friday morning after the black Thursday night—we never quite did get that debate through. But there were many things I wanted to add, and I think this is an appropriate time to add some of them. I think we will just get a chance to get nicely into this and I will amplify my remarks in regard to it tomorrow.

The substantial theme of our suggestions in this regard was that the law of landlord and tenant which has stood pretty well in the same way ever since it has been introduced in Ontario—and we imported it from England where it has stood in the same way for 200 or 300 years prior to that—should be brought up to date; should be rewritten; and should be made to apply so that there could be some protection for tenants.

I started to outline as time ran out on that Friday morning, the incident involving a lady who lived in my constituency who began to have some trouble with her landlord, and let me tell you about that.

This lady lived in a large apartment house in my riding. She lived with her two sons, they shared the rent. One of them got married and was on his way out and she decided that she could get by at less expense in a smaller apartment and she arranged for the rental of it. She had been a tenant, a very responsible lady, in this apartment for five or six years, a responsible lady employed with a large industrial concern in the borough of North York. She paid her rent through her long tenancy on time by cheque. Every cheque that she gave them was accepted by the bank, the landlord got his money.

When she decided to move out, she made arrangements with her new landlord for moving in and he wanted his first month's rent in advance and a security deposit. She gave it to him. She went back to her old landlord, the one she was leaving, and said: I am leaving and you have got my security deposit in hand, would it be all right if that was applied for my last month's rent?

In these big apartment projects you do not really get to speak to the landlord, you get to speak the superintendent who, in due course, brings back the word.

Well, the word did not come. There was no answer really. That is what happened and I know, being familiar as you are, with respect to it, that after 16 days had gone by in came the bailiff, this lady having had no word.

She was a lady of good habits who had taken good care of her apartment. I saw it myself and the place was just spotless. There was not even a nick anywhere. It was clean. The walls were clean. Just a spotless apartment.

She believed, and with good reason, that her security deposit would be applied on account of her last month's rent. Lo and behold she came home one night from work and the bailiff had come and on the door was a notice. The bailiff had taken over. She was locked out of her apartment. She could not get back in.

All her clothes, everything she owned, was inside the apartment. She had been evicted and distrained.

Well, she came to me and said: What can I do? I said we would try and talk to the landlord.

Well, we tried to talk to the landlord and there was no talking to the landlord. "Sixteen days she is in arrears, either you pay or get out."

Well, all right, we will pay, says the lady and she writes out a cheque and tries to

offer it to the landlord. Seven years she has paid her rent by cheque, not one of them has ever bounced, every one has been there on the first of the month. He cannot take a cheque, it has to be cash.

At 7 o'clock at night where is that lady going to get cash to get back into her apartment to let her get her clothes out? To let her carry on in the ordinary way? Well, we cashed a cheque for her, but in addition to the rent, there were bailiff's fees for turning the lock on the door. They have a master switch on these things so that the landlord can lock anybody out and nobody else can get in. That was all the bailiff's seizure was, the turning of the lock and the putting of the notice on the door. Bailiff's fees, $32.

The only way we could get her back in was to pay the month's rent and the $32, which we did that night in cash.

The unreasonableness of the landlord speaks for itself. The fact that he broke the law, and the fact that he evicted and distrained speaks for itself too. But was this lady going to take him to court and ask for damages, and what would the measure of damages be I do not know. The bailiff's fee puzzled me, so I attended the following morning on the bailiff and I will tell the Attorney General his name because I think something should be done about this. I said: "Mr. Bailiff, I would like to know how you arrived at the $32 figure? Would you show me your tariff, and show me how you calculated it? So he pulled out his tariff and looked up and down. "I guess we made a mistake. The fee, the tariff should have been $12."

There it was. Within an hour they had gone back up to the apartment, given her back the overcharge, the $20 overcharge, and there it was.

This, Mr. Speaker, is the kind of practice that goes on. This is an actual case and I can take you to the apartment house. I can take you to the bailiff, and this is the sort of thing that has to halt.

What do you think of a lease, Mr. Speaker, and I have one here in my hand, what do you think of a lease that says this:

> Clause 13. The lessee covenants not to assign or sublet the leased premises without the prior written consent of the owner of the lessor, provided however that such consent may be arbitrarily withheld by the lessor in its sole discretion.

Up to that point it is not unusual, it is a little harsh. Then it goes on to say:

> Notwithstanding any present or future Act of the Legislature or of the Parliament of Canada.

What would you think of that if you saw that in a lease, Mr. Speaker? Would you not be shocked? I am sure you would.

An hon. member: Heartless landlord!

Mr. Singer: What would you think of a landlord who inserted this kind of a clause in his lease?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am not a QC but I know that is no good.

Mr. Singer: I am very glad, and I hope the record will show that the Minister of Reform Institutions said he is not a QC, but he knows that clause is no good. I think this is particularly pertinent to the balance of my story, because I quite agree with the Minister.

Mr. Sopha: The Attorney General will give him a QC.

Mr. Singer: What would you think of a lease, sir, in which the landlord has inserted a clause:

> The lessee hereby waives and renounces the benefit of any present or future Act of the Legislature of the province of Ontario taking away or limiting the landlord's right of distress, and agrees with the lessor that notwithstanding any such Act the lessor may seize upon and sell all the goods and chattels of the lessee for payment of rent and costs as might have been done if such Act had not been passed.

Mr. Sopha: That is incredible—

Mr. Singer: Again, my hon. friend the Minister is not a QC, but I think he would give the same legal opinion, would he not? I am sure he would.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It must have been a lawyer.

Mr. MacDonald: The hon. member for Riverdale put it on the record last year.

Mr. Singer: Well, what would you think, sir, of a landlord who puts in a clause, he says:

> —the lessee will abide by and fully comply with all lawful rules, regulations and by-laws of every Dominion, provincial and municipal or other authority, which in any manner affects the leased premises including those which are stipulated in the resident's handbook.

So not only do you get the lease, but you get a whole bunch of rules and regulations in a handbook which the lessor must immediately comply with.

What would you think about a landlord who says this, and puts it in his lease?

> That the lessor, its officers and employees, agents, contractors—

Listen to all the people who can do this:

> —or any of them shall have the right at all reasonable times and from time to time during the currency of this tenancy, to enter into and upon the leased premises with all necessary men, plant and equipment, for the purpose of viewing the state of repairs.

Up to that point they have not even found out there is anything wrong, but they can come in with any amount of men and equipment and plant, just to view the state of affairs, making any repairs or alterations which are the lessor's responsibility thereto or therein. Well that is one phase. Or:

> To exhibit the leased premises to any prospective tenant and that all persons who have written authority therefore from the lessor may enter in and upon and view the leased premises at all reasonable hours.

Great tenancy you are going to have here. The landlord could write out a slip of paper and anybody can march in and out of that apartment at all periods of time. What would you think of a landlord who would put that kind of a clause in?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Reasonable hours it says. It is bad enough. Do not make it worse.

Mr. Singer: Oh yes. Well I ask my friend, the hon. Minister, that is probably a little more legal but it is—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It is bad enough!

Mr. Singer: What would you think, Mr. Speaker, of a landlord who puts in a clause that says:

> That the lessor may terminate this lease at any time and without reference to the term given in the lease by giving 30 days' notice in writing.

In other words, it does not matter. You think you have got an apartment for two years. The landlord has changed his mind and gives you notice of 30 days and lets you get out.

> Upon expiry whereof the lessee shall deliver up vacant possession of the leased premises to the lessor and if the date for the delivery of such vacant possession falls on any other day than the last day of the month the rent for such month shall be apportioned.

So you even do away with the normal 30 days' notice.

Let me just finish, and I will just be a moment, what would you think of a landlord who in addition puts in this clause:

> That the lessee shall have failed within five days to remedy any default hereunder of which the lessor has given written notice then the lessor may terminate this lease and obtain vacant possession of the leased premises on the expiration of a further five days.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Heartless landlord!

Mr. Singer: No, sir, let me just ask one question: Who would you think the landlord is? The landlord is the Ontario housing corporation.

Mr. Singer moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I would say that if you look at the order paper, despite the remarks of the last speaker, there are a few bills there that I would like to deal with on second reading in order that they might get into the committee stage and be dealt with in the normal process of this House. So may I suggest the bills that are marked as printed, we should be ready to deal with as the opportunity presents itself.

We will continue this debate tomorrow afternoon.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 6:00 o'clock, p.m.

No. 32

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

First Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Thursday, March 21, 1968

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1968

5

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Thursday, March 21, 1968

Eighth report, standing committee on private bills, Mr. Carton 1043

Establishment, extension, improvement and maintenance of airports, bill respecting, Mr. Haskett, first reading 1043

Statement re Elderly Persons' Centres Act, Mr. Yaremko 1043

Tabling reports, Mr. Wishart 1044

Question to Mr. Stewart re milk prices, Mr. MacDonald 1045

Questions to Mr. Wishart re the late Harold E. Rider, Mr. Sopha 1045

Questions to Mr. Wishart re persons posing as Department of Revenue officials, Mr. B. Newman 1045

Question to Mr. Wishart re compensation to crime victims, Mr. J. Renwick 1046

Questions to Mr. Wishart re death of Arthur Louis Cuccia, Mr. De Monte 1047

Questions to Mr. Simonett re the Ontario energy board, Mr. R. S. Smith 1047

Questions to Mr. Bales re education courses for strikers, Mr. Paterson 1048

Questions to Mr. Haskett re list of automobile owners, Mr. Sargent, Mr. Sopha 1048

Questions to Mr. Wishart re Timothy Upshill and Douglas Innes, Mr. Sargent 1049

Questions to Mr. Wishart re legal aid, Mr. Sargent 1050

Question to Mr. Brunelle re forest management, Mr. Sargent 1050

Question to Mr. Randall re the Ontario development corporation, Mr. Stokes 1051

Questions to Mr. Bales re workmen's compensation, Mr. Shulman 1052

Question to Mr. Wishart re Ralph Farris, Mr. Shulman 1052

Conclusion of the debate on the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Singer, Mr. Grossman 1052

Recess, 6 o'clock 1083

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, MARCH 21, 1968

The House met at 2:30 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are always pleased to have visitors to the Legislature, and today we welcome as guests, a scout troop from Peterborough, the Young Women's Christian Association of Toronto and the Golf Club Road public school in Scarborough, all in the east gallery.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Mr. G. R. Carton from the standing committee on private bills, presented the committee's eighth report which was read as follows and adopted:

Your committee begs to report the following bills without amendment:

Bill Pr6, An Act respecting the county of Renfrew.

Bill Pr27, An Act respecting the town of Palmerston.

Your committee begs to report the following bill with certain amendments:

Bill Pr9, An Act respecting the city of Ottawa separate school board.

Your committee would recommend that the following bill, having been withdrawn, be not reported:

Bill Pr47, An Act respecting the Laurentian University of Sudbury.

Mr. Speaker: Presenting reports.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

ESTABLISHMENT, EXTENSION, IMPROVEMENT AND MAINTENANCE OF AIRPORTS

Hon. I. Haskett (Minister of Transport) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the establishment, extension, improvement and maintenance of airports.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Speaker, there are approximately 35 applications to the government for financial assistance respecting the establishment and maintenance of landing strips in the province. It is government policy to lend financial help and when appropriate to do so to aid in obtaining assistance from the federal government.

Within our Department of Transport, we have established a transportation wing for the purpose of dealing with matters of this nature. This bill will enable the department to perform a very important function.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day. I rise on a point of personal privilege.

A report in today's press states that I made certain assurances to Mr. John Caulfield, president of local 878, Canadian union of public employees. I wish to make it clear that I did not speak to Mr. Caulfield yesterday, nor, to my knowledge, have I spoken with him at any time regarding the issues reported in the press, including the posting of notices on bulletin boards at Don Jail.

The general policy regarding the posting of notices has not been changed and, in fact, for security reasons, since notices may be read by inmates, the governor had control of notices to be posted when the staff was employed by Metropolitan Toronto.

I am informed that the governor met with Mr. Caulfield yesterday and advised him that the grievance procedure established under The Public Service Act must be followed. Naturally, I am pleased that the matter appears to be resolved.

Hon. J. Yaremko (Minister of Social and Family Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce to the members of the House, including the member for Ontario South (Mr. W. Newman) who was in touch with me a little while ago about this matter, that The Elderly Persons' Centres Act has been proclaimed, in force and a complete set of regulations has also been approved.

This legislation assists approved organizations to build and operate social, recreational, day care and "drop-in" centres for elderly people—men and women in the community—and was a re-writing and improvement of The Elderly Persons' Social and Recreational Centres Act and regulations back in 1962.

Under the Act, the province continues to offer capital grants covering 30 per cent of the cost of constructing, altering, extending or renovating a building for use as a centre. This is conditional upon a 20 per cent grant from the local municipality.

Former restrictions were lifted so that capital grants could be made for a centre that is part of a larger building, such as a low-rental housing complex or a general community hall. For the first time, some of the day-to-day programme and administration costs will be subsidized by the province, and grants may be made for other services, facilities and research.

The regulations set up the terms under which these grants will be provided—in varying amounts up to $5,000—for the current fiscal year from April, 1967 to March, 1968. The regulations also permit the capital subsidy of 30 per cent of establishment cost to be paid in advance instalments to assist in the interim financing of elderly persons' centres. These centres are becoming increasingly popular with retired people, often living alone, who appreciate the specialized services, recreational facilities, opportunities for continuous earning and a chance for friendship and sociability.

The new provincial legislation, as I have outlined, is in itself an encouragement to the further development of numerous elderly persons' centres throughout Ontario. In addition, we have under consideration further legislation in this regard which will be announced in due course.

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to table the annual report of the inspector of legal officies for the year ending December 31, 1967. Also, Mr. Speaker, the annual report from the commissioner of the Ontario Provincial Police for the year 1967, and the annual report of the fire marshal for the year 1967.

Mr. Speaker, I also beg leave to table herewith four reports of the Ontario law reform commission, which have been submitted to me and which I feel will be of interest to hon. members and also to the public.

The first of these reports is the annual report of the commission for the period from the time of the constitution of the commission up to December 31, 1967. This report reviews the function, the organization and the programme of the Ontario law reform commission and sets forth in a concise, clear manner the very significant contribution which the commission has made to the development of the laws of our province since the enactment of The Ontario Law Reform Commission Act in 1964.

While I have reported on the work of the commission during the estimates of my department in previous years, I felt that an annual report in the nature of the one which I am now submitting would be of assistance to the Legislature and, of course, to those who wish to maintain a familiarity with the work of the commission.

The annual report speaks for itself and I will not take the time of the House to review it in detail, but I would recommend this particular report to the consideration of hon. members, since I know that they will find it of significant interest.

The second report which I beg leave to table is the report of the commission relating to the proposed adoption in Ontario of The Uniform Wills Act. This particular report, Mr. Speaker, is very significant and I am tabling it at this time in order that the legal profession and the public may consider the important recommendations that are contained in the report.

In essence, the commission has recommended that we enact in this province a new wills Act based upon the model legislation which has been developed by the conference of commissioners on uniformity of legislation in Canada. The purpose of the draft bill which is proposed in this report is to resolve many of the discrepancies which now exist in wills legislation throughout our country, and in this context it does make important recommendations respecting conflict of laws and other significant aspects of the law relating to the disposition of property by way of will.

I do not propose to introduce legislation at this session of the Legislature which would carry into effect these proposals, since they are obviously of great significance to all of the citizens of the province and to the legal profession which advises individuals upon the making of their wills and the disposition of their property in that manner.

I am sure that hon. members will agree it would be preferable to provide a wide circulation of this report so that we may receive the submissions of all those persons interested in this field of law, in order that we

may then consider these submissions and proceed with legislation which will ultimately reflect the consideration which may be given to these submissions.

I do wish to state to the House, Mr. Speaker, that we are indebted to the Ontario branch of the Canadian bar association which, through its committee on wills and trusts, has provided the Ontario law reform commission with very real and substantial assistance in the preparation of this draft legislation. This is not the first time that we have received the benefit of this continuing co-operation from the Canadian bar association, and I believe it illustrates just how effective that organization is in providing us with the advice of the legal profession in matters closely related to the development of the laws of our province.

The third report to which I would make reference, Mr. Speaker, is the report of the commission respecting the amendment to The Sandwich, Windsor and Amherstburg Railway Act of 1930, which has resulted in the particular amending bill which is already before this House. The report and the legislation are self-explanatory.

The last report which I wish to table at this time is that relating to the comments provided by the Ontario law reform commission upon the proposed divorce legislation at Ottawa. The comments, I believe, will be of interest to those who have been conversant with the passing of the legislation in the House of Commons and the Senate.

While the latter two reports may not have the same significance to this House as do the first two reports, I feel that they may be of interest to certain individuals and for that reason I seek leave to table them at this time.

Mr. Speaker: The member for York South has a question for the Minister of Agriculture and Food.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, my question to the Minister of Agriculture and Food: Is it the Minister's intention to have his department or any other appropriate body review the announcement of the milk price increase so as to assure the public of its justification?

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): Mr. Speaker, I should first of all say that the news I have heard of the proposed increase in price does not affect all dairies in the Toronto area because not all of them have indicated that they intend to increase the retail price of milk.

And, Mr. Speaker, I would say further that there is no legislation limiting or controlling the retail price for milk in the province of Ontario. Retail selling of milk is a very highly competitive business, as I am sure everyone realizes, and this is particularly true since the introduction of the multi-quart jug which has been sold quite extensively through milk stores.

I would say that competition, sales volume and consumer acceptance and demand for this multi-purpose jug has certainly cut into the costs of delivering milk on a door-to-door basis. The reports that I have heard of this proposed increase is based on a single quart of milk but the fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that close to 70 per cent of all the milk consumed in Metropolitan Toronto, for example, is picked up at stores.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): I have a question for the Attorney General, Mr. Speaker.

In respect of the recent death of a person whom the Attorney General has assured was Harold E. Rider, would the Attorney General inform the House as to the following:

1. Were there any documents upon the body when it was found? 2. To whom were these documents given and where are they now? 3. Did Harold E. Rider own any assets? 4. Did he leave a will and if so, who was the beneficiary? 5. If he did not leave a will, did any person come forward claiming to be personal representative, and if so, who was that person?

Hon. Mr Wishart: Mr. Speaker, as I have, I believe, stated previously in the House there were no documents found on the body of Harold Rider; only a wrist watch. In the locked room where Rider was found, however, was a wallet containing money, credit cards, taxi license—with the name Harold Rider. The wrist watch, the wallet, the money, and the keys to the room were received by Mrs. Rider from the police.

Mr. Speaker, I do not have details of other assets of Rider or whether he had a will. Mrs. Rider claimed all the personal property and I am advised that title to the taxi licence, which Rider owned, was transferred to her and that she had subsequently sold this title and interest to another party.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs.

Mr. Speaker: May I advise the member that this question was so directed and has been redirected, and his office was advised, to the Attorney General. The question was placed first in the name of the member for Sudbury, but that was an error and it is now in the name of the member who is asking the question, so would he direct the question then to the Attorney General?

Mr. B. Newman: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In the light of the recent warning by The Department of National Revenue concerning the operation of persons posing as representatives of the Department of National Revenue in the Ottawa-Cornwall area, for the purpose of making up income tax returns, would the Minister inform the House what steps his department has taken, or intends to take, to curb and regulate the activities of those engaged in this business?

Mon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, I have a question which appears to come from the member for Sudbury in a different language —however—

Mr. B. Newman: This originally was my question, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, the complaints respecting these matters were not directed to me. If the conduct constituted a crime, presumably the individuals would have reported the matter to the local police or the Crown attorney. The federal department has no doubt investigated the incident. I am sure it will take the appropriate action to advise the police in order that they may curb these activities. Our officials in the area have been notified to take any action warranted by the facts.

Mr B. Newman: Mr. Speaker, if I may ask your ruling on this—should this not have remained with the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs, seeing it was consumer protection?

Mr. Speaker: No, it is not consumer protection in my opinion; it is a matter of whether a law has been broken or not, and the department which deals with that is The Department of the Attorney General, in my opinion. If the member wishes to rephrase the question so that it is obviously consumer protection—which I do not think it is the way it is, it is in my area too, my home area—I would be glad to receive another question tomorrow morning.

The member for Simcoe Centre has the floor.

Mr. D. A. Evans (Simcoe Centre): Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago, the residents of my home town of Bradford were particularly thrilled to learn that a beautiful and talented young lady from Bradford, with her partner, Dick Shedlowski, now of Toronto, had won the Canadian junior championship in the figure skating pairs class at Vancouver on January 10.

Maureen Walker is proud to call herself a resident of Bradford, and those of us who live there are even prouder of her and the fame she has brought to our town.

Maureen is the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. D. R. (Brad) Walker, and her father was decorated for bravery on operational service with the RCAF during the second world war, and was a comrade-in-arms of our Prime Minister.

In 1966 Maureen and Dick won the Canadian novice pairs skating championship and in 1967 they were the Central Ontario champions in the senior pairs division. Then, this year, they are the junior pairs champions of Canada. We are delighted, Mr. Speaker, to have Dick and Maureen with us in the Speaker's gallery today.

In asking them to rise, I know all hon. members join with me in expressing our appreciation to them—through you, Mr. Speaker for their skill, perseverance and sportsmanship, and we wish them continued success and good fortune in the years ahead.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Speaker, I have directed a question to the Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts). Because of the—

Mr. Speaker: The member will note that the Prime Minister is not in the House and—

Mr. J. Renwick: I would respectfully ask permission to redirect the question because of its importance to the Attorney General, if I may do so with his permission.

Mr. Speaker: Yes, I think it is a matter of importance and the Attorney General can take it as notice, and he will not be in a position to answer it. I would allow the question to be asked and taken as notice.

Mr. J. Renwick: Thank you. The question was originally addressed to the Prime Minister, and with the Attorney General's permission, I direct it to him.

Will the Prime Minister immediately appoint a commission under The Public Inquiries Act to investigate and report on all the circumstances surrounding the alleged police brutality in the arrest and detention at No. 52 division of the Metropolitan Toronto police of one Gary Harding, presently under intensive care at the Toronto general hospital, suffering from serious injuries, involving amongst others Detective Harry Midgley of the Metropolitan Toronto police and Royal Canadian Mounted Police constable Douglas Nixon.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, I will take the question as notice and I would anticipate I would be able to give an answer very quickly.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Will we have to ask the commissioner's politics?

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, I have a further question for the Attorney General. Will the Attorney General embody in his proposed bill for compensation for victims of crimes, the principles set out in the study undertaken by the Canadian corrections association, released yesterday?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, The Ontario Law Enforcement Compensation Act 1967 is already passed by this Legislature. I have not seen the study referred to by the hon. member except to see the press report this morning. I am going to make a point of reading and studying that report, but at the present time I think that the Act that we have in our Legislature indicates the views of the government on this subject.

Mr. D. M. De Monte (Dovercourt): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Attorney General, notice of which has been given. In view of the fact that an investigation was ordered into the wounding of a 14-year-old boy in Windsor, has a similar investigation been ordered into the death of Arthur Louis Cuccia, the man who was killed recently in an alleged gun battle with the police in the city of Toronto?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, the circumstances in the Cuccia case are somewhat different from those in the Windsor matter. There are criminal charges pending in the Cuccia case which have not yet been disposed of by the court. It is expected that all the facts will be made known at the trial. The disclosure of the circumstances at this time could very well prejudice the fair trial of the accused.

Mr. De Monte: Mr. Speaker, will the Attorney General submit to a supplementary question?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I accept the question but, a matter of this kind, which is before the court, if it relates to this, I think I have answered that I do not wish to discuss it while it is before the court. I will accept the question but I will not undertake to give an answer.

Mr. De Monte: Would the Attorney General—

Mr. Speaker: Order. I think it should be well understood, particularly by the newer members of this House, that in this House, as well as other similar assemblies, matters which are before the courts are not open for discussion, and while I do allow a certain number of these questions to be put because they are matters of public importance, I trust the members will be guided by that particular rule. The member may place his supplementary if he wishes now.

Mr. De Monte: Has an investigation been made by the police chief of the city of Toronto?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, I do not know that this has been completed yet. If I had notice of the question, I might have been able to give an answer.

Mr. R. S. Smith (Nipissing): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Energy and Resources Management. First, what steps are being taken by the Ontario energy board to assure that the supply of domestically-produced oil, refined in Ontario, will meet the demands of Ontario? Second, has the Ontario energy board, in conjunction with The Department of Economics and Development, taken any steps to have refinery capacity increased in Ontario, since the national energy board policy of using domestically produced oil in most part of Ontario is being broken by some major oil companies?

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Mr. Speaker, the answer to the first part of the question is "none". The Ontario energy board does not have any jurisdiction; and to the second part the answer is "no". This matter comes under the national oil policy which is administered by the federal government.

Mr. R. S. Smith: Mr. Speaker, could I ask the Minister a supplementary question? Do

you have an opinion, as the Minister responsible for energy in the province on this matter?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, I did not get his question.

Mr. R. S. Smith: Do you have an opinion as to whether the national energy board should enforce the ruling that crude oils coming into the province from foreign countries, should be stopped, and that the line being drawn down the Ottawa Valley should be the line to which these oil companies will submit?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Speaker, I think that is a question which should be directed to the national energy board as I would think they would have much more experience along those matters than we would in the province of Ontario.

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Labour. Does the Minister's department have any involvement in the education courses that are obligatory for the membership of certain unions while on strike to enable members to collect strike pay?

Hon. D. A. Bales (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, in reply to the question from the hon. member for Essex South, my department has no involvement in these courses.

Mr. Paterson: Might the Minister accept a supplementary question? Is the Minister aware of the nature of the courses being given in those instances?

Hon. Mr. Bales: No, Mr. Speaker, I am not. I have seen certain press reports but that is all.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): The question I have for the Minister of Agriculture and Food has been withdrawn.

Mr. Speaker: I would reply to the member for Essex Kent that I will take care of the other question when the Prime Minister is in the House.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): A question to the hon. Minister of Transport:

1. Will the Minister advise the House if an ordinary citizen in the province of Ontario can obtain a complete list of car owners in the province;

2. Is the complete file of the Ontario motor vehicles licence branch available to R. L. Polk Company?

3. If the answer to the question is "yes", what does the R. L. Polk Company pay for that privilege?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Speaker, the answer to the three questions are, respectively:

1. Such a duplicate list is not immediately available. It could be provided, but since our vehicle registration system is still a manual one, the preparation of such an additional list would be time-consuming and expensive.

2. The only surplus copy, that is the second carbon copy, of registrations and renewals is made available.

3. Approximately $35,000 this year, and in addition, supplies our department with a variety of statistical reports.

Mr. Sargent: Will the Minister accept a supplementary on this?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I will hear it and try.

Mr. Sargent: What right does the Minister have to give a monopoly to this valuable property worth maybe a quarter of a million dollars?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Speaker, I think I explained the physical limitations there is to providing more at this time while the system is still manual. Once the system becomes automated, I think we will have to review this problem and see if others wanted duplicate lists, what it would cost to make them available.

Mr. Sargent: The Minister says he will make them available to the ordinary person?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Speaker, in answering the first question, I said such a duplicate list is not immediately available but one could be supplied.

Mr. Sargent: What does that mean? Will he or will he not?

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Sargent: He does not answer my question, Mr. Speaker.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: The Minister has answered the question in the manner in which he prefers to answer it. The member who asked the question was entitled to ask the question in the manner in which he wished to ask it. That question has exhausted its possibilities at the moment.

Mr. Sopha: I would like to know if the carbons are put out on tender. Does the department put it out on tender?

Mr. Speaker: Order! The member can place that question if he wishes, tomorrow.

Mr. Sopha: He was just going to answer it.

Mr. Speaker: If the Minister wishes to answer it now I have no objection.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Speaker, the answer is a very simple "no". It has been supplied, and it is the only one that is available, to one firm for more than 30 years. It was originally supplied to another firm and the present firm bought out the one to whom it was originally supplied, and this one firm is supplied with comparable lists, I think by every province and state on the continent. That is what makes the collection valuable to us in the variety of statistical reports with which we, in turn, are supplied.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, that is completely illegal.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sargent: At ten cents a name, that is a lot of money.

A question, Mr. Speaker, for the hon. Attorney General. Is the Attorney General aware that Timothy Upshill and Douglas Innes, aged 17 and 18, have been held—and this question is wrong Mr. Minister, it should have read five weeks—in Don jail as material witnesses having committed no crime? What steps are being taken to clear this injustice?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, I am glad that the hon. member corrected the question which read that they had been held five months. The witnesses referred to have been held, and were taken into custody actually on February 24, 1968, as material witnesses in a murder case. Bail was set in the amount of $500 for each person, and I am advised that counsel has been available to these men.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I must say that I am reluctant to discuss the matter in detail, because I am advised that a preliminary hearing is in progress today, and at the conclusion of the preliminary hearing, bail for these witnesses will no doubt be considered again. I think that I should not discuss the case further than that at this time.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the concern for the case here, but the principle that is involved in the answer, so far as the duty of counsel of the Don jail, this morning, voluntarily, of course—

Mr. Speaker: Order!

The member is entitled to ask questions, not to make statements.

Mr. Sargent: Will he answer the question then? The duty counsel said that this is completely in violation of section 603, subsection 2 of the criminal code. The duty counsellor says this. Will the Attorney General qualify how you can break this law today with these young chaps who have co-operated fully with the police, and have committed no crime?

Mr. Speaker: Order, the member has asked his question, now will he please be seated while the Minister decides whether he will answer or not.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member will submit this question in clear form so that I may understand it, I will be glad to answer it. I do not quite understand the question the way it is put in this supplementary way.

Mr. Sopha: It is in section 603(2).

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Well, I still have to have it stated so that I may answer it.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: And he has not got any QC, the hon. member can take it from me. Mark it up to my experience but he will get a QC out of it.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, I am familiar with section 603, and 611, which I referred to in this House recently. It was a similar matter having to do with the taking into custody of—

Mr. Sargent: The people of Ontario should be aware of it also.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order!

Hon. Mr. Wishart: The taking into custody of, and the holding of, material witnesses. I pointed out at that time that the criminal code of Canada provides for these procedures.

Mr. Sargent: Not this one!

Hon. Mr. Wishart: And I am quite confident that if these people are being held as material witnesses they are being held within the provisions of the criminal code, namely sections 603, and 611.

Mr. Sargent: The duty counsel does not think so.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: If the hon. member wants to pose a particular question and give me the details, I would be happy to give him a detailed answer.

Mr. Sargent: Thank you. Along the same line, I will finish up the questions to the Minister. In view of the fact that we have now over 30 courts being held daily in Metro Toronto, does the Minister plan a review of the many shortcomings in the judicial system, where the accused are not able to get proper justice owing to lack of lawyers? Magistrate Dneiper was the man, the offender in this case—

Mr. Speaker: Order! The member has a question—will he please place the question?

Mr. Sargent: When is the Minister going to take steps to reprimand magistrate Dneiper and other offenders for not setting realistic bail? And for not having human understanding in handling and sentencing accused in court?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The member will not get a QC for that one.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, to take the questions in the order in which they were given. I would agree with the hon. member that the magistrates' courts, particularly in the Toronto area, are very busy. We have, however, provided a very comprehensive system of legal aid, and I am not aware that anyone is being denied counsel.

If the hon. member has a specific case of this I will be glad to have him bring it to my attention. I think that the opposite is the fact, that where counsel are asked for, they are without exception supplied. As to the question, when is the Minister going to take steps to reprimand magistrate Dneiper, I would have to say to the hon. member that as Minister of Justice, and Attorney General, I do not contemplate reprimanding any person on the bench of the magistrate's court or any other court.

I would say that I am free to express opinions, as the hon. member is, as to the decisions of the courts, but my post in the government gives me no authority to reprimand, or to change a decision, or to direct a decision. I think the hon. member will appreciate that if you once allowed the political arm to get into the administration of justice, this would be the most dangerous and reprehensible thing that could happen.

Surely the hon. member realizes that he should not urge or suggest that this should happen. We do have a magistrate known as the chief magistrate to whom complaints are made and to whose attention matters are brought when we feel that the administration is not carried out in what we think is a satisfactory manner, or when we have disagreement with the magistrate's views or procedures. If the hon. member would care to bring me a particular case which I have not already reported to the chief magistrate, I would be glad to have it looked into in this way.

Mr. Sargent: A supplementary question, would the Minister agree that there is a need for a pool of lawyers to be made available solely to handle legal aid? Because it is my opinion that it is bogging down completely; legal aid is not working now. Would the Minister agree that a pool should be set up, sir?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, in every country and every district of the province there is a committee, I do not call it a pool, established under The Legal Aid Act—

Mr. Sargent: Oh—

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Just allow me to finish, please.

There is a committee of lawyers, including welfare persons to assay and weigh the requests for legal aid, and to allocate persons to take care of the cases where legal aid is required. And as I am informed, and I think that I am pretty well informed, the legal aid plan is working very well.

Mr. Sargent: This is a question for the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests. In view of the statement in the *Gobe and Mail* this morning, that the chief forester, MacMillan Bloedel stated that the forest situation is in grave danger and substantial government funds are needed to be spent on our forests, will the Minister advise what plan his department has to improve the situation?

Hon. R. Brunelle (Minister of Lands and Forests): Mr. Speaker, I first wish to commend the hon. member for his interest in this important matter. My department recognizes the need to increase the productivity of our forests, and accepts the responsibility for providing future generations with high yield forest crops. The preparation of detailed

long range wood production objectives is well advanced and we are anxious to take the steps necessary to ensure that the required quantities of raw material will be available to Ontario's forest industries on an expanding supply basis in the years to come. The Department of Lands and Forests has stepped up its forest inventory, regeneration and stand improvement programmes in recent years and further increases will take place in 1968.

In point of fact, the department's forest management programme is being expanded as rapidly as the provision of funds, the development of technology, the availability of professional and technical forestry staff, permit. We are confident that our anticipated wood production targets will be met.

Mr. Sargent: I have two questions for the Prime Minister, and I would like to put them on the record.

Mr. Speaker: Order! The member will please desist from reading the questions in accordance with the agreed custom. When the Prime Minister is in his seat the question may be put.

Mr. Sargent: This question has been sitting on the order paper for a month.

Mr. Speaker: The member can take that up with Mr. Speaker.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Economics and Development. Will the Ontario development corporation assist financially in the reopening of Norply in Nipigon and if so, to what exent and under what conditions will such assistance be made available?

Hon. S. J. Randall (Minister of Economics and Development): Mr. Speaker, in answer to the question, officials of the Ontario development corporation are meeting this afternoon, March 21, 1968, with a group which has shown interest in reopening the mill. It is not possible for me to give an assurance that the Ontario development corporation will be in a position to assist financially in the reopening of the Norply mill at Nipigon, nor the extent and conditions under which such assistance might be made available. This will depend on the type of proposal that is received.

I would state, however, that any sound proposal, either from the group with which ODC is meeting today, or any other group, which indicates that the mill can be reopened with a reasonable chance of success will be given favourable consideration for financial assistance by the Ontario development corporation.

Mr. Speaker, while I am on my feet, I have a question here from the hon. member for Sandwich-Riverside (Mr. Burr). If you would like, I will be happy to answer it.

1. Ontario housing corporation borrows 90 per cent of the funds required to develop its housing projects from central mortgage and housing corporation under the terms of The National Housing Act. CMHC's policy with regard to the provision of ancilliary facilities in Ontario housing developments is that these must be "appropriate to the development". For this reason such facilities can only be of sufficient size to meet the requirements and needs of the residents of the development and are not available to residents of the community at large.

Ontario housing corporation's developments in Metropolitan Toronto in which facilities have been provided to date have all been in excess of 400 units. However, there is no arbitrary limitation as to what is considered a suitable size.

2. Present projects in Windsor comprise federal-provincial developments constructed and financed on a partnership basis with the federal government, and, since the creation of Ontario housing corporation, projects which the corporation has developed on the basis of long-term federal loans. In either case the provision of ancilliary facilities at this time would be dependent upon the availability of space for such facilities and the willingness of the federal government to participate financially. I have asked Ontario housing corporation to look into each of these matters and they will advise me later on and I will give further information.

Mr. Stokes: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Education (Mr. Davis).

Will the Minister assure parents of Indian children in the Armstrong area that they will be provided with educational facilities without having to travel away from home?

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I had a question which was misdirected—it was my error, I hasten to add—to the Prime Minister. I have sent a copy of it to the Minister of Economics and Development and he has indicated he will answer it tomorrow, so I will put the question tomorrow, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Labour.

Will the Minister during this session of the Legislature introduce legislation amending section 37 of The Workmen's Compensation Act, to increase pensions paid to the dependents in case of a workman's death?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Speaker, in reply to the question from the hon. member for High Park, on March 5 the hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. Deans) asked a similar question and I answered on that occasion that I expected to be introducing amendments to the Act shortly. I anticipate that the amendments will include changes in allowances along with other revisions to the Act, and that answer still stands.

Mr. Shulman: Will the Minister allow a supplementary question?

Will this apply to widows who have already become widows, in other words, the people who are already on the previous small pension?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Speaker, that will depend on the working out of the legislation when it is ready. It will be one of the matters considered.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Attorney General.

In the light of the miraculous recovery of Ralph Farris a former director of Northern Ontario Natural Gas, does the Minister intend to lay new charges against this gentleman?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: The answer, Mr. Speaker, is no. I think perhaps I might enlarge on that a bit, Mr. Speaker, because the question implies that perhaps charges should be laid. I think the hon. member, some few days ago in the House, quoted a statement I made some considerable time ago that Mr. Farris was ill and in jail, and that we would not contemplate other charges until his recovery, in case he recovered, or that we would not review the matter until then.

Now I think I should point out that in the meantime, the matter with which he was involved was a matter involving municipalities and the mayors and councils of the municipalities in connection with Northern Ontario Natural Gas. There were four of those mayors of those municipalities brought to trial. Three were dismissed at the preliminary inquiry. There was no case to make against them. The fourth proceeded to trial and the charges were dismissed, so the reason I say "no" is that in our consideration now, there would be no possibility of securing another conviction against Farris because he was involved with these same four situations, and as we could not secure a conviction in those, it would be senseless to proceed against Mr. Farris.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, would the Minister be prepared to give a similar explanation in reply to the question I gave yesterday about the other gentlemen?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I am not ready today, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Shulman: Would he take notice of it, sir?

Mr. Speaker: Before we proceed to the orders of the day, I would like to express my appreciation to the members of this House for their co-operation in making the one event where Mr. Speaker, during the life of a House, can be friendly and not use the gavel. Mr. Speaker is grateful to each one of you for your assistance and help last evening.

Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The first order, resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the amendment to the motion for an address in reply to the Speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor at the opening of the session.

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Speaker, to pick up the debate where I left it yesterday at the time I moved the adjournment, let me first through you, sir, express my heartfelt thanks to the Minister of Reform Institutions (Mr. Grossman) for his kind help and co-operation.

An hon. member: Very helpful indeed.

Mr. Singer: I am sure that we will be able to call upon his services at another time. But to return to this topic, which I think is a most important one, I wanted to suggest to the House that in view of the facts that many members have recited and the facts that I tried to give some credence to last evening, that the steps that must be obvious to the government of Ontario is that we need now, and I use the word now deliberately and draw the attention of the hon. member for Eglinton to the word "now", we need now,

notwithstanding the fact that we did not win the election, the people of Ontario need now a new bill of rights for tenants. Tenants must be protected as well as landlords, sir, and it would therefore be my suggestion that a new Act should be written in accordance with the situation, the economic conditions, and the problems that exist in 1968 and that we can no longer afford to rely on the statute that we imported from another jurisdiction, perhaps a century and a half ago, which has never been substantially changed since we imported it.

And in importing the statute, we also imported the common law and the basis for that statute and the common law background relating to it goes back possibly to the time of the signing of the Magna Carta.

In England they have had the good sense to change the landlord and tenant law, but the province of Ontario has not seen fit to do it. It would therefore be my suggestion that we must turn our attention and all our zeal and energy to drafting a new law to protect tenants. The law should be written in language that can be understood, and it is high time that we began to instruct our legal talent who draft statutes that we write them in language that has some modern usage, and that we try and get away from the cliches that tie us up in unusual and unreasonable procedures that are such a predominant part of so many of our statutes.

I would suggest that a new statute must provide for a number of things: a standard form of lease which could and should be a part of all landlord and tenant agreements and if it is important that there be further agreements beyond the stadard form; that they be written on separate pieces of paper, in large type, and in simple language and that they be specifically drawn to the attention of the tenants clause by clause, and that they must be properly initialed and explained on the way by.

I would think, sir, that wherever a written lease has been entered into, and this has been one of the sources of complaint that has come to me so frequently, that the landlord must be required by law to deliver a copy of that lease to the tenant. So many tenants have come complaining about what they believe is unfair treatment and when you ask them where a copy of the lease is, so that you can check and see what agreement they have entered into, they say: "We never got a copy of the lease."

I suggest it would be a very simple remedy to enforce such a provision in the law. If a statute stated that a landlord who had not delivered a copy of the lease would not be able to collect any rent after the first month, that would certainly make certain that the copy of the lease would be delivered very quickly.

I would think, sir, that we must have a rental review board, which will hold public hearings and inquire into all cases where it is alleged that excessive rentals are being charged. It would be my hope that if such a review board were established and given proper publicity and were to hold public hearings and that sort of thing, that the exposure of grasping landlords to the glare of such publicity would be sufficient to produce the desired effect.

And in saying this, I join with the hon. member for Scarborough Centre (Mrs. M. Renwick), who brought several cases to the attention of the House in her very appropriate remarks and suggested a similar sort of a procedure.

I would think, sir, that the whole question of rules and regulations relating to security deposits have to be worked out very carefully, so that people who pay security deposits or make advance payments of the last month's rent can be properly protected. I would think that those funds should, of necessity, be placed in some sort of trust account, and that if they earn any interest, the persons who pay them should be the persons entitled to receive the benefit of such interest.

I do not think it is fair or just that landlords should be allowed to have such an extra source of income. Why, in large apartment houses, sir, it would not surprise me if upwards of $50,000 is not being held by a landlord as a so-called security deposit. He has the use of these large sums of money for an extended period of time. In some instances interest is refunded to the tenants, but this is the exception rather than the rule.

I would think that the handling of those security deposits must be very strictly regulated. If the landlord proposes to deduct from these deposits certain amounts because damage has been done to the apartment, I think there should be a serious onus on the landlord to establish that, in fact, the deduction is justified. Before he makes any deduction, he should be compellel to provide a list saying the reasons for the deductions he is making, and the price for the repairs that are necessary, and then there should be severe penalties attached if these are not reasonable and logical and if the prices are excessive.

I think this sort of protection is just about an elementary kind of the consideration that should be brought for the protection of people who are, today, almost completely unable to protect themselves. I would think, sir, that some protection has to be given—and I shy away, I deliberately shy away from rent control—but I would think that some protection has to be given even against the Ontario housing corporation because I understand the Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Randall), in making an off-the-cuff reply to some of the remarks I had to make yesterday, said, "Well, we are talking about monthly tenancies".

Even where the Ontario housing corporation gives monthly tenancies, and that is the clearly understood bargain that is made at the beginning, I would think that a tenant is entitled to some kind of security. My suggestion would be that once he has been accepted as a monthly tenant, perhaps he could be guaranteed, in law, security of the amount of his rental for at least six months. And if the landlord wants to increase his rent, that he be compelled to give at least three months' notice to such a monthly tenant before this is done.

What is happening now—and I am sure that most urban members have big files about this—what is happening now is that rents can go up and are going up month after month after month and there is just no way of coming to grips with this problem.

I would suggest, sir, as well, that apartment rules, which so often form a part of present-day leases, be in the standard form and that standard form could be set out in the Act. Again, if there are variances from it, that the variances be particularly spelled out in large type and initialled and their receipt acknowledegd and that sort of thing.

It seems to me that the very common regulation that appears in so many of these leases —which gives the discretion to the landlord to add, after the execution of the lease, such other conditions as he may from time to time see fit—should be removed and barred absolutely.

I would think there is a serious problem insofar as heat is concerned, and again, as a member of an urban riding, I am certain that whenever there is a cold spell either late in the spring or early in the fall, and a poor tenant tries to get his landlord to do something, the landlord looks at the lease and says, "Well, all I have done is covenanted the heat from the middle of October to the first of May and too bad, you're out of luck".

I would think it would be very simple to prescribe that where premises have been leased in our climate there should be a compulsion to keep the heat up at least to 65 degrees throughout the 12-month period of the lease. I do not think that is unreasonable at all. We have to begin to treat tenants like people.

I would think, sir, that it is almost basic we should state in our statutes, clearly and loudly, that statutory conditions which this Legislature has designed to protect tenants can never be waived by agreement. And as the gentleman who drew my attention to the Ontario housing corporation lease form expressed in his letter, "Who is the Ontario government trying to protect itself against? Is it afraid of its other half?"

Surely, there could be nothing more disgraceful than when a public body, controlled by the government of Ontario, attempts to rule out Ontario legislation. For anybody to do it is a pretty serious thing and certainly it must be obvious that all our statutes must be drafted so that this can never again be done.

I would say, sir, there must be an established forum, a special form of court procedures set up and, if necessary, special tribunals to deal in a speedy and economic manner with complaints made under this new Act. The object of the Act would be to provide for the tenant the same kind of protection that we tried to provide for builders and tradesmen in The Mechanics' Lien Act. But it would be some speedy form of resort to the courts, an inexpensive form of resort to the courts, and a method of getting to court where conscience and good judgment and equity could prevail, rather than the technical rule of law which is part and parcel of our present law under The Landlord and Tenant Act.

On the whole question of distraint, landlords have abused this right and abused it miserably. Where a landlord distrains for arrears of rent, I would think it must be made a serious offence if he distrains an amount of goods substantially in excess of the arrears that he is, in fact, owed. I think there should be an onus on the landlord to establish, if there is a complaint that the distraint was excessive, that he has acted in a reasonable and proper manner.

Landlords today, sir, not only distrain but, through their bailiffs, distrain and evict at the same time and that is the case I was reciting the other evening. It is clearly illegal

but what tenant has the time, when he finds himself in these unfortunate circumstances, or the money or the zeal to pursue through the court an action for damages? I would think we have to provide that kind of remedy.

I mentioned as well the use of private bailiffs. I think this should be done away with; I think private bailiffs in so many cases have abused their rights and their privileges and I think the time has come where that responsibility in our community should be taken over by a public official. I think it could be well handled by the sheriffs in the various counties throughout the province, and I think that should be done immediately.

It would seem to me, sir, that not only are there all of these problems, but there are attendant problems. I am glad the hon. Minister of Economics and Development is back in his seat and I wish he would pay heed to these particular remarks. He said the other day that one of the bases on which the Ontario housing corporation evicted tenants was for wilful refusal to pay rent. I interjected across the floor and I got a smile from him—that was all I got. The question—and I want to pose the question very deliberately —was "Just what does the phrase mean?"

If a tenant does not have any money, is that a wilful refusal to pay rent? Is there any real examination by the various officials of the housing authority into the reasons because of which the rent is not paid? I know that in the Lawrence Heights development in my area—which is probably the largest public housing development in Canada—this problem arises day after day; there are some 5,000 people living there and this problem arises all the time.

I certainly get the impression that the housing corporation is concerned only with collecting its money. It is not concerned at all, nor is there any public agency by itself that seems to be concerned at all, with the reason why the money is not paid. We have a variety of services that this government and municipal government provide for people in trouble. We have welfare services and counselling services and children's aid services, and all sorts of things, but it would seem to me that there should be some place where a tenant who is faced with eviction can go for advice, counselling and direction.

I would think that, as we revise the whole law of landlord and tenant, the province of Ontario would do well to establish what, for lack of a better title, I would call a tenants' advice committee and set it up in the major centres, at least, throughout the province of Ontario. The public would have access to such a committee in order that tenants could be advised of their rights in regard to a proper course of action, and they could be counselled.

These committees would be charged with the responsibility of initiating action against landlords who were in breach of statutory provisions, and they would also be responsible—and this is most important, and I am surprised that it has not occurred to the Minister of Economics and Development before—for directing tenants who are in trouble to other government agencies, even to legal aid, if this sort of thing should be necessary.

Well that, sir, is a rough outline of the sort of reform that we are talking about and that is the sort of thing that we would hope —notwithstanding some of the callous remarks we get from the other side of the House—would be very high on the government's priority list.

Unfortunately, sir, we have seen no indications from any leading member of the government that they are even contemplating this type of long-overdue reform.

Now in winding up my remarks, I want to refer very briefly to the two amendments that are before us. You will recall that my leader, the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Nixon) moved that the motion for an address in reply to the Speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor now before the House be amended by adding thereto the following words—and I would say that each one of these five statements that follow deserves the serious consideration and support of all members of the House. The first one, of course is:

That this House regrets that this government:

1. Will not participate in the benefits of the federal medical insurance Act.

Mr. J. H. White (London South): I am not surprised the member cannot say it clearly.

Mr. Singer: Well, I would not be so surprised. The member for London South is always surprised when we get into the whole question of medicare. I am glad he interjected, because I had almost forgotten to draw to his attention the very fascinating letter that I have received from a gentleman named Colin N. Brown, who comes from the same city as the hon. member for London South. Colin N. Brown is a very interesting fellow.

He publishes advertisements in the paper at his own expense, decrying the evils of medicare. Somebody told us, Mr. Speaker—and I believe that it is true—that Colin N. Brown is associated with an insurance company—I think the London Life Insurance Company, if my memory serves me correctly—and it has also been suggested that Colin N. Brown is the agent who was responsible for negotiating the very excellent health plan for the civil service group here in the province of Ontario.

So I would think that if all of that information is correct, Mr. Speaker, Colin Brown does not come to this whole discusison as the most impartial observer.

One of my colleagues asked, I think it was the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs (Mr. Rowntree), the other day how much money the province of Ontario paid to Colin Brown, and the Minister replied that the province paid him nothing—and quite right. I am sure that, had this second question been asked, the Minister would not have been able to answer it and the second question would have been: "Did Mr. Colin Brown receive any commission from the London Life Insurance Company as a result of the insurance that was placed on behalf of the civil service association?" I am sure that the Minister perhaps would not have had access to those figures and perhaps would not have felt that he should have access to those figures, but it would seem to me—suspicious as my nature is—that Mr. Brown probably received a commission for the work that he did, and why should he not?

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): My recollection is that he did not.

Mr. Singer: Well, I would think that Mr. Colin Brown, who works very hard to place insurance like this, like any other insurance agent, should get a commission. I am not suggesting for a moment, Mr. Speaker, that he would get a commission from this government, but surely he would get a commission from the London Life Insurance Company, on behalf of which he sells insurance.

In any event, the reason that I welcomed the interjection from the hon. member for London South is that I had a little communication from Colin Brown the other day. I think all lawyers might have received it. It came to my office and several of my colleagues in the office received it as well, and Colin Brown has a new scheme. He addresses his letter to "Dear Taxpayer", and says that medicare is terrible and gives six reasons why it is, and he sends a bunch of little cards addressed interestingly enough to "The Right Hon. Lester B. Pearson, House of Commons, Canada", and it is very convenient—all you have to do is sign, and it reads:

> Dear Mr. Pearson:
>
> I am in favour of a medicare plan to support the needy, but I am opposed to compulsory universal medicare because—

Pick out one of these numbers, one to six—I suppose Mr. Pearson has the code letter to the numbers—and sign the card and send it.

Mr. Brown is very cute about this too, because he suggests that it is going to be so effective if everybody takes one of these little cards and mails it on March 22, so that thousands and thousands of the little cards will arrive in Mr. Pearson's office, at which point on March 25, I am certain that Mr. Pearson is going to rush into the House of Commons and repeal the federal Act.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): The member for London South has left.

Mr. Singer: I am sorry that the member for London South left. I thought he would be interested in hearing the end of this story, but I guess he is not.

In any event, sir, notwithstanding the efforts of Colin Brown and others, it is our feeling, it is our very strong feeling, that all members of the House should be able to support as intelligent a suggestion as that the province of Ontario should participate right away—now—in federal medicare.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, to continue. The second clause in my leader's amendment is:

> That this House regrets that this government:
>
> 2. Has failed, in spite of much publicity and fanfare, to evolve a workable urban programme for the province that will meet the needs of our family of average income with regard to housing, recreation and transportation.

Well, these things all speak for themselves and will be elaborated upon by my colleagues and myself as the proceedings of this House continue. The next part of the amendment is:

> That this House regrets that this government:
>
> 3. Has been unable to bolster and equalize our economic development, par-

ticularly in northern Ontario, so that all citizens can share in prosperity.

4. Has failed to reform educational financing to meet local need, and reduce the level of local taxation.

5. Has failed to provide leadership to lead the farming industry from economic doldrums.

For all those abundantly good reasons, Mr. Speaker, I can see no reason for any member of the House to fail to support this motion.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Singer: Sir, if I may, I just want to spend a moment addressing a few remarks to the amendment to this motion put by the hon. member for York South. He suggested our motion be amended by adding to it these provisions: To keep exorbitant prices in check through the public mechanism of a prices review board; and certainly that is a sensible suggestion. It is contained in many of the things we have said and is certainly implied in the tender of our resolution.

The second suggestion is that there be added a clause to raise northern family incomes by promoting economic development, and to eliminate gross disparities between those prices charged for consumer products in northern Ontario and those in the rest of the province; and that seems to be an eminently sensible suggestion as well.

The third point, to reduce the high cost and eliminate the other inequities of automobile insurance through a government operated, non-profit car insurance plan.

Well I am afraid, sir, here we must part company with the hon. member for York South. As he knows full well, over the years we have advocated and as strongly as we can and we will continue during this session of this Legislature, to advocate a reform of the method of insurance in this province and the adoption of those very intelligent, well supported recommendations made by the select committee on automobile insurance.

We believe that private industry can properly operate the insurance business if the government will implement the recommendations of that report. We do not believe that the government should get into the insurance business, except as an absolute last resort and we think there is a sensible alternative way of proceeding and, therefore, we cannot give our support to the second portion of that third clause in the member's amendment.

Fourth, he suggests to protect tenants from exorbitant rent increases by means of a rental review agency. I have said that we support that in my previous remarks.

Fifth; A minimum wage of $1.75 an hour makes good sense.

Sixth, to adopt measures essential to closing the gap in demand and supply for low cost housing, all kinds of housing, housing apartment units and so on—we have been talking about that for a long time, again hopefully thinking that something can stir the government into action into this important field.

The seventh one I am afraid I do not understand too well: To reduce the oppressive burden of property tax. Fine, we talked about this during the campaign. My leader has mentioned it before. Many of my colleagues have—and we will continue to direct our efforts in this regard.

Then he goes on to say, "To introduce equity into Ontario's tax system by means of a foundation tax plan for municipal financing." I listened very carefully when that idea came up and it was equally as fuzzy, Mr. Speaker, as the suggestion that the hon. member from York South had about the method of reconstituting Metropolitan Toronto. Somebody, one of their good speech writers, had evolved some complicated plan that nobody could understand. But accepting that the member from York South has appraised its value, if this would be a method of reducing oppressive property tax I would welcome his fuller and more detailed explanation of it.

Mr. MacDonald: It is in *Hansard*; read it!

Mr. Singer: It is confusing, it is mixed up —as so many of the ideas coming from that group are. But, perhaps he has got an idea, if he would only spell it out a little more clearly.

With these reservations expressed publicly, and there is no way of breaking our vote into sections, we will support the amendment to the amendment in the hope that by the support of the amendment to the amendment, and the amendment, we will bring a better life to the people of the province of Ontario.

Finally one thing more. I would hope that the government will turn its attention to the problems of the people of the province of Ontario; that we will get on to the order paper, as quickly as possible, the major government legislation that they plan to introduce that we will have ennunciated clearly

and distinctly, from the government leader, what he proposes to do about municipal reorganization, about the Smith report, about the McRuer report, about all of these other things. Let us stop the nonsense that has been going on in this House for six weeks and get down to business.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): Mr. Speaker, in rising to participate in this formal debate on the Throne speech, may I first congratulate you, sir, on your election as Speaker of this chamber. It is evident that all hon. members, on both sides of the House, have a great admiration for the manner in which you have been conducting the affairs of this chamber. You have certainly shown a greater degree of patience than most of us could under many trying circumstances, and I hope that the firm and impartial manner in which you have been presiding will reflect in the conduct of the House for the balance of this Parliament.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate those of my colleagues who have been recently promoted to Cabinet rank. They have already proven themselves as top-flight administrators, and worthy of the confidence the Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) has placed in them. I also extend a sincere welcome to those who have been newly-elected to this august assembly. There is a great deal of satisfaction to be derived from membership in this House. But, just as in other areas of endeavour, you get out of this job just what you put in.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Some get more than others.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I can only hope that the new members will find the same satisfaction that I have in representing the people of this province and my constituents. I also want to congratulate the hon. members for Hamilton (Mr. J. R. Smith) and York East (Mr. Meen) who, with great distinction, made their maiden speeches in moving and seconding the motion that a humble address be presented to His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor. They have also proven themselves worthy of the honour which was bestowed upon them in this respect, and it is quite evident that their contributions to the debates in this House will be both forceful and constructive.

I hope the hon. members, Mr. Speaker, will forgive me for speaking for a few moments about my own constituency. I know that this is usually something which a new member to this House does in his maiden speech and I am certainly not a new member to this House, but, since October 17, I have had the honour to represent a newly-created riding, of St. Andrew-St. Patrick.

Under redistribution, a part of the former riding of St. Patrick was annexed to the riding of St. Andrew, a riding which it has been my privilege to represent since 1955.

This is, as I have said on many occasions, one of the most cosmopolitan ridings in Canada. Under successive Progressive Conservative administrations, Ontario has continued to welcome people from all parts of the world who want to settle in this great province of opportunity. Ontario receives more than half of all the immigrants to Canada and thousands of them are my constituents.

In the riding of St. Andrew-St. Patrick, where at least 27 languages are spoken, there is representation of practically every ethnic and racial group in the world. They have contributed a great deal, through their various cultures, to a new and vibrant society which all of our citizens are now enjoying. Indicative of the make-up of the riding is the fact that most of the ethnic groups have seen fit to establish their national churches within its confines.

The history of this riding indicates that this has been the area of initial resettlement for newcomers upon arrival in the city of Toronto. It is, perhaps, of some passing interest to the hon. members that my own family followed this patern. As the first Canadian-born son of Polish immigrants, I have spent most of my life within the boundaries of the constituency which I proudly represent.

Born on Edward Street, on its borderline, I subsequently lived on McCaul Street, Spadina Avenue and Brunswick Avenue, and it was in my riding that I met my wife, where I married my wife and where she also was the first Canadian-born member of her family of Polish immigrants.

My political career began as a very young boy, right in this riding, with my election to the Toronto boys council as alderman for ward 4—a ward which I later had the honour to represent as a member of the city council for four years until my election to this Legislature.

Each provincial election, Mr. Speaker, 1955, '59 and '63, and the most recent one last October 17, has had, of course, very many interesting points. However, there were many occasions during the 1967 election when I was convinced that my opponents felt that they were campaigning for election to

a municipal seat of government rather than to this Legislature.

Mr. Sopha: We thought the doctor was going to run against you.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Their platforms—we will come to that a little later perhaps—their plaforms stressed lower municipal taxes, urban renewal, and other municipal matters almost exclusively. At one campaign meeting I was constrained to challenge them to run for municipal office as they were obviously not interested in discussing any provincial issues other than education, and this they discussed on the university of Toronto campus, which became part of my riding under redistribution.

Here their appeal was to the campus electorate almost exclusively on one particular subject—free education. In other words, in the areas of the riding where the small home owner lives the emphasis always was—"we will reduce your taxes." But while on the campus they promised to spend millions more of the taxpayers' money to provide free education and some other costly benefits which they felt the young students were desirous of having.

It became evident that the record of this government with its increased opportunities, increased educational advantages, increased progressive social welfare measures, increased industrial training and so on were such that in the opinion of the Opposition they were not debatable on the campaign trail, and that local issues would be more advantageous for them.

Frustrated as my opponents were, and I think this was general at least in Metropolitan Toronto, they in desparation sought to hoodwink the students on St. George campus with their promises of free university education and more of whatever they thought the young students wanted to hear about.

During the campaign, I attended, I suppose, approximately 20 meetings which had been arranged on campus. The first and largest meeting was held in convocation hall and much of this was publicized in the press.

Attending this meeting was a booing, hissing, vocal minority of young socialists who were easily identifiable by the NDP placards which they carried. Some of them appeared at subsequent meetings. As a matter of fact it was rather interesting watching this very well organized campaign. As the young people walked into convocation hall there was a group handing them these placards. It was a very well organized machine.

My supporters became concerned when they read in the press about my reception on campus. I assured them that in my view this vocal minority did not represent the large body of those fine students who attend our universities. And on election day, through the power of the ballot, a well informed campus electorate proved that one does not ride to victory on a platform of pious platitudes, and did, in fact, give me a very large and solid expression of confidence.

Now there were many other interesting things in that campaign, Mr. Speaker. They have been touched upon by other members. I will not bother going into them at this stage. Perhaps some day, on the election in my own riding alone, if the Lord spares me and I have the time and I have some ability to do it, I might write a book. Perhaps, who knows, I may make a million out of that book.

Mr. Speaker, on a more serious note—a very serious note. Over the years, The Department of Reform Institutions—and incidentally, I might say I am very disappointed in the fact that the hon. member for Beaches-Woodbine (Mr. Brown) is not in his seat and that the hon. member for Scarborough West (Mr. Lewis) is not in his seat. I think that they should have given me the courtesy of being here, knowing as they must that I would have answered some of their attacks.

I did the courtesy to the hon. member for Beaches-Wodbine of sitting through his whole speech—and, of course, I did not interrupt him because it was his maiden speech. He made some very strong attacks and he did not do me the courtesy of staying. He got up and made his speech, with some very wild charges and then kept saying that "I am going to Chicago."

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): That is all right.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, that is all right but I could have been in many places on the day the hon. member made his speech. I am at least as busy as the hon. member. There are many places I could have been, but I made it my business to be here, Mr. Speaker, to hear what he had to say. I made it my business to also be here and sit through everything the hon. member for Scarborough West had to say, because I knew that he had some interest in the work in my department. I think it would have been the courteous thing to do, to be here on this occasion.

Of course, I suppose they do not think that anything I have to say is as interesting to listen to as what they say.

Mr. Speaker, over the years The Department of Reform Institutions has continued to add qualified staff to its team of dedicated professional and lay personnel. We have been able to do this despite the fact that it is universally difficult to recruit staff of a high calibre in sufficient numbers to correctional work, partly because there is a world-wide shortage of such personnel.

Also it is well known that the corrections field is a difficult one in which to work, because those placed in our care are among the most difficult to reach; the adults and children with whom we work present complex problems which even the most qualified sociologists in the world have, to a large extent, been unable to solve.

It must be apparent, too, that success in this field is difficult to assess. It is much easier, of course, to document failure in this field than it is to document success. It must be obvious to everyone that those who have been rehabilitated naturally seek anonymity. They melt into the general population and do not write public testimonials to the fact that they spent time in correctional institutions. Unless, of course, they are out to write a book or a play.

In other words, whereas in many other fields concrete results can be shown and proven, correctional personnel must be prepared to devote great time and energy in trying to rehabilitate individuals even though it is most difficult for them to document and take credit for their successes.

The new hon. members should know that one of the greatest problems facing correctional jurisdictions throughout the world is the constant conflict between custody and treatment—the difficulty inherent in having at one and the same time the responsibility both for custody and for treatment. Accusations over the years, particularly in this House, against our department from the Opposition have constantly revolved around the charge that the department was, as they used to call it, "custodial minded." Three or four years ago we began placing in top administrative posts outstanding treatment personnel in order that professional treatment personnel would be responsible for both aspects of our programmes.

Mr. MacDonald: It took ten years to achieve that though.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, I am glad that the hon. member agrees now we have achieved it, we have accomplished it. I thank the hon. member for that.

Mr. MacDonald: There is not enough being done yet.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The effect of this has been our ability in recent years to attract staff of a high calibre to positions at all levels within the department. Our existing programmes have been operating well; we have been experimenting with new programmes; we have continually attempted in our programmes to employ modern correctional methods and techniques; and we have not only tried to lead the way, but in fact have been, leading the way in developing some new approaches. A strong *esprit de corps* has developed, and morale in our department has been and is high.

Our close liaison with universities across the province is kindling, to a much higher degree than previously, interest and participation in our programmes by young people who are now involved in undergraduate courses in the social sciences. Many of these young people are already participating in our programmes through field placement schemes, and it is our hope that a goodly number of them will join us permanently upon graduation. In addition to the liaison with universities which now exists, we have announced that we will be providing even wider facilities for the training of students with the construction of a reception and assessment centre for up to 120 juvenile boys and girls.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, a concentrated campaign of vilification of training schools and their staffs has been going on for several months now. A campaign such as this, if allowed to go unchallenged, could undermine staff morale—the morale which we have laboured so hard to establish—and endanger our staff recruitment. It could reduce the effectiveness of the programmes in our training schools and destroy public confidence in both the staff and the programme at these schools. I deem it necessary therefore, Mr. Speaker, in the public interest, to deal with these unfounded charges and with this most unfortunate campaign of misinformation about the training schools in our province.

That, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Sopha: The Minister will have to tell us who the authors of this campaign are, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, we will find out about this soon, too.

Mr. Sopha: Well, I do not think it is proper to put it that way.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, the House will find out, I will give the requested information. This is one of the reasons I was hoping the hon. member for Beaches-Woodbine and the hon. member for Scarborough West would be present. Unfortunately, if they are not, it is not my fault. We are winding up the debate and this is the time I have to do it.

The campaign to which I refer has been spearheaded in public statements made by an hon. NDP member of this Legislature—I am referring to the hon. member for Beaches-Woodbine.

I have had brought to my attention statements attributed to the hon. member on numerous occasions. Some of the statements have been such that I have found it almost incredible that they should have been made, reported, and then not corrected by the hon. member. I have witnessed these statements becoming wilder and wilder as the weeks rolled by. Letters and news clippings quoting the hon. member have been referred to me by outraged citizens who are familiar with the work at our institutions, university staff, members of the judiciary, chaplains, and a host of others. These people have drawn to my attention the misleading statements attributed to the hon. member and expressed concern that they have gone unanswered.

Now it was my intention to refrain from attacking the hon. member's actions in the hope that he would soon acquaint himself with the facts relating to the operation of our training schools, and himself correct the misleading statements made by him.

Mr. MacDonald: Don't malign the hon. member. He is an expert in the field—as much as anybody is.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well we will soon find out how much he knows. And if he knows as much as his hon. leader says he knows, then there must be some deliberate attempt at giving misleading information. It was also my hope, Mr. Speaker, that as the opening of the Legislature had already been announced, he would cease making these emotional outbursts until such time as the facts could be debated in this House.

Incidentally, the other night he made quite a point of the fact that he had made many charges against me outside the House, where, as he put it—"attempting to make a virtue out of it—he did not enjoy the privilege of the House." Well that was a red herring, if I ever heard one.

Mr. MacDonald: Members on that side of the House are always raising that red herring.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Because the hon. member need not try to appear to be such a hero. While some of his remarks bordered on the hysterical, even scurrilous, there was nothing libellous about his remarks. He could have made them here.

Mr. MacDonald: He will—have no fear!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: He could have made them here. Well now, Mr. Speaker, I would hope that the hon. leader of the NDP would appreciate the fact that statements about Mao Tse-tung and Ho Chi Minh and so on are also not relevant to the speech of the hon. member the other day.

Mr. MacDonald: It was just a quotation—and an apt one at that.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, let me handle my speech my way; and the member can handle his.

Mr. Speaker, that is—and I am glad the hon. Prime Minister mentioned it—that is something else which most of the new members, the new members who are here for the first time—if they have already not found out—that is one thing they will find out—something that is typical of the NDP opposition—that they love to dish it out, but the minute you for one moment suggest that they are doing something wrong they blanche, they get mad, the leader gets up in an outrage and sometimes is even hysterical.

Mr. MacDonald: We can take it—but we will be back.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I sincerely, really sincerely, regret that it is necessary for me to deal with this hon. member specifically in the Throne debate.

Mr. MacDonald: The Minister always deals in personalities rather than issues.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: But he is not here—one of the reasons being that he is not here. But I do not know how I can possibly permit

the situation to go unchallenged any longer. After all, in a letter to me, and in his speech the other night, the hon. member for Beaches-Woodbine stated on the one hand that he offers his services "in my department in any way you might deem helpful", and in his speech the other night, he also then wound up by saying: 'We can never work together because this is war and we cannot communicate. There can be no meeting of the minds." Now, what a generous offer of co-operation that is. He offers his co-operation and then immediately makes up his mind that we cannot co-operate, "we do not think alike." What a great offer that was.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am going to list and answer today those outrageous allegations brought to my attention and attributed to the hon. member in various newspapers across the province, during the recent months.

Before doing this, however, some background information should be provided, particularly for the benefit of the newer members of the Legislature.

The Department of Reform Institutions has under its jurisdiction a total of 14 training schools. Three of these training schools are operated by Roman Catholic religious orders, with all maintenance and operating costs provided by this department. The programmes and settings provided at these training schools are diversified, in order to allow the placement of each youngster in the particular type of programme and setting it is felt will best meet his or her individual needs. The admission of children to training schools is always and can only be by court order—juvenile court order.

The hon. member for Beaches-Woodbine professes to have entered the field of politics, as he has stated, for one reason only—to aid emotionally disturbed children.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): How ridiculous!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is what he said. He did not sound like that in his Throne speech—with his Mao Tse-tung, and the usual Marxist claptrap and blood-and-thunder approach. Certainly to aid children, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MacDonald: The Minister's usual innuendo.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Just sit there and you will hear all about this.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Certainly to aid children, Mr. Speaker, is a laudatory reason to give for entering politics. It appears from what I have read of the hon. member's comments in the press, however, that he has set himself up as the white knight who would, in his words, "rescue all youngsters in training schools from the programmes in which they are now involved." And it appears that this "rescue operation" calls for the destruction of existing programmes and the destruction of the integrity of the staff participating in them.

In fact, he has placed himself in direct opposition to practically every professional person and programme in the world, believing as he does that he, and he alone, has the answer. I recommend to him, sir, the advice that he gave me the other day, and that is, that he not feel he is totally without error. That he does not have all of the answers and that sometimes, just sometimes, the great John Brown is not the greatest in the world.

The hon. member for Beaches-Woodbine operates Brown camps, which have been described as a network of residential treatment units for emotionally disturbed children. The national director of Brown camps is the New Democratic Party member in this Legislature for Scarborough West. Now I draw these facts to the attention of the hon. members of this House because I think they are of a more than passing interest, when we consider the comments made by the hon. member for Beaches-Woodbine on training schools.

A campaign against training schools began, as I mentioned earlier, late last fall. Subsequent statements which were reported in the press were emotional, at times inaccurate, certainly irresponsible, and on a number of occasions totally without foundation.

Now I had intended to provide a full chronology of this campaign to set the record straight. I shall pass briefly over some of the earlier points raised and later I shall detail the most outrageous statements and comment at length about them.

Three days after a visit to the training school at Galt, the hon. member for Beaches-Woodbine spoke to an NDP association meeting in Oshawa. Reports on that speech were carried on January 22 in the Toronto *Daily Star* and the *Globe and Mail.*

Among the hon. member's allegations were the following—first from Toronto *Daily Star*, Brown said:

> 1. Children have been sent to training schools where they have been forced to submit to inhuman practices.

2. These schools are nothing but schools to train criminals.

3. They use methods 40 years old. It's unbelievable how these children are treated.

And still quoting from the Toronto *Daily Star*, Brown said:

4. There are now approximately 150 boys seven years old in training schools in the province.

And from the *Globe and Mail*, Mr. Brown said:

There are more than 150 children, seven years old in Ontario institutions—the present administration is just giving the institutions a white-wash—the girls' school in Galt —the name has been changed to Grand View—

I will not make any comment about the change of name of the Brown camps, it is a little bit different then, I guess:

—these girls are subjected to inhuman practices—

Mr. Brown would not comment on what he meant by inhuman practices, but he said he was willing to talk about it to reporters in Mr. Grossman's presence.

Mr. Speaker, these are very serious allegations and the statement that there are 150 children, seven years old, in training schools, is a blatant untruth, and I shall deal with these allegations at length later on too.

In February, the *New Democrat* for that month, that is for February, published a front page diatribe on training schools called "Innocents Behind Bars".

An hon. member: Does the Minister want me to go and get it?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I have it here. We will show it to them. I would not be very proud of it if I were them. Showing a child behind a mesh fence, which you can see in any school in this province—a ridiculous situation. We will talk about that a little later.

On January 30, the *Telegram* carried an account of a speech to the meeting of the Humber riding NDP association, in which the hon. member for Beaches-Woodbine was reported to have said that training schools should be closed immediately. He was reported as saying:

—Only five to ten per cent of youngsters in training schools today should be in security institutions.

—That the reception, diagnostic and treatment centre at Grand View school, Galt, is a farce.

—They are not equipped to assess and diagnose the children there. They don't have the staff to do it.

—You simply put them—children—in a maximum security institution and surround them with a bunch of silly notions.

The hon. member seems to feel compelled, in most of his speeches about training schools, to talk about "maximum security" and/or to refer to the schools as "prisons for children" as if to imply in the first place that all training schools in the province employ heavy security.

The fact is that 12 or the 14 training schools in the province utilize open settings and only a small portion of one of the other two has what might be termed maximum security facilities. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, you are familiar with that. On any given day, approximately 93 per cent of all children in training schools would be in these open settings. On the day before the hon. member made the speech to the Humber riding NDP association, only 6.3 per cent, or 71 boys and girls, out of a total of 1,130 in all the training schools of the province, were in what might be termed "maximum security" facilities, and even some of these youngsters were only in such facilities undergoing assessment before being transferred to an appropriate open setting.

The hon. member was reported to have said that the programme at the assessment and treatment units in Galt were a farce and "they are not equipped to assess and diagnose the children there. They do not have the staff to do it", he said.

I would like to point out to the hon. members that at the treatment unit at Galt we have the following professional staff.

one full-time psychologist; two part-time psychologists; one part-time psychiatrist—who is in attendance three to four days a week; five full-time psychometrists; two part-time group therapists; two part-time medical doctors; and 13 full-time teachers.

Mr. M. Makarchuk (Brantford): Does the Minister call that an adequate staff?

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): What does the member call it?

An hon. member: There is a group on part-time—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: In answer to the question, "do we call it adequate staff", we would like to have more staff, the same as would any other institution in the world dealing with children and other sociological problems.

I mentioned earlier, if the hon. member was listening, that there is a shortage of this staff throughout the whole world. In regard to the remark attributed to the hon. member that children are placed in maximum security institutions and surrounded with a bunch of silly notions, apparently any treatment technique, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member disagrees with, or does not understand, is comprised of silly notions. I shall have more to say on this later in my speech as well.

On February 23, 1968, the hon. member for Beaches-Woodbine altered his attack somewhat. In a speech to the NDP riding association in Grey-Bruce, he suggested that training schools should be closed to children under 14 years of age. See how well researched all this is. And while speaking about training schools he also said that there are approximately 200,000 children sent to these institutions. How fantastic can you get—200,000 children sent to these institutions.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Typical distortion!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: If anybody on the opposite side thinks that I am not quoting exactly from the clippings, I have them here and I will read them.

Mr. H. Peacock (Windsor West): He said 200,000 needed treatment.

Mr. Renwick: Why does the Minister not check his facts?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is what I wish the hon. member for Beaches-Woodbine would do.

The Owen Sound *Sun-Times* of February 24, here is another "mis-quotation", I guess. The Owen Sound *Sun-Times* of February 24, 1968, quoted the hon. member as saying:

> 1. Our reform and training schools in Ontario must be closed to children below 14 years of age because they are inhumane —

You will be glad to hear that, Mr. Speaker:

> —inhumane, indecent and a sorry reflection on our society.
>
> 2. Approximately 200,000 children in Ontario are sent to these institutions and this represents 10 per cent of the population.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Hon. members opposite have some great people!

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not think the hon. member really knows what he wants. One day he says that all training schools should be abolished because children in them are, as he quotes, "submitted to inhumane practices." The next day he says only kids over 14 should be placed in training schools. He appears to be saying that the alleged inhumane practices are fine when practised on children over 14. What other conclusion can one come to?

Mr. MacDonald: If the hon. Minister would forget the high school debate and get down to the issues.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is what I would suggest the hon. member tells his member.

Mr. MacDonald: Since when did the hon. Minister have any affinity for facts?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: One day, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member thinks the training schools are schools for crime, and I quoted that earlier. He says they are schools for crime. Apparently, he feels schools for crime are all right for children 14 years and over. There is a real, clear and concise policy for you.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, this 200,000 figure is of course fantastic. Last year a total of 1,073 youngsters were admitted to all training schools in the province. At this rate, I suppose it is possible that by the time the hon. member's grandchildren or great-grandchildren grow up, this figure will have some validity, and then only if he is referring to all of the children who have passed through training schools by that time.

Mr. Speaker, I should mention here that I have had a letter from a member of the judiciary—unsolicited—I assure this House on my honour, who felt that this charge about 200,000 children being sent to these institutions was a serious reflection on the juriciary which in fact it is, and he asked me to ensure that this ridiculous statement be refuted, and I am doing that right now.

Mr. MacDonald: It is a serious reflection on the Minister for not recognizing it as a garbled news account.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, well, a lot of newspapers must have gotten a garbled account, because they are all the same.

If members want to complain to the CP —well, Mr. Speaker, let us talk about that. It is possible the hon. member was misquoted. In that case it was his responsibility. This happened perhaps two, three or four weeks ago. It was his responsibility to get up in this House, as I did today, and other members have done on a matter of privilege, and say that he was misquoted—

An hon. member: A big lie!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, on March 5, 1968, a report of the hon. member's remarks—he is always talking only at NDP meetings—to an NDP meeting in Welland was carried in the *Evening Tribune,* Welland and Port Colborne. The hon. member is reported to have said:

> Even in Hagersville, the department's showpiece when it comes to care, the department's ratio of child to staff is as much as ten to one.

In actual fact, Mr. Speaker, the staff to child ratio is not one to ten, it is one to one. That is another misquotation, I suppose.

The *Evening Tribune* also quoted the hon. member as saying:

> He — Grossman — knows nothing about rehabilitation of the child and is whitewashing the service and trying to sell the spending of your money.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not pretend to be an expert in child rehabilitation. I rely on a staff of experts, and I have an excellent staff to rely on.

Now this one is a honey. Mr. Speaker, here is a man who is dedicated only to the problem of the emotionally disturbed. In the same context of a speech which he made in Welland, in which he was discussing this terrible problem of the children and rehabilitation, he somehow or other got this quote off and I am puzzled at it. And if the hon. member were here I would ask him. I would give him five minutes to get up and explain what he meant by this, because it is beyond me to understand in the first place what he was driving at and why he brought it into the context of the discussion of the work of The Department of Reform Instsitutions, and I would like any member there if they would like to explain it, because he ought to be thoroughly ashamed of himself for having made this speech, and I quote this:

> He—Brown—said that Allan Grossman, Minister of Reform Institutions, is trying to rebuild his name in the Tory party but the Tories make it obvious that he is a Jew and treat him with obvious prejudice. His own party members are giving him the axe behind his back.

Some hon. members: Shame, shame!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: What does the hon. member for Peterborough (Mr. Pitman)—what does he think about a statement like that by one of his colleagues?

> His own party members are giving him the axe behind his back, Mr. Brown said.

I would like to hear the explanation of that one.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: He is in Chicago.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, in February, the *New Democrat* for that month published a front page diatribe on training schools which I showed earlier, called "Innocents Behind Bars" and I have already shown the hon. members what they did on that. There were a lot of other things which were mentioned in that article, and if I have time we will discuss it a little later.

Now what I have just detailed, Mr. Speaker, is only a partial list of the events and allegations of the last few months. I have already commented on a few of the allegations. Now I should like to deal in detail with what I consider to be the most outlandish and irresponsible of these charges.

I should like to return to the statement attributed to the hon. member for Beaches-Woodbine in news reports of January 22, and I am quoting:

> There are more than 150 children seven years old in training schools in the province.

This is an incredible figure also. It is incredible because not only were there no seven-year-olds in our training schools when this statement was made, but in fact we have not had a seven-year-old in training schools for years. I suppose that is also a misquotation.

This fact was easily discovered by CKEY news commentator Joe Morgan, who was alarmed by the figure and immediately checked the department's annual report, which all members opposite have. His scathing remarks broadcast that day regarding the hon. member's charges apparently did not go unnoticed by the NDP, because the figure of 150 appeared in an altered version in the same February *New Democrat* in an article attributed to a writer-researcher for the hon.

member for Beaches-Woodbine. The article stated, and I am quoting now:

> At any given time there are about 150 children under age 12 in these schools.

Note this time not 150 children, seven-years-old, but 150 "under 12". The retreat from the figure of 150 children "seven-years-old" continued in a newsletter from Brown camps which claimed that, quote:

> At any given time there are over 100 children "under the age of 12" in Ontario training schools.

Presumably given enough time, some responsible member of the party over there will start using an accurate figure.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Do not hold your breath.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The fact is that during the fiscal year ending March 31, 1967, a total of 66 children under 12 were admitted to the training schools. This, in case of any misunderstanding, was the total for the whole year. At this time, on this given date, March 21, 1968—

Mr. Makarchuk: Sixty-six is okay, 100 is not?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: There are a total of 51 children under 12 years of age in the whole training school system.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Let me summarize this, Mr. Speaker. On January 22, the figure given by the hon. member was 150 seven-year-olds in training schools, a totally mythical figure like the 200,000, with absolutely no basis in fact whatsoever. In the February issue of the *New Democrat*, 150 children under 12 in training schools, a blatant exaggeration. In Brown camps' newsletter, over 100 children under the age of 12, another gross exaggeration.

Now what possible reason, Mr. Speaker—in all sincerity—what possible reason can the hon. member offer to excuse such a wild excess of figure manufacturing and figure juggling? Just what was his purpose? I cannot understand it.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I can.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Certainly, Mr. Speaker, the article is a classic example—that is the article in the *New Democrat* is a classic example of the use of a political organ to misinform the party followers, and I urge all members of this House to get a copy of the February *New Democrat*, if for misinformation only.

Mr. Speaker, to bolster this inflammatory title, "Innocents Behind Bars," I have shown you the picture that they have put in there, which could be youngsters in any schoolyard. There are other techniques employed, like "tormented cries" right under and next to these bars, and this is a shameful thing to do. It says: "Tormented cries of help are being used to deprive children as young as seven of their freedom." And another, "Kids Bill 99, Training Schools Act, 1965."

Further on in this article, Mr. Speaker, in the *New Democrat*, they state that The Training Schools Act, and I quote:

> The Training Schools Act gives judges power to send an innocent child to a place like Millbrook, the maximum security prison which is to be euphemistically named the Kawartha detention centre. This awesome power is being used repeatedly by judges.

The article goes on to say—and we took this up the other day—and I quote:

> According to Walter Pitman, Peterborough, plans to build a new juvenile assessment and detention centre in Kawartha have been scrapped. The adult prisoners in Millbrook will have to be moved to other institutions, but instead of tearing down the grim fortress, The Department of Reform Institutions is going to incarcerate children there.

Let me repeat the key phrases from that.

> The Training Schools Act gives the judges the power to send an innocent child to a place like Millbrook. This awesome power is being used repeatedly by judges, but instead of tearing down the grim fortress, The Department of Reform Institutions is going to incarcerate children there.

What utter and absolute nonsense. I know that this is nonsense, you know that this is nonsense; all members here must know that this is nonsense. And I hope that no member of the public has been taken in by this. The point is that the researcher who wrote this must know it. She must know it, or she could not possibly call herself a researcher. What I cannot understand is why it was written. How could anyone get so confused as to state that judges are sending innocent children to an adult maximum security reformatory? Or that we are ever going to incarcerate children there.

Mr. Speaker, in fact, no judge has a legal right to do so, even if he so desired. I cannot think that any judge in this province would wish to have the power to send an innocent child, or any child, to a maximum security institution for adults. Nor do I know of any judge in this province who would not resent the implication in this article, and there is already information from some of them that they resented it very much.

There is only one regretful thing about this whole matter. I am awfully sorry that I took it out on the hon. member for Peterborough when he asked me this question the other day. I am convinced that he asked it in all sincerity because I think it was handed to him by this writer-researcher.

Across here, just the same as you look at us, we get fairly good assessment of what goes on over there, and the hon. member for Peterborough is considered to be one of the more reasonable members of the group on that side. The only thing I regret is stating that this was a "bare-faced lie," because perhaps it implies that the hon. member deliberately lied, and if this is the implication I want to withdraw it. But he did make the statement, according to the *New Democrat*, and it is absolutely untrue, it just is not so. The hon. member should get after the person who handed him that slip of paper, and take him out into the backshed.

Mr. MacDonald: The Minister should get after some of the people handing him slips of paper.

Mr. R. M. Johnston (St. Catharines): The researcher needs a spanking.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to turn to the allegations made by the hon. member for Beaches-Woodbine shortly after his very brief visit to the reception-diagnostic and treatment centre at Grand View school in Galt. As I have pointed out before, I do not pretend to be an expert in treatment techniques. I rely on the judgment of professional treatment personnel, and so I should like to turn now to a number of letters that I have received relating to the programme at Grand View school, Galt, and the hon. member's charges.

The first of these letters is from Dr. R. R. Ross, and before reading it, I should like to tell the House who Dr. Ross is, and list his qualifications. Dr. Ross has a BA from University College, University of Toronto; MA, University of Toronto in clinical and social psychology. He is the recipient of an Atkinson Foundation fellowship through The Department of Reform Institutions. He has a Doctorate in Philosophy which he obtained at the University of Toronto in the major area of experimental psychopathology.

I will not give members all the pages of his background, but I will give you some of the more important. As to his academic appointments: He was from 1964 to 1966 adjunct professor of psychology at the University of Waterloo, and is presently associate professor of psychology at the University of Waterloo. He is a member of the Ontario psychological association, the Canadian corrections association, the Ontario corrections and criminology association, the Canadian mental health association, and the American association of correctional psychologists. And he is, of course, a registered psychologist in the province of Ontario, and I have two pages of listings of some of his publications. A very eminent man. Let me tell you what Dr. Ross had to say about some of the hon. member's charges. This is on the letterhead of the University of Waterloo, Department of Psychology, and it is addressed to me:

Sir:

> My colleagues and I on the faculty of the University of Waterloo are distressed and concerned over charges made by John Brown, MPP, concerning the treatment of children at the Grand View school, in Galt, which have recently appeared in newspapers and other news media. Mr. Brown's statement not only criticized the treatment of girls at Grand View school, but also calls into question the ethics and professional competence of faculty members of this university.
>
> Furthermore, his charges deride the efforts of psychologists and psychiatrists throughout this continent who have developed and are applying the treatment techniques which are being utilized at the Grand View school. The department of psychology at the University of Waterloo has worked closely with your staff in the past two years in establishing at Grand View school a facility for young offenders, wherein training of clinical psychologists and research on juvenile delinquency can flourish jointly with the treatment of young offenders.
>
> We wish to assure you that the work which is being done at Grand View school compares favourably with work which is being done at any other institution on this continent, and we do not hesitate in expressing our pride in the achievements we have made. Mr. Brown has stated that

the Galt centre is and I quote, "a farce", and that the treatment is, I quote, "archaic and inhumane", unquote. We wish to assure you that such statements have no basis in fact. First may we point out that there is not just one treatment programme at Grand View, there are many. I would be naive to expect that any one form of therapy could be successful in treating such a wide variety of problems manifested by the children in Grand View.

In order to maximize the probability of success of our treatment efforts with these girls, we utilize almost every technique that is presently available in the psychological sciences. Among these are such well established techniques as individual and group psychotherapy, occasional and behavioural counselling, relaxation training desensitization, role playing, reality therapy, and the like. The principles of millieu-therapy and the concepts of the therapeutic community have a central role in our overall programme.

By stating that our treatment programme is "archaic, inhumane or a farce," Mr. Brown is impugning and deriding almost every treatment technique used by social scientists throughout the world. That, in a word, is ludicrous. In our treatment programme we do not restrict ourselves to already established therapies. The majority of girls in the treatment centre in Galt are committed there after having been provided with extensive but unsuccessful treatment for many years by psychiatrists, psychologists and social workers in a variety of treatment centres, including psychiatric hospitals and specialized centres such as Maryvale and Warrendale.

These are girls for whom all attempts at treatment have failed. Obviously then, our task is to attempt to improve existing techniques and to adapt the most recent developments in the field to the particular problems of the girls at Grand View and, indeed, to innovate new approaches.

A description of one of our successes in such innovations has already been submitted for publication in a major psychological journal, and other submissions are presently being prepared. In view of these facts, I find it ironic that Mr. Brown would state that our programme is "40 years out of date." We might note that we are utilizing one particular form of therapy a great deal. This is a treatment method generally referred to as "operant conditioning," or behaviour therapy.

Behaviour therapy has been used with considerable success in Britain and on this continent during the past ten years in treating a wide variety of disorders which have been resistant to traditional therapies. These include chronically-regressed schizophrenics, mentally retarded children and autistic children, among others. We are endeavouring, at Galt, to adapt behaviour therapy techniques to the modification of anti-social behaviour of adolescent offenders in our treatment units.

Two similar projects are presently underway in institutions in the United States, one of which is substantially supported by The Department of Health, Education and Welfare of the United States government. To our knowledge the Grand View project is the first attempt in Canada to utilize behaviour therapy techniques with delinquent children.

We presume that when Mr. Brown states that "at Grand View we surround children with a bunch of silly notions", he is referring to our behaviour therapy project. Mr. Brown is labelling as "silly notions", a treatment technique which has been adopted and enthusiastically supported by social scientists and practitioners in universities and clinics throughout this continent.

Mr. Brown—to continue—wait until you hear some of this language—

Mr. Brown has also stated that the girls in Galt are treated like "rats in a maze". Again we presume he is referring to the behaviour therapy aspect of our treatment programme. It is true that many underlying principles of behaviour therapy were derived from the studies of laboratory animals in the same fashion that most of the—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: He is in Chicago.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: To continue:

Fundamental principles in medicine have been derived from studies with animals. Surely it is a distortion of logic to conclude, on that basis, that we are treating children like "rats in a maze" or that we are treated like animals when we visit our family physician.

Mr. Brown has branded the programme at Grand View as "dehumanizing" and "inhumane". During the past two years, your staff and my colleagues and I at the University of Waterloo have invested an enormous amount of time and energy to ensuring that the girls at Grand View are

surrounded by warm, supportive adults who are concerned deeply and genuinely with their welfare.

You have our assurance that we would not condone inhumane practices, nor would we have any association of any kind with an institution which permitted anything but the most human and humane practices. We do not feel that our treatment programme, nor indeed any treatment programme, is a panacea, nor do we feel that the techniques we are using are the only solutions.

We would urge, however, that we be permitted to continue to develop a treatment programme which has a considerable promise of success, and we would respectfully request that we not be subjected to irrational and emotional attacks which are obviously based on inadequate knowledge, and motivated by needs for political gain.

Yours sincerely, Robert R. Ross, PhD, associate professor of psychology, University of Waterloo.

Mr. Speaker, Doctor Donald Meichenbaum—Education BA, city college of New York; MA, University of Illinois; doctor of philosophy, University of Illinois; majored in clinical psychology. His professional experience—veterans' administration hospital, Danville, Illinois; assistant professor, University of Waterloo, 1966 to the present; and consulting psychologist at Grand View school for girls from 1966 to the present. His professional honours—he was recipient of the United States Public Health Fellowship, 1965 to 1966; recipient of the Ontario mental health grants, 1967 and 1968 and he also has, to his credit, a great number of publications.

Let me read you what Doctor Meichenbaum has to say on the University of Waterloo letterhead:

Dear Mr. Grossman: In recent weeks, the training schools in Ontario, and in particular the Grand View school at Galt, have been seriously criticized by Mr. Brown, MPP. According to newspaper reports, he has characterized the treatment programme at the Grand View school as inhumane, dehumanizing, a farce, and has suggested that the treatment programme is 40 years out of date.

As a psychological consultant to the Grand View school, it is important that I respond to the criticism of Mr. Brown in order to determine if they have any basis.

It appears that Mr. Brown's criticism of Grand View is based upon the treatment programme which has been recently implemented in the reception and diagnostic centre. This treatment programme has two major goals: one is to make the girls more manageable; and second to make them more amenable to a wide range of therapeutic endeavours which may be applied on an individual and group basis.

In order to achieve the first goal, we have adopted a reinforcement therapy programme which is designed to encourage and reward socially appropriate behaviour, thus eliminating major misbehaviours which often occur in institutional settings.

Various incentives are made contingent upon the girls' behaviour. A girl can work her way through a series of stages, each having greater reinforcing value, by improving her behaviour. The sense of responsibility for modification of behaviour is shared by both the girl and the staff.

A girl working through the programme may thus learn the consequences of her behaviour and the self-control needed to achieve her goals. A second and important goal of the treatment programme is to supplement the reinforcement, or resocialization therapy with individual and group therapy. Each girl in the programme has a trained therapist who is being supervised to employ the therapy most applicable to a specific girl, that is, role playing, desensitization, sex education, and others.

And this is important, Mr. Speaker:

Mr. Brown recently visited Grand View school, and in a very brief tour and in a brief meeting with those responsible to implement the programme he came away with several misconceptions. I underlined the words brief because I met with Mr. Brown for less than an hour to describe what we were trying to accomplish, and encouraged him not to prejudge our efforts. Unfortunately, Mr. Brown felt a necessity to speak out before he was fully informed of our goals or programme. I will specifically discuss the following three criticisms he has raised: (a) the programme is outmoded by some 40 years; (b) the programme is dehumanizing; (c) the programme is inhumane.

Mr. Speaker, I would liked to have put all of this on record but I think some of—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Carry on.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It is quite technical—

Mr. Sopha: Oh, no, go ahead.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): The Minister is a good reader.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —and maybe it is boring to the members—I do not know. Certainly it must be boring to the leader of the NDP—he is paying no attention.

Mr. MacDonald: I am listening. Do not be so sensitive.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: All these people who are so concerned with the children of this province are not even paying attention.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: All right, I will put it on the record, Mr. Speaker.

An hon. member: They can read it.

Mr. MacDonald: This government is so obviously on the defensive, it is staggering.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: To continue:

The use of reinforcement therapy is based upon a very basic common sense notion that we are likely to perform behaviours that result in rewards or pay-off, and unlikely to perform behaviours that result in loss of these pay-offs. In this sense, the idea of underlying reinforcement therapy is old, but the systematic and planned use of this principle has only recently been applied to the modification of behaviour. Reinforcement therapy is presently being applied by psychiatrists and psychologists in both Canada and the United States to modify many behaviours, including that of schizophrenics, autistic and retarded children, problem school children, and institutionalized adolescent offenders.

Within the last ten years, 75 scientific articles have been published which describe the promise of this approach to modify behaviour.

Thus, within the scientific community, which Mr. Brown has not bothered to consult, the use of reinforcement therapy has received increasing attention. When I met Mr. Brown, I indicated that I would make copies of such reports available to him and indicated that Smith, Kline and French, the drug company, has an excellent film describing such a programme. It appears Mr. Brown did not feel obliged to familiarize himself with this material and drew his conclusions hastily and with little forethought.

Mr. Brown characterized the programme as dehumanizing. This statement further illustrates Mr. Brown's biased misconception of a programme which appears to differ from his own notions of treatment for delinquents. The human relationship between staff and girls is a very important element of our treatment programme. In order to achieve such relationships with the girls, the staff is carefully trained. One goal of our treatment programme is to have the girls become more responsive to the social reinforcement which the staff may dispense.

The third criticism, and the one which received most publicity, is that the programme is inhumane. One attribute of the programme which should be emphasized, and insures against any deleterious consequences of the treatment, is the daily recording of the girls' behaviour. The careful recording of the girls' behaviour serves two purposes: (a) to assess the effectiveness of the treatment programme, and (b) to inform us of the consequences of any treatment manipulation. The programme's concern for the girls' welfare and behaviour seems to suggest that Mr. Brown's selection of the word, "inhumane", was poorly chosen.

In summary, I find Mr. Brown's criticism of the treatment programme at the Grand View school without foundation. The treatment programme is relatively new and there is room for improvement which we well realize. However, preliminary results encourage us to pursue its implementation and to critically evaluate its merits.

Mr. Grossman, I give you full authorization to use this letter in any manner you see fit to make the public aware of the unjustified accusations Mr. Brown, MPP, has made in recent weeks. If I can give you any further information or be of any other service, please let me know.

Sincerely yours,

Donald H. Meichenbaum, Ph.D.,
Assist. Professor, University of Waterloo

Mr. Sopha: Is the hon. Minister able to inform us—a number of us are curious—just what qualifications the member for Beaches-Woodbine has in this field—and I mean professional qualifications.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The question has been asked, Mr. Speaker. I presume that there are people who would get up and defend the hon. member and give his qualifications the same as they have done in respect of other members across the way.

Mr. Sopha: Does he have any?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: This is not the point in question, as far as I am concerned. I am not going to put myself—in answer to the hon. member, Mr. Speaker—in a position where I appear to be persecuting the member for Beaches-Woodbine. What I am doing here is documenting the charges he has made, documenting the answers to them and letting those who are in a position to judge decide to whom they should pay attention.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Sopha: One other question: Does the hon. Minister have any information that he ever made a speech anywhere than at an NDP meeting?

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. MacDonald: Sure, he is doing so today in Chicago.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: There is a great deal of levity on that side for people who are concerned with children—

Mr. MacDonald: The Minister said exactly the same thing ten years ago, and he completely changed his policy after defending it so vigorously. So go back and see *Hansard* from the year 1957 on into the '60s.

An hon. member: Nonsense!

Mr. MacDonald: I know whereof I speak.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I take it, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. leader of the NDP is saying that he did not like our policy ten years ago—I was not defending the policy of this department ten years ago; I have been Minister of it for only four and a half years!

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The hon. member is, in fact saying—if he would only realize it—that there have been many improvements made. This is what he is saying! Now why does he not admit it?

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Let it be noted, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. leader has said that there have been many improvements. I would suggest that he tell that to the hon. member for Beaches-Woodbine.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. MacDonald: Too much of it is window dressing.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I have a pretty good idea of what is going on too, you know, and I know what has made the hon. member who is not present today so irrational and so emotional in many of his public statements. You see the people from whom he used to draw a lot of support in this area have told him, "Look, lay off! The department is going ahead very well." And he does not have anybody to document his case and he is getting wild. This is what has happened!

Mr. MacDonald: What a shock the Minister is in for before this is all over!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We will find out—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Dr. Kenneth Bowers, Mr. Speaker, is in the department of psychology in the clinical division of the University of Waterloo, and has an honours B.A. Bachelor of Arts, Philosophy from the University of Illinois, 1959. He is a Doctor of Philosophy, Psychology, University of Illinois, and some of the awards and special recommendations he has had are United States Public Health Fellowship; he has had an Ontario mental health grant and a medical research council grant; a certificate of merit from the society for clinical and experimental hypnosis for the best research paper in experimental hypnosis for 1966-67. He is a member of the American psychological association and I also have a list of many of his publications as well here. His work experience—the Albert Einstein hospital, the Bronx, New York, 1961-62; the University of Illinois, 1962-63; the director of clinical psychology division from 1966 to the present, and he was an associate professor as well from 1963 at University of Waterloo and he is a consulting psychologist, of course, to the Grand View school which we are talking about.

Mr. MacDonald: Did all these letters come from Waterloo University?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes.

Mr. MacDonald: Purely spontaneous, no doubt!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well now, I suppose there is something wrong with the University of Waterloo. Of course there is no spontaneous outburst.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: Remarkable spontaneity!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Why would there not be a spontaneous outburst? These are the people who are working on this programme. What were they supposed to do? Sit back and listen to these attacks?

Mr. MacDonald: What was the member for Beaches-Woodbine supposed to do when the Minister went after him?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: When was this?

Mr. MacDonald: When the Minister went after him.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I am going to give the leader of the NDP two or three minutes of my time to tell we when I attacked the member for Beaches-Woodbine.

Mr. MacDonald: Never mind wasting the time. Of course I meant the government which the Minister represents.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Then why did the member not go back to—

Mr. Speaker: Order. I would call particularly to the attention of the member for York South that we do not engage in cross talk to members. We talk to members through the Speaker and if he wishes to refer to a member in this House, I would ask that he would refer to that member through Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, the outburst of the hon. member is, of course, rather indicative of something. Here is a man who came in here with a halo on his head. He is interested in nothing but the emotionally disturbed, so it is almost an admission that because somebody in the government had been attacking the member for Beaches-Woodbine in the past, he is using the work we are doing with disturbed children as a means of getting even with the government, as it were.

Mr. MacDonald: Personal attacks again!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is a blind approach for a man who is interested in children and nothing else.

Mr. MacDonald: He has done more for emotionally disturbed children than any other man in the province.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: If I have not been down to the issues up until now, I do not know what I have been doing.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, Dr. Bowers writes as follows:

> Sir, in my capacity as a clinical psychologist and consultant at Grandview school, Galt, I feel I must convey to you my considerable indignation at the charges made by Mr. John Brown, MPP, concerning the treatment programme at Grandview.
>
> Your department, and the staff at that institution, have worked very hard and effectively to establish what must be viewed as a very progressive programme of rehabilitation.
>
> The treatment approach utilized at Grand View certainly differs from that espoused by Mr. Brown, but it is based on sund, scientific principles which, when wisely applied by men of integrity and intellectual honesty, have resulted in very dramatic results indeed.
>
> Patients mute for more than a decade have begun to talk again. Hopelessly autistic children have begun to establish really human relationships for the first time in their lives, and mental retardates have known the excitement of being able to learn effectively, all by virtue of the systematic application of principles which are now being employed in a programme of treatment at Grand View.
>
> On the basis of such successes elsewhere, there is good reason to expect that the Grand View treatment programme will be an effective one. Indeed, the progress of the first girls to enter the final stages of the treatment programme confirms our optimism. Nevertheless, I think it is only fair to say that the programme has not yet been in operation long enough to pass any final judgement concerning its overall success.

So you can imagine my consternation upon learning that the programme has been publicly called "a farce" by a man who is neither trained nor, by habit, disposed to evaluate treatment effectiveness. I can only infer that Mr. Brown has prejudged the Grand View programme out of his own treatment biases, and out of a very considerable ignorance of recent advance in treatment methods. This ignorance is particularly obvious in his statement to the effect that the Grand View programme is 40 years out of date. Even cursory knowledge of recent psychological advances would have saved him the embarrassment of such a flagrantly erroneous statement.

But what is most distressing about Mr. Brown's public comments, is the unsubstantiated and totally unwarranted charge that the treatment programme at Grand View employs "inhumane" treatment methods. I regard such unsupported statements as scurrilous, irresponsible, and inflammatory. They serve no purpose execpt to mislead and alarm the public. In so doing, such statements may well have a disrupting and demoralizing effect on the treatment programme itself. One cannot help but feel that anyone making such statements is less interested in the treatment and welfare of children than in fomenting a political crisis to gain personal publicity.

I hope that communicating my views on this matter can be of some help in setting the record straight. In my opinion, Grand View school may very well be a precedent-setting endeavour. We have already submitted some of our findings for publication, and have received bibliographic recognition for our work. By making our work available in journals to professional and academic peers, we hope to engender the kind of responsible criticism that will lead to even better treatment methods. That is the way science progresses, and the lot of man improves. Sincerely, Kenneth S. Bowers, Head of the clinical division, university of Waterloo.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think these—

Mr. G. Demers (Nickle Belt): Put that in your pipe and smoke it.

Hon Mr. Grossman: —letters set the record straight about the programme at Galt. The whole point here is that men of professional integrity and stature are devoting their time and efforts to a programme in which they believe. And I think this Legislature should be proud that professionals with the qualifications that these men possess should be involved in programmes of the department.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that this Legislature will also be interested to learn that the Ontario mental health foundation thinks so highly of the treatment programme, and the research that is being carried out at Galt, that it has recently provided a grant of $43,000 to Dr. Ross and his colleagues for their work.

I am not trying to make the point, this afternoon, that programmes in training schools are any better than those in other facilities, that is not my function at this moment. I would point out that I, and I have mentioned this before, as a lay person must rely on the advice of professionals in the social sciences and in the field of corrections generally. The professionals at Galt believe in the techniques they are employing, and I think it is fair to say here that even within the department there are professional people who may favour other techniques. I hope there will always be.

I know full well that in the whole field of the social sciences, there is a wide divergence of opinion of how best to deal with alienated, disturbed children. The simple fact is that few people will claim that they have the panacea, that their techniques and methods are the be-all and the end-all in the area of problem children. The department does not claim to have all the answers—as suggested by the hon. member the other day; we have quite often said this publicly and I wish he would do the same—or indeed that we shall ever have all the answers.

We do say, however, that we are successful in the rehabilitation of a great number of children who are placed in our care, so that there would be no doubt in the hon. member's mind about the fact that we are reaching and helping many of these children to make a satisfactory adjustment upon their return to the community. To prove this, I intended, and I have just made some changes in my script, Mr. Speaker, to read a few selections from the reports recommending termination of wardship which pass across my desk every week in the year. I suppose some of the members have watched me here every Thursday or Friday signing these documents.

But in case I should inadavertently be responsible for one youngster being identified, I have decided not to do so. If I am challenged to do it, I will have to do so. I recall, Mr. Speaker, we had some criticism about some members opposite who once read these

case histories, and even although they attempted to disguise them, they were not so well disguised that they did not do a lot of damage later on.

But I have them here, I will not trouble the House with them, but they prove, and we have hundreds of these in our files, that children have adjusted, also and the tremendous job that is being done by our staff in the department.

Mr. Speaker, in nearly all of the speeches by the hon. member for Beaches-Woodbine, he has aimed his shotgun at section 8 of The Training Schools Act 1965. Now this Act was fully debated by this House and passed uanimously three years ago. Yesterday, the hon. member for Scarborough West also made a number of derogatory remarks with particular reference to section 8 of The Training Schools Act.

He suggested that this section was most offensive to civil liberties of children, and stated that there was also dissatisfaction with section 8 by children's aid societies, juvenile and family court judges, and made reference to Mr. Justice McRuer's report on the inquiry into civil rights.

Subsequent to the hon. member's remarks in the House yesterday, I spoke to the executive directors of the two largest children's aid societies in the province, and discussed with them the hon. member's statement that the children's aid societies were not happy with section 8 of The Training Schools Act. They advised me that they were most supportive. of The Training Schools Act; that this legislation was conceived with the best interests of the child in mind; they had no objection to section 8, and, in fact, would deplore its elimination.

When asked to suggest any possible amendment they would like to suggest, they could not think of any amendment which they would like to propose. Section 8, Mr. Speaker, they stated in fact ensures placement of the child in facilities best equipped to meet his needs. However, they did state that section 8 highlights the need for alternate facilities—

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): That is just the point.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —but they did concede.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is not the whole point. They are not saying anything now which I did not say, Mr. Speaker, when I introduced the bill. There was a lot of argument that we would not have facilities. And I said we will find this out when we see the Act working for a while. Now there are more facilities being provided.

Mr. MacDonald: Far too few.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: But let me finish. They also conceded that at the present time, it has not been established that alternate facilities would provide more adequately for these children. This is a subject for research. We still would not know this if we had 500 institutions—whether they be called residential treatment centres or group foster homes or what—it is a difficult field in which to do research because it is hard to do controlled research in this field.

The hon. member also stated that judges of the juvenile and family courts were not happy with section 8. I should point out that during the drafting of the bill we had numerous discussions with the juvenile and family court judges and I may say that we have continuing liaison with these judges.

With reference to Mr. Justice McRuer's remarks on page 550 of the inquiry into civil rights I believe the hon. member quoted from this. He quoted the following statement:

> It is ludicrous that anyone should have power to send a child to an industrial training school for any breach of a city bylaw or of a provincial statute while an adult may only be fined a nominal amount.

If the hon. member will read the entire section it would be obvious to him and to all members present that Mr. Justice McRuer is referring to The Juvenile Delinquents Act —Canada, because the very point that Justice McRuer is objecting to in this Act is exactly what we eliminated in The Training Schools Act in 1965, and the recommendation summing up this particular chapter No. 13 states:

> There should not be power to send a child to an industrial training school for breach of a city bylaw or a provincial statute.

This recommendation has been provided for under section 9 of The Training Schools Act which states that a child of at least 12 years of age cannot be sent to a training school for contravention of any statute in Ontario unless such contravention would be punishable by imprisonment if committed by an adult. This obviously eliminates municipal bylaws and practically all provincial statutes.

Recommendation No. 14 states: The term "juvenile delinquent" should be abolished as far as it applies to provincial offences.

We foresaw this three years ago. This has been done in Ontario under The Training Schools Act and I am happy to report to this House that the federal government now has a draft bill which it appears will follow Ontario's lead in this regard. And I strongly suspect, Mr. Speaker—I strongly suspect, and many in this field suspect, that Mr. Justice McRuer had the Ontario legislation in mind when he made these recommendations which were obviously directed at federal legislation.

However, this section 8 still concerned me because it could be misinterpreted by some people who have not lived with it for quite a while. I might add that I recently asked Dr. Tadeusz Grygier, formerly with the University of Toronto school of social work, former director of research of The Department of Reform Institutions, now director of the University of Ottawa centre of criminology—and every one who knows anything about people in this field will know that he is an outstanding and world renowned expert in this field, to comment on section 8. In his letter Dr. Grygier said:

> I regard section 8 as an important provision safeguarding children's human rights. No decision under this section can be directed against the child; it can only be made in the child's favour in the situation where his welfare demands it and the facts, to be stated by the judge, justify it.

As I mentioned, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Beaches-Woodbine also does not agree with section 8 of our Act. However, I fail to see that his concern about this piece of legislation in any way justifies the irresponsible, misleading statements which he has been making publicly about training schools and their programmes and staff.

I think all he has accomplished in his campaign to undermine confidence in the programmes in training schools and in his questioning of the integrity of the staff involved in them, is to bring discredit upon himself.

His statements, Mr. Speaker, have opened a credibility gap which would take a bulldozer to close. I think, Mr. Speaker, and this is the point, that all his future statements in public and in this Legislature will be measured against the statements he has already made based on faulty or incompetent research and/or a total disregard of the facts.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Scarborough West yesterday also stated that section 8 is being contested in the courts. He failed to mention to the hon. members, and I think he should have, that Brown camps were the instigators of the appeal to declare *ultra vires,* section 8 of The Training Schools Act, passed unanimously by this Legislature, and approved of and commented upon, as I mentioned the other day, in very favourable terms by the hon. member for Scarborough West who is himself a director of Brown camps. There are no interferences to be drawn from this.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): It very clearly was already public knowledge.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Oh, yes, he learned that. All I am saying is that I think it would have been fairer to the hon. members for him to point out that if section 8 is being contested in the court, the organization with which he is associated is the instigator of this appeal. I think he should point this out so the members will know.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough): I agree that we are taking the case to court.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Why did not the hon. member point this out. He agrees with me. Let the record say that the hon. member agrees and should have pointed this out to the hon. members. The programmes, Mr. Speaker, carried on in the training schools of this province are based on research and studies of programmes in our own and other jurisdictions. We are continually trying to improve our present methods and develop new approaches. I have a great deal of confidence in my staff. I am proud of the work they have been doing and the dedication they have shown. I do not intend to allow them to be subjected to unwarranted and unfair criticism without replying on their behalf.

The hon. member has said, and I refer to the hon. member for Beaches-Woodbine, that he entered politics because of his concern for emotionally disturbed children. Now I have a great deal of admiration for those who give time and effort in the field of problem children. I say to the hon. member that he and I are both involved in trying to help troubled children and I say to him, whether or not he will concede it, we are both working in a difficult field toward a common goal—the helping of children to return to useful, productive lives in the community.

Nothing is to be gained from the hon. member maligning other professionals, other approaches and other techniques. I have not attacked his treatment methods. What I have

done today is to try to set the record straight in regard to a number of serious and unfounded allegations directed at the programmes and staffs in training schools.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, in the future the hon. member will refrain from making unwarranted attacks on these programmes and the personnel involved in them. The hon. member must accept the fact that he is not the sole repository of all the knowledge in this complex field. I say to the hon. member that we need all the facilities for troubled children which can be provided. We cannot afford to waste time—

Mr. Lewis: Not training schools!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No, just Brown camps.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We cannot afford, Mr. Speaker, to waste time in senseless destruction of the sound programmes which are now being carried on both in training schools and in the multitude of facilities and agencies working with these children across this province.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. Is the Minister alleging or charging a conflict of interest in this case?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I never mentioned conflict of interest.

Mr. Sargent: Well, you implied that, did you not?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No, I never did mention anything about conflict of interest.

An hon. member: The Premier did.

Mr. Sargent: Well, the Prime Minister did, then.

Mr. Speaker: Order! Will the Minister resume.

Mr. Sargent: Will the Minister answer the question?

Mr. Speaker: He did. The Minister will not debate the point of order.

An hon. member: Mr. Speaker, I submit there is no point of order, there is—

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, this is very important.

Mr. Speaker: Will the member please resume his seat while the Speaker is on his feet. The member raised a point of order. He stated his point of order and in my opinion there was no point of order. The Minister's statement did not contain, in my opinion, any such allegation as is mentioned.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, he read into the record the name of the member for Scarborough West as a director of this company.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether the hon. member was really following. I made the point and the hon. member for Scarborough West agreed with me.

Mr. Lewis: I did not agree.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes he did.

Mr. Lewis: I agreed that we were taking the case to court.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I said that section 8 was being appealed in the courts as to its validity and I said if a member gets up and makes this point, he should let the members know that the people who are appealing this, who are behind the appeal—I think I used the word "instigated" the appeal, were the Brown camps of which the hon. member is national director.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): It is well known.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, I guess it is well known, but apparently it is not well known to many of the hon. members.

Interjections by hon. members.

An hon. member: You do not like it somehow, do you? You really do not like it.

An hon. member: What are you trying to hide over there?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Now, Mr. Speaker—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: They have accused everybody in the world!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, point of order.

Mr. Speaker: Order! The member has a further point of order which he will state.

Mr. Sargent: There can be no more top authority in the House than the Prime Minister and he made a remark that there is conflict of interest.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order! There is no point of order. I did not hear any remarks by the Prime Minister. The Minister of Reform Institutions has the floor.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I have the floor now, Mr. Speaker. I say to the hon. member that we need all the facilities which can be provided for troubled children. We cannot afford to waste time in senseless destruction of the sound programmes which are now being carried on, both in the training schools and in the multitude of facilities and agencies working with these children across this province. There is a whole wide world full of children who need help, and I say let us get on with that job.

Mr. Speaker, reviewing the Throne debate, particularly the speeches from the new members, most of which I have listened to intently, I must say that I was very encouraged by the general approach—the new ideas, the delivery and so on—of some of those new members.

At the beginning of any new Parliament, there is a twofold duty. One is a duty on the part of new members to get to know the Legislature, to get to know its moods and its workings, to get to know what is effective and what is redundant in the process of democratic government. Some, quite naturally, feel in their way around a little, knowing there is much to learn. Others throw themselves right into the fray as if they know all there is to know, and even after just a few days in the House, some began to tell the Speaker how to conduct the affairs of the Legislature.

Many of this latter group—many of whom we have seen before— they come in like lions and go out like lambs early in their political careers.

The speeches we heard from new members have been most revealing, some high in tone and with an approach which deserves and gets respect of the hon. members. The hon. members' evaluation of the contributions which each one can make, will be based on his own appreciation of his worth and his ability to indicate it to this House. However, his individual worth, the individual worth of all members of the Legislature, adds up to the worth of his party and its policies. And the individual worth of all three parties, their policies and their effectiveness, adds up to the total worth of this Legislature.

I should like then to make some general comment on some of the things which have been said in this House, and then call upon you to reject the amendments which have been put before us, and in so doing, to support solely the main motion which is the subject of this debate.

First of all, I would say that the leaders of the two Opposition parties had presumably written their reactions to the speech before reading it in detail—

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): There was not much to read.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Or, perhaps I should say they did not have to write them, they knew what they would say. They used the "same old tired phrases" to describe the Throne Speech as being the "same old tired phrases."

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: In this respect, I would refer them to the comments of the hon. member for Sudbury on Monday night when he was strongly condemning what he referred to—I do not know whether he used the exact words—as the "trappings of office," the "pretense that the Lieutenant-Governor is speaking for his government," and all the usual, as I think he called them, "worn out, hackneyed practices" and so on.

Perhaps he should also advise his leader, and the NDP leader, that they should really read the Throne Speech, the government's programme, and study it before making the same "worn-out, hackneyed criticism," within five minutes of its presentation—comments like, as I said, "same old tired phrases" and so on. So they are going through the same routine, the same old traditions, as they are criticizing.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The official Opposition, Mr. Speaker, makes a big play on medicare, just as does the other opposition. But both these parties seem to be diametrically opposed to each other in such things as: what is medicare?—why is medicare?—how is medicare?—and what are the financial implications of medicare? I shall, however, deal with the specific amendments to the motion later.

Returning to the official Opposition, with, I must say, one or two notable and familiar exceptions, it is obvious that this party, at least to date, is making a serious and responsible contribution to the deliberations of this House. They have shown again, with one or two notable exceptions, by their actions, that by and large they intend to be a responsible Opposition. They deserve to remain, as they

undoubtedly will remain, the official Opposition for many, many years to come.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, in case there is any doubt in what I said, I finished off saying they deserve to remain, as they undoubtedly will, the official Opposition for many, many years to come.

Mr. Speaker, it was interesting to listen to the hon. member for Sandwich-Riverside (Mr. Burr) in his apologia—incidentally, I thought he was supposed to be my official critic. I wish some of the other hon. members over there had given him a chance. If I were in his place, I would feel awfully insulted at the way he has been handled. He has not been given a chance.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, it was interesting to listen to the hon. member for Sandwich-Riverside in his apologia for being a member of the NDP. He described his impressions of the different parties, saying that we were all socialists and describing his own party as the "marching" socialists. On page 706 of *Hansard* he states that the Ontario Conservative Party is in some ways a "socialist" party, and that the federal and Ontario Liberals are in many ways a "socialist" party. Then, on the same page and I quote:

> **The New Democrats, at their founding convention, accepted the principle of a mixed economy based partly on social enterprise and partly on private enterprise. Therefore, the NDP is not a completely socialist party.**

Mr. Speaker, what in the world are the hon. member and his colleagues doing in a third party? If we are all the same, why do they muddy the electoral waters by forming a third group? The answer is obvious.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The answer is obvious, Mr. Speaker. They, in effect, are now saying, "We are just the same as you but we want power", that is what they say.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: The member from Beaches-Woodbine cannot speak for the whole group.

Mr. Lewis: The Minister cannot call us Marxist and then say we are all the same.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I wonder what the true socialist will say to that kind of cynical approach to politics? Where, oh where, have the halos gone? And I wonder who does define the NDP policy for the party. Is it the member for Scarborough West?

It should be noted, when I interjected after the hon. member for Sandwich-Riverside had made the statement about his party being partly free enterprise and partly socialist, I asked the question, "Does the hon. member for Scarborough West agree with this?" and the hon. member for Scarborough West replied, "Did the Minister not hear me say 'shame'?"

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Minister of Municipal Affairs): That is the leader.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I cannot figure out who is the leader.

An hon. member: That is the Premier's problem.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, to do my job I must know.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The hon. member also, in defining socialism in this House, that is, the hon. member for Sandwich-Riverside, made the following statement:

> **The word "socialism" comes from the Latin *"socius"*, meaning a friend, and *"ism"* a belief. Socialism is a belief in friendship as a way of life.**

I will say, sir, that we all believe in motherhood. But I looked in the Oxford Dictionary and its definition of socialism is:

> A theory or policy of social organization which advocates the ownership and control of the means of production, capital, land, property, etc. by the community as a whole; their administration or distribution in the interest of all.

An hon. member: The tired and weary old statement. Try the Webster's Dictionary, it is worse.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Webster's? Shall I try Webster? All right, here is Webster.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. R. Welch (Provincial Secretary): Who is your straight man?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The member should not feel so badly, Mr. Speaker, I was the straight man for the member for Downsview yesterday.

Webster's Dictionary gives the following examples—

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Is that the encyclopaedia dictionary?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Now just a minute. The member asked me a question.

Webster's Dictionary gives the following examples of socialism.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: He can go on as long as he likes.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Collectivism, fabianism, marxism, bolshevism, communism—

Is that what you wanted?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sopha: They have them all, and a few more.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: We would love your help but we are able to do it alone.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, in talking about whether they are "capitalist socialists" or "socialist capitalists" or, I do not know, "socialist socialists", or just something I do not know, it is rather interesting to note the attack that was made by the hon. member for Scarborough West on the hon. member for Ontario South, I think it was, when he talked about the Bell Telephone Company and its modest profits.

In January this year, the hon. member for High Park appeared on television to defend his principles. He was asked, as an NDP, what he would include in state take-overs and he could think only of insurance firms and insurance firms and, when further pressed, insurance firms.

Mr. Shulman: They do need taking over.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: But one thing he said was that large firms which were making reasonable profits would, in no way, be affected, and an instance he gave of the large firm making a purely reasonable level of profit, was the Bell Telephone Company.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The member will be seated when the Speaker rises and asks for order. The member has a point of order—or personal privilege.

Mr. Shulman: I am sure that the hon. Minister—

Mr. Speaker: The member will advise the chair whether he has a point of order or—

Mr. Shulman: Yes, I have a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: Would you state your point of order.

Mr. Shulman: I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. Minister would not wish to deliberately deceive the House and I would like, therefore, to inform you that what was said, sir, on that programme, was that in my opinion this particular company should not be nationalized, and profits should be limited to a reasonable amount.

Mr. MacDonald: And they are reaching it.

Interjections by hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I would advise the hon. member for High Park not to get into the NDP spirit of things. This can hardly be considered an attack on the hon. member.

Take it easy, take it easy. It is going to get worse than this before it gets better. Because if you are going to dish it out, you have to take it a little bit anyway, no matter what you do.

I am sure that you are going to find some contradictions in respect to statements I made over the last 16 years, too. Of course you will. I have been in politics for 16 years. But I do not make a virtue out of changing my mind as they do over there.

It really was interesting, the hoots, howls, and the jeers that the hon. member for Ontario South got when he had the temerity to suggest that the Bell Telephone Company was making a modest profit. Now I could not care less, one way or the other, about the Bell Telephone Company, and I am not here to defend it. I am not here to attack it either, but that was an interesting thing.

I felt like getting up and, at that time, saying to the hon. member for High Park, "Meet the hon. member for Scarborough West", and to the hon. member for Scarborough West, "Meet the hon. leader", but I did not know that everyone had different views over there this time.

Mr. Speaker, I have a lot more here. It could be interesting. I will not bother the House with the rest.

Hon. Robarts: Go ahead.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, we find that the members opposite called the "New Democrats", "socialists", "semi-socialists", "capitalist-socialist", or what you will—and I am sure that this must be regrettable to the member for Lakeshore (Mr. Lawlor)—they are really a group of individualists, a party with no unifying policy among themselves. A party certainly with very little credibility, and no responsibility, and if they continue to be

just a large group of dissidents, protesters, prophets of gloom and doom, then their increase in quantity is most definitely going to be at the expense of quality.

Mr. Young: Those are the words that Diefenbaker used about the Liberals.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: And incidentally, and I hope that this is not going to hurt him, I do not really want to stab the hon. member, it is just that the hon. member in that same television show described the party that he was joining as a "little rump of a half a dozen sitting in Queen's Park." So I suppose that if they were a "little rump," so I suppose that there are "big rumps" too.

Mr. MacDonald: There may be little rumps too on that side.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I do not believe it really!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, there are many reasons I could give but I was hoping to get down to the specifics before the closing hour, in respect of the main motion and the amendment and so on and so on. But I think, generally speaking, we could point to two outstanding examples, without referring to my notes, in respect to the criticism that we generally get from the other side. That we dream dreams, or that we never carry them out, and so on. I just wonder how many of the constituents from the—those constituents from Scarborough can say that we have visions which we never carry forward, and I wonder how many of those members who come from the ridings out in the Scarboroughs ride in on those visions every day on the GO train? There are people who said that the Confederation of tomorrow was just a red herring to draw attention. I remember that, "it was a wild dream," and I do not need to remind the members of the House of the effectiveness of this conference. Everyone here knows the effectiveness of the conference. And how its stated purpose exceeded the hopes of all concerned. Ask the leader of the Opposition. Ask the leader of the NDP. Ask the hon. member for Sudbury. Ask the Premiers of the other nine provinces. That certainly was not a dream. It came about, and as I say, succeeded in much greater measure than we even envisioned. And we are accused by both the Opposition parties of being complacent, and what else is there to say? You say complacent, smug, indolent, and yet from your own mouths, and it was already repeated by another member. The hon. member for Peterborough pointed out the difference between the way things were handled up in Ottawa as against the way things are handled here. Who does he think is responsible for this sort of thing? Where else would he find a government headed by a leader who practically any time the Opposition does not feel that it is ready for a bill says, "All right, we will withdraw the bill for later consideration." Some private member gets up and asks for it to be taken to a committee—"It will go to a committee." The Prime Minister calls an order and they are not ready for it—"It's all right. We will not debate it at this time." I will agree that the Opposition does not get everything that it wants.

They have never seemed to discover that they were not elected to govern this province.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Get the seats, if you are able to do it.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, where else would you find a government which has a Minister who is making his Throne speech to close the debate and has about another six pages and will say, out of respect for the members, I will not read them!

There is not the slightest doubt, Mr. Speaker. After all, we have just come through an election, so obviously the people have given us a mandate on our record and therefore, if they have done that then it means that they believe us when we say we are going to do something in the Throne Speech, it is going to be done!

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: And they obviously—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, a very brief and cursory examination of just some of the things which members opposite have espoused in the short period of four or five weeks would prove that it would cost hundreds and hundreds of millions of dollars, which would probably double and triple the taxes in effect today. This government intends to carry on a balanced programme with regard—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We intend to carry on—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Oh, come on! There are five minutes to go.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I am forced to draw to your attention once again that I do not object to interruptions, but sometimes when this side of the House interrupts vigorously we get reprimanded. The Prime Minister is very vigorously interrupting. Now let us have an even application of the rules.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I might say that I would be prepared to accept any reprimand that Mr. Speaker might administer.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Speaker: I would like to think that the member for York South, whose reputation for interruptions and crossfire is second to none in this House, perhaps should be more lenient in his views of what happens in other areas in the House. The Minister will conclude his remarks.

Mr. MacDonald: I am not asking for leniency. The Prime Minister acknowledged the validity of my point.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member will let me, I will close.

We have proceeded with our promised plans to relieve the local taxpayer. We have started our reform of the educational structure and financing. We shall continue to make such positive, purposeful changes in the tax structure as the economy of the province, the country and the world dictates, if reasonable and possible of achievement, and that also means that we will not succumb to every call for expenditures regardless of the cost. The public wants government to concern itself with the financial implications of its legislation and that is precisely what we intend to do.

We have a mandate from the province to govern, a mandate from the people, and we shall govern in the best interests of all the people.

I ask the hon. members to indicate their support of this policy by the rejection of both amendments and by the support of the main motion.

Thank you.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Speaker: The Throne debate now being concluded, I shall call for the vote as follows:

Mr. Smith (Hamilton Mountain): moved, seconded by Mr. Meen, that a humble address be presented to the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor as follows:

> To the Honourable W. Earl Rowe PC (C) LLD, DScSoc, Lieutenant-Governor of Ontario, we, Her Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects in the legislative assembly of the province of Ontario now assembled, beg leave to thank Your Honour for the gracious speech which Your Honour has addressed to us.

Mr. Nixon moved, seconded by Mr. Singer that the motion for an address in reply to the Speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor now before the House be amended by adding thereto the following words:

> That this House regrets that this government:
>
> 1. Will not participate in the benefits of the federal Medical Insurance Act.
>
> 2. Has failed, in spite of much publicity and fanfare, to evolve a workable urban programme for the province that will meet the needs of our families of average income with regard to housing, recreation and transportation.
>
> 3. Has been unable to bolster and equalize our economic development, particularly in northern Ontario so that all our residents can share in prosperity.
>
> 4. Has failed to reform educational financing to meet local need, and reduce the level of local taxation.
>
> 5. Has failed to provide leadership to lead the farming industry from economic doldrums.
>
> It is for these reasons that the government does not enjoy the confidence of the House.

Mr. MacDonald moves, seconded by Mr. Renwick, that the amendment to the motion for an address in reply to the Speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor now before the House, be amended by adding thereto the following:

> And this House further regrets the government's continued refusal to assist the Ontario people in coping with the soaring cost of living and specifically its failure—
>
> 1. to keep exorbitant price increases in check through the public mechanism of a prices review board;

2. to raise northern family incomes by promoting economic development and to enlighten gross disparities between those prices charged for consumer products in northern Ontario and those in the rest of the province;

3. to reduce the high cost, and eliminate the other inequities of automobile insurance through a government operated, non-profit car insurance plan;

4. to protect tenants from exorbitant rent increases by means of a rental review agency;

5. to increase the minimum wage to at least $1.75 an hour, thereby augmenting the purchasing power of a majority of Ontario people;

6. to adopt measures essential to closing the gap between the demand and supply for low-cost housing in Ontario;

7. to reduce the oppressive burden of the property tax and to introduce equity into Ontario's tax system by means of a foundation tax plan for municipal financing.

And therefore the government does not enjoy the confidence of this House.

The House divided on the amendment to the amendment moved by Mr. MacDonald which was negated on the following division:

AYES	NAYS
Braithwaite	Allan
Breithaupt	Apps
Bukator	Auld
Bullbrook	Bales
Burr	Belanger
Davison	Bernier
Deans	Boyer
De Monte	Brunelle
Edighoffer	Carruthers
Farquhar	Carton
Ferrier	Connell
Gaunt	Demers
Gisborn	Downer
Haggerty	Dunlop
Innes	Dymond
Jackson	Evans
Knight	Gilbertson
Lawlor	Gomme
Lewis	Grossman
MacDonald	Guindon
Makarchuk	Hamilton
Martel	Haskett
Newman (Windsor-Walkerville)	Henderson
Nixon	Hodgson (Victoria-Haliburton)
Paterson	Hodgson (York North)
Peacock	Jessiman
Pitman	Johnston (Parry Sound)
Reid (Rainy River)	Johnston (St. Catharines)
Reid (Scarborough East)	Johnston (Carleton)
Renwick (Riverdale)	Kennedy
Renwick (Mrs.) (Scarborough Centre)	Kerr
Ruston	MacNaughton
Sargent	Meen
Shulman	Morin
Singer	Morningstar
Smith	McKeough
(Nipissing)	McNeil
Sopha	Newman (Ontario South)
Spence	Olde
Stokes	Potter
Trotter	Price
Worton	Pritchard (Mrs.)
Young—42.	Randall
	Reilly
	Reuter
	Robarts
	Rollins
	Root
	Rowe
	Rowntree
	Simonett
	Smith (Simcoe East)
	Smith (Hamilton Mountain)
	Snow
	Stewart
	Villeneuve
	Welch
	Wells
	White
	Whitney
	Winkler
	Wishart
	Yaremko—63.

Clerk of the House: Mr. Speaker, the "ayes" are 42, the "nays" are 63.

Mr. Speaker: I declare the amendment to the amendment lost. We will now vote on the amendment moved by Mr. Nixon.

Some hon. members: Same vote.

Mr. Speaker: I declare the amendment lost. We will now vote on the motion moved by Mr. Smith (Hamilton Mountain). All those in favour of the motion please say "aye". Those opposed please say "nay". I declare that the "ayes" have it.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): That would be a reversal if you would wish the House to stand. The Prime Minister has indicated that he wants a special vote taken.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I rather like this expression of my confidence in the government.

Mr. Speaker: Call in the members.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: It appears to be the same vote.

Mr. Speaker: Are we satisfied now to take the same vote? I declare the motion carried.

Resolved, that an humble address be presented to the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor as follows:

To the Honourable W. Earl Rowe PC(C) LLD, DScSoc, Lieutenant-Governor of the province of Ontario:

We, Her Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects of the legislative assembly of the province of Ontario now assembled, beg leave to thank Your Honour for the gracious speech Your Honour has addressed to us.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, it is with a great feeling of heartfelt relief that I stand in the knowledge that the government has been sustained. Tomorrow—

An hon. member: No! Tonight!

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Oh, tonight we will beg to proceed with the second readings and then following that, we might start on the Budget debate, which is, I think, the second order on the order paper.

It being 6:00 o'clock, p.m. the House took recess.

No. 33

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

First Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Thursday, March 21, 1968

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1968

5

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Thursday, March 21, 1968

Brucellosis Act, 1965, bill to amend, Mr. Stewart, second reading 1087

Marketing of cattle for the production of beef, bill respecting, Mr. Stewart, second reading 1089

Sandwich, Windsor and Amherstburg Railway Act, 1930, bill to amend, Mr. Wishart, second reading 1110

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Rowntree, agreed to 1115

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, MARCH 21, 1968

EVENING SESSION

The House resumed at 8:00 o'clock, p.m.

THE BRUCELLOSIS ACT, 1965

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food) moves the second reading of Bill 34, An Act to amend The Brucellosis Act, 1965.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, the provisions of this Act, according to the Minister's remarks on first reading, signal the victory on the part of the veterinarian profession over a disease which has been of great difficulty for many years in the province and the nation.

The Act that this bill seeks to amend was introduced, I understand, following a joint agreement federally and provincially that the time had come when there was sufficient knowledge of medicine, and sufficient funds, to undertake the eradication of the disease, brucellosis. Now as I understand this Act, it takes away the assistance that the government has been extending to the farmers for the provision of vaccination without cost, which was associated at one time with the requirement that all young animals had to be vaccinated.

We know in the dairy business, particularly, it will be a continuing requirement for anyone wishing to enter the export market that vaccination be continued, and this, of course, will be at the expense of the farmer. But it is a serious area, I believe, for misgiving, that the confidence that the Minister and his advisors have that the disease has been irrevocably stamped out is perhaps not founded on sufficient factual basis for the type of bill that he is putting before us tonight.

Surely it would be a reasonable procedure to continue the requirements that we have had down through some years now, including the aassistance that the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. MacNaughton) has been able to provide for the continuation of this programme. The confidence that the Minister has that the disease will no longer be of significant difficulty is admirable, and we on this side, and farmers certainly across the province, hope that he is correct—but surely we could continue the programme just as we have continued the obligatory testing for tuberculosis, which does not seem to be a major problem in the bovine population, as a sort of safeguard that will leave Ontario with the reputation that we have earned in the markets of the world for a disease-free livestock product.

One of the best sources of trade—the most lucrative sources of trade—that is available to many areas of the farm economy, has to do with these sales of livestock. The Minister, I know, is very well aware of this. It is not our intention to offer an amendment to the bill, but the assurances that the Minister has given that we can forget about the disease are ones that we are not prepared to accept. It seems that the programme that has been successful in eradicating the disease for the time being, could well be continued at little or no cost, if the Provincial Treasurer felt that there had to be this saving. But to put it on the basis where most of our livestock will no longer be vaccinated is surely premature.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Mr. Speaker, I would just like to underscore what my leader has said. I think that the export market in this country is a very important market as far as the Holstein-Friesian cattle are concerned, and I mention them specifically because I believe that they export more than all of the other breeds put together.

It is my feeling that this is an extremely important market. I can think of two sales within the last month and a half which have occurred. They occurred on the basis that the orders came into the province saying that we want, I think in the one case, it was 14 head of cattle, and in the other case, it was seven or eight, I am not sure.

But the point is that the order came into the province, and it was given on the basis that these cattle would be vaccinated and would be free of brucellosis. Of course, the order was filled and we were able to negotiate and complete the sale. If this bill becomes law, and I am sure it will, no matter how strong our objections may be, then I think there will be a tendency on the part of

many pure bred breeders to simply take the easy course and not vaccinate.

Mr. Nixon: Right.

Mr. Gaunt: I am sure there will be this tendency because it—

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Provincial Treasurer): Certainly he is right.

Mr. Gaunt: —will mean a financial obligation on the part of the breeder which has not been the case heretofore, and I am sure that many pure bred breeders will stop vaccinating because of this.

It seems to me that the cost involved would be fairly minimal if we were to continue this on a voluntary basis, but pay for the service of a veterinarian in the event that the pure bred breeder wanted to vaccinate his calves.

I think the Minister should give this consideration because, as I have said before, the export market is a very important one. I feel that the pure bred breeders will tend to become, perhaps, a little laxed in this respect since the financial implications are much greater for them than has been the case, and I would hope the Minister would give these points consideration and perhaps make amends for those suggestions which we have indicated.

Mr. Speaker: If there are no further speakers from the Opposition, then the Minister will wind up the debate.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, I would like to comment on the remarks that have been made. I think the points that have been made by both the leader of the Opposition and the member for—

Mr. Gaunt: Huron-Bruce.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: —have been well stated.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): You should get to know him.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes, I should get to know him better but then I may have to wait a long time until that time comes.

Mr. Nixon: Brucellosis inspected.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, the points that have been raised to me indicate, as the leader of the Opposition said, in the remarks that I made at the introduction of this bill, that the disease has been eradicated. We owe a very great debt of gratitude to the degree of co-operation that existed between the federal government and the provinces of Canada at the time the programme of brucellosis control was introduced, I believe in 1956.

At that time the federal government suggested that if the provinces were to embark on this programme of calfhood vaccination, that they would then undertake blood testing in a few years' time and wipe out those cattle that proved to be reactors to the blood test. The breeders would be compensated for them up to market value. And this undertaking was agreed upon on the understanding that the farmers in the various communities would sign a petition asking for this to be done on a compulsory basis.

I recall very well in our own community that there were many farmers who were beef producers, inasmuch as they were feeders of stocker cattle, and brought into their feed lots, or their feeding areas, western heifer calves—yet they were expected to vaccinate these calves on the compulsory programme. I recall very well having some reservations myself as to just what this would mean as far as our own farm was concerned.

On the other hand, we recognized the very severe losses that had occurred in many areas of the province because of the disease, and what it meant to farmers and to the health of many humans as well. We agreed upon—I think it was generally accepted right across Ontario and I am sure this was the case in other provinces although perhaps not with the same degree of enthusiasm as was indicated in Ontario—that we should embark on this programme. After these years, the disease has virtually been stamped out in that the whole of Ontario is now declared or certified a brucellosis-free area.

Two years ago, we moved an amendment in this House through legislation that removed the compulsory aspects of vaccination for brucellosis control. That being the case, the government continued to pay the costs of the veterinarian, to supply the free vaccine, and to supply, free of charge, the vaccination certificates and the ear tags. Now, after two years, we have come to the place where we feel that there is little need for us to continue this as a livestock health measure or a human health measure, because the disease is sufficiently under control. In fact, it is virtually non-existent.

There is a problem that must be referred to on the other side of the coin in regard to these export cattle; both my hon. friends referred to this matter. I have talked—and I am sure these men are well aware of this—to some exporters of Holstein cattle and other

breeds, who say that they have purchased extremely high quality cattle for export only to have them proved positive in the blood test. And the reason for this is they may have been vaccinated too late so that it carries over into the blood test, proving positive. Well, here is a danger that has not been referred to and I think should be mentioned.

On the other hand, we have to recognize as well that in some countries—for instance those belonging to the European common market—they will not purchase cattle that have been vaccinated and we cannot ship them there. In the United States, there are some states that takes the same attitude, and there are others that demand that their imported cattle be vaccinated.

Mr. Speaker, with great respect to what has been said by my hon. friends, whom I know have a very great knowledge of this matter, it should be recognized that any breeder who wants to sell cattle on the export market should surely be aware enough of the value to him of the vaccination that he would see to it that his cattle were vaccinated. Today we have no authority under legislation to force him to vaccinate his cattle—he is doing it voluntarily now. And the government will continue to provide free vaccine, free certificates and free ear tags. All the farmer will be required to do, other than what he is now doing, is to pay the veterinarian for injecting the animal with the vaccine. This is the principle of the bill, sir.

Mr. J. H. White (London South): Mr. Speaker, I was hoping the rural representative from York South would give us the benefit of his guidance this evening.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): If the hon. gentleman has nothing to say, I wish he would not say it.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

MARKETING OF CATTLE FOR THE PRODUCTION OF BEEF

Hon. Mr. Stewart moves second reading of Bill 35, An Act respecting the marketing of cattle for the production of beef.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Speaker, Bill 35 is, to my mind, one of the worst examples of blank cheque legislation that has ever appeared before this House. Here is a bill, the purpose of which appears nowhere within its confines. What have we got? We have got a section which is a definition section, and it was nice. The Minister at least chooses to define some of the terms. He then goes on to tell us that everyone who sells cattle—no one can sell cattle without a licence—shall be deemed to have a licence, which I think is great progress.

The operating section of this bill, section 4, gives the Lieutenant-Governor in council authority to pass regulations in respect of A to T, and power to pass regulations without again defining what the purpose of this Act is. What are the regulations going to be? For instance 4(r) says: "there can be regulations passed respecting the buying and selling, handling, weighing, measuring, shipping, transporting of cattle and carcasses."

Does that mean we are encouraging buying, that we are fixing selling prices, that handling must be done in a certain way? Is there a health concern? Is there a marketing concern? Is this going to be compulsory on all people who sell cattle? Is it not going to be measuring, weighing, shipping? What has the Minister got in mind?

One cannot help, Mr. Speaker, but come to the conclusion, as you go through the provisions of this Act, that the Minister does not want to tell us what he has in mind. He wants to reserve to himself—because he will be the advisor of the Lieutenant-Governor in council in this respect—the right to make up policy as he goes along. He comes before us and asks this House to give him a complete blank cheque to do whatever he may want to do in this particular field of the sale of beef cattle.

Look at section 6 for example, sir. It deals with inspectors who may be appointed, and again the unusual powers that are given to them. For the purposes of enforcing this Act and the regulations, an inspector, section 6, subsection 3, for the purpose of inspecting a head of cattle or a carcass, may detain it at the risk of the owner; in subsection 2, he may require the production of documents; in subsection 1, without a warrant and without anyone's authority, he can go on any premises used for assembling, holding, slaughtering, storing, processing and grading of cattle.

Surely we are entitled to expect sir that when a Minister comes before us and asks for this kind of unusual power he has a duty and a responsibility to this House and to the people of the province of Ontario and that

the legislation he asks for should be more than a blank cheque.

By contrast, sir, look at Bill 36, which is the Conservation Authorities Act. It is a substantial piece of redrafting. It goes through many sections, and there are powers to pass regulations and so on. But, by the time you come to section 26 and 27 of that Act, to pass regulations, there have been all sorts of previous sections which set out in full detail what the government has in mind, what the objects of The Conservation Authorities Act shall be, and the reasons for which regulations can be passed.

Here, sir, we have what to my mind is a complete negation of all proper legislative precaution and safeguards. The Minister might just as well commend to us and ask for a department of agriculture act which will say nothing more than, for the purposes of this Act, the Minister can do anything he wants in relation to the field of agriculture and can make regulations for 900 different things. Maybe the Minister would be happier in that way. I know it is a bore to have to come into the Legislature and say what you are going to do, what your intention is and why you should have specific authorization to do certain things.

But, sir, it is completely beyond my understanding as to why a Minister should come forward to this House with a bill which is nothing more than a piece of blank cheque legislation. Sign the cheque and let me go out and do whatever I want. That is what the Minister is asking tonight. I may say, sir, it is all the more ludicrous that this bill should come forward in this House at this time, and I have mentioned this before.

We have just received the McRuer report, and surely if the Minister had spent any time at all reading even the third book of the report—where the conclusions are summarized—he would find that this kind of bill flies completely in the face of four recommendations Mr. McRuer makes about the importance of legislative responsibility.

What brought about the McRuer report? Surely the hon. Minister should have learned a lesson. It was the unusual and unwarranted powers that the government asked for in Bill 99 that brought forward that inquiry and that report. To a field that is quite different, not in the administration of law, but in a certain segment of the field of agriculture, the Minister is asking again for a blank cheque.

If this House is prepared to give to the Minister the powers that he is asking for in this Act, without any clear delineation of what the purposes are, and without having them spelled out in the Act, so that there is a limit on the use of the regulatory power, I say sir, we might just as well all go home. Let the Minister bring in his general Act, let him be the dictator, let him pass regulations over which we have no control, let us abandon our legislative responsibility, and let us give him the powers he asks for in this Act.

I say this is a great affront to this Legislature to bring before it an Act such as this one. I would urge upon the Minister, with all the sincerity at my command, that he withdraw it, and if the ideas that he has in his mind, that perhaps he has expressed on first reading—and perhaps he is going to express tonight—are important in his opinion for the welfare of this segment of the agricultural industry, let him come before this House with an Act which says what he wants to do and let him get legislative approval for that purpose. On that basis we can then decide and he can then have the proper responsibility. But to pass this Act in the form that it is in, sir, I say is an affront to the whole parliamentary and democratic purpose.

Mr. M. Makarchuk (Brantford): Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on this particular bill and would like to speak against the bill, but not because there is no need for improvement in beef cattle marketing in Ontario. We need improvement; there have been no changes in that particular field for the last 30 years. But there seems to be a great deal of suspicion developing in the farm field regarding this particular bill.

If you talk to the farmers you find out that they are under the impression that all this bill will do is put a levy of 15 cents and 5 cents on cattle and this will be used to promote the sale of beef cattle. This is the only impression they have of the bill, Mr. Speaker, and it is only after you explain to them that this particular Act empowers the association with the right to make regulations respecting the buying, selling and handling, weighing and so on, that the farmers get worried.

I would like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that the Ontario farmers union has collected up to date more than 2,000 signatures on a petition from farmers in Ontario who are opposed to this particular form of beef cattle marketing. I would like to stress here, Mr. Speaker, that 2,000 farmers is not a small number and I think that we should take the size of this petition into account when we are dealing with this bill. All the petitions are not in and the chances are that this figure

will rise to something like 2,500 to 3,000 names of farmers in Ontario who are opposing this particular bill. There is a certain feeling on the part of some of the farmers that the beef improvement association, under whose particular jurisdiction this association will eventually come, have a feeling that the beef improvement association represents a few farmers, namely the large beef producers. They feel that these particular beef producers have worked at times, and will work in collusion with processors and packers to the detriment of the small farmer.

They are also concerned, Mr. Speaker, because they are not sure just exactly how this bill, or this particular association will apply to dairy farmers, who also sell cattle. About 50 per cent of the cattle sold for beef in Ontario is not necessarily beef cattle, but old dairy cows. There is suspicion, too, in the minds of the farmers that this will open the way for some back-door selling; that this will open the way to kickbacks from processors and producers to certain particular farmers; that this will give an advantage to large producers again to the detriment of the small farmer; that this will be to the detriment of the small dairy man who may have one or two or possibly three or four cows to sell in the period of a year. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that in my view there is a definite need for a beef marketing plan in Ontario. The beef cattle industry is in a state of unrest at the moment, and the big reason for this, of course, is that there really is no organized way of selling beef cattle. I understand, that contact men would be going out and spreading, as the farmer would say, malarky about how they can sell their particular cattle to the producers, and afterwards the farmers find out that they have been taken.

The OFU petition stresses the idea, of trying to organize a compulsory beef marketing plan in Ontario, and for this reason, they have been collecting these petitions. They want to bring it to the Minister's mind that there is a need for a beef plan but there is certainly no need for this particular kind of a plan. I would suggest with all respect, Mr. Minister, that this particular bill, Bill 35, be delayed or changed, or modified, so it comes out in some form as a compulsory beef marketing plan similar to the hog marketing plan, making certain changes that will be more suitable for handling of beef cattle.

Mr. Gaunt: Mr. Speaker, I think it is fair to say that the underlying principle of this bill is the self support of the beef improvement association. Presumably when the 10 cent check-off goes into operation the beef improvement association will be in a position to finance its own organization. At the present time I believe it receives a grant of some $20,000 from the government—I think I am right in that—and I think the beef improvement association feels that it would like to be an organization set apart, financed by members within its own grouping. So they have suggested—I believe, 24 of the beef improvement associations voted in favour of this type of check-off—not to support only the organization here in the province but also to pay for a membership in the national oragnization which they propose to enter.

I suppose one could say that this is a commendable objective, that is to say, we stand on our own feet and we support our own programmes and we pay for our own programmes. You know I really feel—I think the comment would be appropriate at this time—that as far as the beef industry is concerned, it is not in a state of unrest, particularly insofar as this bill is concerned. I feel a very strange reaction to it.

The farmers whom I have talked to, by and large, feel that they support this bill in a more or less negative way. They feel that as far as the bill is concerned, it is the lesser of two evils. It is fair to say, Mr. Speaker, that the beef producers in this province are the last of the truly free enterprisers. They do not want to have anything to do with compulsion. They do not want to be regimented in any way, shape or form and they have suggested that this is a lesser of two evils in that there is no compulsion attached to it. They are not really in favour of it but if they have to take something, they will take this over and above a compulsory type marketing plan.

I am not landing on one side or the other. As far as I am concerned I am just stating to you, sir, a reflection of the impressions that I have had from the producers themselves. Beef marketing in the province of Ontario is a bit of a hodge-podge, I think that is an accurate statement. Notwithstanding that, the price received for beef cattle in Ontario and in Canada is the highest in the world. Perhaps there are other factors which enter into that, and supply and demand, of course, is a big one. Nonetheless, the marketing of beef cattle in the province of Ontario is a very complex problem.

Basically, there are three ways in which beef cattle are marketed. They are marketed

through the community sales; they are marketed through the Toronto public stock yards; and they are marketed in treaty transactions between the individual beef producer and the plant. So that, some sales go directly to the plant, some sales come to the Toronto public stock yards and other sales are transacted through the community sales.

The beef industry, economically, is a big one in the province of Ontario. I cannot over-emphasize its importance to the economy —to the agricultural economy. We have some 400,000 beef cows in the province of Ontario. Beef sales in 1967 represented some $250 million in the Province of Ontario, and so it is a very important industry in terms of dollars and cents.

As I said previously, the beef producers generally are the last of the truly free enterprisers. I believe that 20 to 25 per cent of the cattle sold in the province—beef cattle—are negotiated on a direct farm to plant basis. Many have said that this is a very confusing situation because when the prices are quoted at the Toronto public stock yards, the prices quoted are not a true reflection of the market conditions—because of the 20 to 25 per cent of the cattle which are not going through the normal channels, which result in the prices being quoted.

This is quite true, but on the other hand, the old forces of supply and demand do reflect, to a certain extent, on the Toronto public stock yard prices, so that this is not as great a problem as may appear on the surface.

Nonetheless, there have been a great many problems associated with the marketing of beef cattle in the province of Ontario. Quite frankly, I think this bill goes some distance in correcting many of those ills which have plagued the industry for many years. It has set out, as my colleague has said, in very thin detail, some of the things which we would have liked to have had in greater detail. But, nonetheless, it does deal with price reporting, which I think is quite important. After all, it is only reasonable to facilitate any means of communication whereby farmers in this province might know, on an accurate basis, what beef cattle are selling for on any given day in the province.

And, I think anything that is done that is helpful in this regard is to be encouraged, and so I think that that particular feature of the bill is a good one. I also think the uniformed dressing and defatting procedures are worthwhile.

There has been what might be termed, a very loose arrangement in respect to the uniformed dressing and defatting procedures in the province. Some plants, when cattle are sold on the dressed weight basis, take two, three or even four per cent shrink. There is no uniformity and I think that uniformity in this regard is to be desired.

Insofar as defatting is concerned, here again, some plants do a lot of it if they are very heavy on the knife, and other plants are not quite so heavy. I think there needs to be some guidelines and some type of uniformity in respect to these things.

Also weighing; I thing that weighing is a very important matter. I think that it should be supervised and I think that this bill enunciates that principle that inspectors will supervise the weighing, presumably done on scales which are periodically inspected for their accuracy.

But I have just briefly reviewed some of these areas where there has been a need for some type of action, and I think that the bill does not deal with those areas.

Now, as far as the check-off is concerned, the beef improvement association has asked for this. It has said that it wants it. I am not so sure that it is an absolutely true reflection of how the ordinary beef producer feels —I have some doubts about that, Mr. Speaker, and in that connection I would have thought the more democratic way, insofar as the check-off is concerned, would be to put it to a vote of the beef producers. In this way, we would have had an accurate expression of opinion and we could have moved ahead if the vote so indicated.

But, I am not so sure. I really do not know. There is no way of knowing accurately, I suppose, whether, in fact, the beef improvement association does represent the small beef farmer who, perhaps, only ships 20 steers a year. I suppose there is no way of knowing that really other than to put it to a vote. In any case, having said what I have said in respect to the various procedures, I think my colleague from Downsview set out how we feel in respect to the drafting of the bill, and to the principle that the bill is very skeletal in nature to say the least.

Surely, if the Minister and the government —when it comes in with a bill, the government obviously has a course of action in mind. That being so, the principles that are going to govern the power—and I think my colleague from Downsview stated this yesterday that is being asked for, should be set out in the bill.

Now here in this bill, the Minister is asking to do something he wishes, under the guise of passing it by regulations through the Lieutenant-Governor in council. Surely, we could have some detail.

I realize that the regulations are, perhaps, somewhat difficult to set out in precision. I think the defatting procedures, for instance, are very complexed and very detailed, and I certainly would not expect the Minister to set them out in precise and accurate detail in the bill, and I suppose the same can be said for the uniform dressing procedures.

They are involved, no doubt, and perhaps it would be very laborious to set them out in exact detail in the bill. However, I feel, and I am sure my colleagues feel, that the Minister really has not given us much to work with here. We feel there should have been a vote of the farmers in respect of the check-off, and for those reasons, I tell you, Mr. Speaker, that we are going to to have to vote against the bill.

Mr. E. A. Winkler (Grey South): Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words in regard to this bill, and I appreciate the statement by the hon. member for Huron-Bruce when he says that this is the last area of free enterprise in that particular part of the agricultural industry. I also wish to join with him to say that there are fears being expressed in certain areas and I think probably for good reason.

Today, the agricultural industry is in a depressed state and I think that the area of support for the farmers in the province of Ontario is not looked at closely by our counterparts in Ottawa. Consequently, I feel that there is a need for this kind of a bill.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): You should have stayed there.

Mr. Winkler: Is the hon. member speaking to me?

Mr. Sargent: You heard me.

Mr. Winkler: But I told you before I am here with the same mandate that you are.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The members will please recall that they will address each other through the Speaker.

Mr. Winkler: Yes, Mr. Speaker, and I agree. I regret that I am following the same course as my hon. friend who made the remark.

Mr. MacDonald: You followed rather instinctively.

Mr. Winkler: Mr. Speaker, agriculture is becoming a very regional thing, as many other things are becoming in this country, and I suggest to you that the federal government is dealing with agriculture now on a very regional basis. This is one of the reasons why I believe such a bill of protection is necessary for the beef producers of the province of Ontario.

We know that there are going to be tremendous areas of competition once the borders are freer in regard to the sale of beef than they have been in the past, and I am sure with the situation as it is developing in western Canada, where the farmers are recognized as grain producers, they will once again, as they did previously enter into a situation where they are either finishing beef or they are involved in the finishing of beef.

When this beef begins to move into our market, the farmers of Ontario will be in very, very poor shape, because they will not be able to meet that competition if such regulations are not in effect. Now, in the area where there is some suspicion—and my hon. friend from Brantford over there, Mr. Speaker, made it quite clear that the Ontario farmers union are concerned, and that petitions are being drawn up. I know of this question; it has been referred to me before. There is a fear, of course, that the Minister is taking some dictatorial attitude in the matter, or wants to take a dictatorial position, and I am sure that the Minister will clarify this, because I do not think there are too many members on the other side that will accuse the Minister of Agriculture and Food of taking this attitude, and I believe also, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. MacDonald: Ask the bean growers.

Mr. Winkler: And I also believe that when the Minister takes the floor, he might tell us, if the farm beef producers of Ontario want their own marketing board, what his attitude is in that regard. But the fact of the matter is that these associations for the benefit of these producers would not have existed had The Department of Agriculture not come to the financial assistance of their organization and supported them with the amount of money I believe that the hon. member for Huron-Bruce has made a reference to.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that in the future, this sort of protection, as I have said, for the agricultural industry, is going to be necessary and I believe that the fears of the members that have spoken thus far will be

allayed when they hear the Minister's explanation of what the purpose of this particular bill is. I know very well that it will only accrue to the benefit of those people in the beef producing business.

I was not aware that this bill was coming up, but as late as this afternoon I had a member from my constituency here and I was concerned about this bill. I know he is a beef producer and I also know he is a supporter of the Liberal Party. As a matter of fact, he was my opponent in the last election campaign and he wholeheartedly supports this legislation. So I would ask my friends over there to be a little careful.

And I do not say that—it was no trick or plan, because I did not know the bill would be in the House tonight, but I ask my hon. friends to be very careful of the position that they are taking in regard to the beef producers of the province of Ontario, and I am sure too that the members of the OFU will be a little more satisfied once they hear the answers to the questions that have been put forward tonight.

It is a queer thing to hear one of them speak in favour of the bill, and the other one dead against it. I want to see them examine it objectively when the time comes and support it.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Sargent: Well Mr. Speaker, in opposing this Beef Cattle Marketing Act, I may say I am not an expert.

Mr. Winkler: How many have you fed?

Mr. Sargent: An expert is a fellow who is a long way from home. Or another definition is a big drip under pressure. But for once I agree with my friend from Grey South, that agriculture is in trouble. In fact I have been told, Mr. Speaker, that it is in the worst situation agriculture has been in since the 1930's and I do not think that this bill should have gone first of all to the agriculture committee for its analysis. In fact I do not see how the Minister can bring this bill into the House without its endorsation.

Second we have been told there are great things happening to agriculture and that the Minister is doing a $500,000 farm income study so I would suggest again that this is premature because what this does, Mr. Speaker, is put into the hopper another control of the lives of our people, another commission not responsible to the people. We have about 100 boards like that now in this area.

As the member for Downsview has said, the powers of the Lieutenant-Governor may appoint inspectors and fix all their fees, their remunerations, the powers of inspectors, the government control. Now, the future of agriculture does not lie in the political field. It is strictly an economic thing from here in and the farmers are a diminishing part of our economy, representing a progressively smaller percentage of the voting strength of this province. But may I say, Mr. Speaker, that politicians do not act, they re-act and eight per cent of the voting public now are agricultural but agriculture produces 100 per cent of the food.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sargent: This is a speech of the Minister's. He said this.

Mr. Speaker, the basic need today of agriculture is a price tag. Everything the farmer goes to buy has a price tag on it. Everything he buys he has to pay what the union, the economy says he will pay, but basically, the processing industry is well organized, and today it takes a good steer to bring 20 cents a pound. And these prices are lower than they were 20 years ago. What we need today is not an Act like this. We need credit from the government to enable the producers to build their own processing plants. Mr. Speaker, as far as I am concerned, the farmers I have talked to feel that this Act is going to give too much power to the government, another commission not responsible to the people. I oppose it.

Mr. W. Newman (Ontario South): Mr. Speaker, after hearing all the agricultural experts on this particular field, I would just like to point out a few facts and figures; a few things about the bill that is presented to us here tonight.

Mr. MacDonald: Are these going to be quotes from Bell's annual report?

Mr. W. Newman: If you want it, I have it! Mr. Speaker, I have a few facts and figures here tonight. The speaker before me, from Grey South, just finished saying "it gives the government too much power." Quite obviously he has not read the Act. The Act puts the power in hands of the retail beef improvement association, an association which was formed as a result of an association that used to exist several years ago; this association has built a lot farmers, farmers who are interested in the beef business, brought them into the realm of this association, made them aware

of the problems we are faced with in the beef industry, and that is why this Act is before you tonight—because it does offer something to the farmers of Ontario, and as a beef producer, and the hon. member for Downsview—

Mr. N. L. Olde (Middlesex South): He is a farmer.

Mr. W. Newman: Let me say this, Mr. Speaker.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Speaker, let us keep this non-political. This Act does not say the farmers have to do it; it gives them a choice, a free choice which we are losing in many of our places today. The farmers in the beef industry still have a choice.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. W. Newman: No, Mr. Speaker. It is quite obvious that he has never seen a cow.

Mr. Speaker, this bill does give us a choice. Now we have three way of marketing beef cattle today. For those urban friends of mine across the way, Mr. Speaker, I would like to explain the three ways there are to sell beef cattle today. One is on the open stock yards by public auction; one is direct to the packers; the other is on a rail-grade basis—that is, on a graduate basis.

Mr. Speaker, talking about our free enterprise system, and being a producer of beef cattle, I strongly support it because the farmers do not have to take it. They can write in and they can have this on a check-off basis. It puts them on a self-supporting basis.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. W. Newman: The option is there.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. W. Newman: Mr. Speaker, if you will wait, I am sure the Minister of Agriculture and Food will point out where you have the option.

Some hon. members: Where, where?

Mr. Speaker: Order! When the Speaker rises, I keep telling the member for Grey-Bruce, all members will resume their seats. Now the member for Grey-Bruce has a point of order. He will state his point of order.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Ontario South, the Bell Telephone stock operator, says that there is an option here, an "out" for the farmer. Where is the option? Will he read it to us?

Mr. Speaker: That is not a point of order. The member for Ontario South has the floor.

Mr. W. Newman: Mr. Speaker, may I refer to Bill, 35, under section 4, subsection (g) providing for the refund by an association of any licence fees paid to it, and prescribing the terms and conditions under which such refund shall be granted.

An hon. member. How about that?

Mr. W. Newman: Mr. Speaker, may I go on from here?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. W. Newman: Mr. Speaker, if they would read the bill carefully, they would understand that a farmer has a right under this bill; if he wises to withdraw from this plan, he has the right to do so.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): Where, where?

Mr. W. Newman: I just finished reading it, Mr. Speaker, under section 4(g).

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. W. Newman: All right, Mr. Speaker, we are talking about a pretty serious situation. We are talking about people who have problems—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. W. Newman: —and they sit over there and tell us about all the problems; they do not know anything about it. I happen to be in the agricultural business—

An hon. member: A lot to laugh at!

Mr. W. Newman: Mr. Speaker, I ask you this. The OFU wants a compulsory marketing plan. Where is it? They know we have been talking about this for two years. They have not got a good plan and this is a plan that is offered by the beef producers of Ontario. So if you want a compulsory plan, you are going to vote against this.

Mr. Speaker, I say this—how many beef cattle are marketed in Ontario as compared to what are marketed in North America with the free exchange of beef back and forth. Now tell me—not one of them can tell me. But I can tell you, Mr. Speaker—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. W. Newman: I can tell you, Mr. Speaker. Here in the province of Ontario, we market between two and three per cent of the beef cattle in North America, and you want a compulsory plan. How is it going to work when you only handle two to three per cent of the beef cattle in North America. Now tell me that?

Mr. Speaker, I have figures that will tell the marketings not only here in Ontario, but in Canada and North America. And, Mr. Speaker, as a beef producer, I am interested in the well-being of the beef producers and what they can do. The Ontario beef improvement association system since it has been inaugurated has done a great deal for us. They get a grant now from The Department of Agriculture of $20,000 a year. They want to be self-supporting.

This plan, providing not too many farmers pull out of it, and I do not think they will, will produce for them approximately between $100,000 and $120,000 a year. And you say what are they going to do with this money?

They are going to make sure that we, as beef producers, when we sell our cattle, and when it is hung up on the rail—and in case some of the hon. members from the socialist party over there do not know, when they are hung up on the rail, they are hung up by steel hooks and weights—we are going to make sure through this beef improvement association that the farmers' cattle are weighed properly, and we are going to keep an eye out to make sure that the farmers get every cent they are entitled to for their beef from this association.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to suggest to some of the hon. members across the way that the goals of the Ontario retail beef association marketing committee are already laid out. I say this, and I say this to you in all sincerity, we know that we have a problem and the member for Grey South has said so, though he was wrong that you would have trouble. He said that you could not get 40 cents per pound on the hoof for a good beef in Toronto now.

It is quite obvious that he is in some business other than the beef business, because I shipped a load of cattle yesterday and I got 46.5 cents per pound for them. It just bothers me that we as Parliamentarians, representing the people of Ontario, can stand up as individuals and make statements—and I have sat here for five weeks and listened to it—we stand up and we make irresponsible statements that we do not know what we are talking about.

Let us face facts. Mr. Speaker, I do not know which side was clapping for who there, but it does not matter; we have a problem in the agricultural business, and it is not a funny problem. The beef improvement association has come along and they have offered to do something about it. They come out with concrete ideas, and concrete purposes, and they are all there for you to see in black and white.

A compulsory marketing plan will not work when you only handle two or three per cent of the beef cattle in the North American continent. You know it, Mr. Speaker, and the hon. leader of the Opposition knows it—he is in the dairy business but his cattle go to market too. We all realize the situation.

In standing up to speak to this bill, I think that it is a good bill, and I think that it is a step forward.

Mr. Sargent: Where is the option?

Mr. W. Newman: Mr. Speaker, I am not saying that this bill is perfect, nobody is perfect.

Mr. Sargent: It sure is not.

An hon. member: He is weakening now.

Mr. W. Newman: No, I am not weakening, I am telling the truth. I am telling the truth for once and it is nice of the hon. members to listen to it.

We have a problem, we have to solve it, we have a bill, we have got to pass it in order to get this moving along so that we can improve the beef improvement association here in Ontario. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that we quit playing games about taunting people who may or may not have the qualifications. Some people can be in the game all their lives, and know very little about it. As a matter of fact after listening to the last speaker, I think he has proved the point. Now Mr. Speaker—

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): If there is anyone in my department who is not good enough, he will have to go.

Mr. MacDonald: Perhaps.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: No "perhaps" about it.

Mr. MacDonald: I was interested in listening to the hon. member for Grey South when he cautioned the hon. members in the official

Opposition about the position they are taking. He is a fairly experienced, though not always accomplished politician, and I was even more impressed with the careful position that he took. Because on the one hand, he conceded that agriculture faced difficulty—and that is common knowledge—secondly he conceded that there are a lot of beef producers who have worries about this bill. But knowledgeable and accomplished politician that he is he did not deal with the worries, he said that he was sure that they would be satisfied when they are answered by the Minister.

Mr. Winkler: And I am.

Mr. MacDonald: So that when he goes home—and many farmers are not going to be satisfied with the Minister, because they are opposed to this legislation—then he will be able to play both ends against the middle. It is a neat piece of stick handling—if I may borrow the phrase.

As for the hon. member for Ontario South, there was a lot of wind and fury, but frankly I do not know what he did by way of explaining the bill. There was nothing except that he is apparently one of the flaming free-enterprisers, a doctrinaire free-enterpriser. He thinks that it is a good thing, and he wants us to take a step forward, but what is the step forward? But what is the step forward, Mr. Speaker? As has been pointed out by a number of speakers that have already contributed to this debate there is a growing recognition of the fact that something has got to be done in the beef marketing field. We have got to have some marketing legislation. But this is not marketing legislation. It is not. And let us not try to kid the farmers that it is. It is not a step forward. It reminds me of the little game that the children play. You know the one—a baby step, a big step, after you have said please. This is very much a baby step.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): The member is away out of his territory.

Mr. MacDonald: The explanatory note, Mr. Speaker, is that this bill provides for the "collection and establishment of licence fees respecting the marketing of beef, and the standardization of procedures respecting such marketing." Now, as the hon. member for Huron-Bruce says it is going to bring a bit of order out of the infinite chaos of procedures, and that presumably is the step, the baby step forward but it is no marketing scheme at all. That is the reason why you have such a deep sense of fear and doubt among many of the farmers—not the hon. member from Grey South necessarily, you are a good Tory and you will go along with the flock because the whip has been cracked.

What I am saying is that there is even among your own farmers up in Grey South, an overwhelming—

Mr. Speaker: May I call to the member's attention that he persists in addressing the other members on the other side of the House direct, and he will do it please through the Speaker.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, do we both know something about agricultural and beef marketing? Can we talk among ourselves and forget the rest of them?

Mr. Speaker: Yes, I come from an agricultural area.

Mr. MacDonald: I am ex-journalist and you an ex-lawyer. We will talk about farming and the others can sit it out.

The basic point that I want to make, and I shall not speak at great length, is why I am going to oppose this bill, and let us take a vote and see where people stand on it.

Mr. Winkler: No vote here.

Mr. MacDonald: Oh, yes there will be a vote, make no mistake about it. The members will have to speak up. Mr. Speaker, there is a fear with regard to the purpose of this bill. It is a fear which has been engendered by the situation up to now, and which is going to be strengthened by the new situation that this bill is creating. What you have had for years is a beef marketing association, financed by this government to the extent of $20,000—I am sorry, a beef improvement association, financed by this government to the extent of $20,000 per year. A lot of suspicion in the minds of farmers has been aroused that this beef improvement association is made up of the aristocrats of beef producing who have been using some of that money—how much, I do not know or pretend to know—to conduct a campaign against a marketing scheme.

So, somebody made the comment here—the hon. member for Huron-Bruce—that "they had to take something." I think upon careful reflection that it is not a case of "having to take something," they were not going to take anything, and they were able to enter into a cosy arrangement with the government, a nice little paternalistic arrangement in which

this government with its typical paternalism is willing to play ball with them and their characteristic paternalism to impose a decision upon the beef producers when it has no idea whether the beef producers want this new arrangement.

The government is going to give them the right to collect from the farmers certain amounts of money. In fact I would be interested for the Minister when he speaks of the check-off, and the amount of money which it represents, I would like the Minister to explain to the House: Does the $20,000 continue to go to the beef improvement association or does the check-off replace it so that we will have an idea of how much money this organization is going to have to deal with the routine regularization of sales, of getting a bit of order out of the chaos, and the promotion of the industry? But no marketing at all.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in the minds of those farmers who think that they are getting a marketing plan, this is a fraud—little short of being a fraud. It is fastening on the producers a new kind of organiaztion without any effort to find out if this is what the producers want. If it were a marketing plan you would have a vote, and you would get some kind of indication of how the producers feel. It is rather significant that this government is not going to hold a vote, they are just going to have this cosy arrangement with those who have dominated the industry up until now through the beef improvement association. It is for these reasons, Mr. Speaker, that we will oppose this bill.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, the member for Grey South in his comments a few moments ago said that he had detected fears among his constituents about the intention of this particular bill and that he felt that when the Minister had an opportunity to explain it these fears would be allayed. Now, as far as he is concerned he may be satisfied but our main objection to the bill is that it requires the explanation of the Minister himself and perhaps a representative of the beef improvement aassociation to make it clear what the bill does intend, because it is not in the bill.

This is what we are here for—to write legislation and approve legislation which will direct the government in their activities in this regard, not the other way round. The bill has many areas in which the Minister may do this or representatives are given certain authorities to do other things. As a matter of fact if these regulations are written as they are permitted here, the Minister, or whomever he designates, will have an iron-clad control of the industry from top to bottom, on price and all other aspects.

This is surely not what we are concerned with tonight, in this bill. All these things may be done. The Minister is going to assure us, perhaps, that as long as he is Minister, or his successors are Ministers, there will not be anything done that is not in the best interests of the farmers. Well, I would hope so. But it is our job to see that there is no legislation on the books of this province that would permit any of these activities that are not in the best interest of the farmers.

Other speakers have pointed out very clearly that the draft of the bill is inadequate; the aim of the bill is not made clear.

All of us here want legislation that will improve the marketing of beef cattle, and will accrue to the greater profits of those in the business who surely need every assistance that we in this House can give to them. The bill before us is entirely inadequate. Normally, in agricultural legislation, it is enough to put our views on record and we felt the last bill—the brucellosis bill—was probably poor judgment on your part, but in this particular bill, the drawing of the bill has been of such a nature that it puts in the hands of this Minister, tremendous powers which he says he is not prepared to use at this time, but which he may use.

We have general legislation having to do with farm marketing, that particular bill might have been amended to give the sort of assistance that the beef producers would require, without the compulsory aspects that are there in some of its other sections. The bill, therefore, is inadequate. We will not only vote against it, but we intend to divide the House in this regard.

Mr. Speaker: Order! The member for Halton East.

Mr. J. W. Snow (Halton East): Mr. Speaker, if I may enter into this debate in support of this bill and, being a former director of the Ontario beef improvement association, I may be able to clear up some of the points that have been so bandied around here tonight.

Mr. Sargent: This will be a snow job.

Mr. Snow: It sure will be a snow job. Mr. Speaker, I will try not to get as emotional as the last few speakers have got. One of the purposes of this bill that I see is to provide for a reasonable check-off of 5 cents to 15 cents a head on the sale of livestock to pro-

duce funds for the operation of the Ontario beef improvement association.

It has been said tonight and I believe it to be estimated at $100,000 to $125,000 a year. This is a very small amount of money—a very minute percentage considering the volume of dollars that is handled in the Ontario beef industry today. This money is used. As has already been said, the province assisted the beef improvement association to be formed a few years ago and has assisted it to operate since that time—but the $20,000 that has been supplied, I believe it is, is not sufficient to operate the programme, but it has been wisely spent by the association.

Many programmes have been carried on at the provincial level, and at the county level, to bring to the consumer a story on quality beef, marketing or beef advertising. Also, projects have been carried out in research; some of the areas have carried out test projects with different feeds on cattle; different warble fly control projects, and so on. This has all been carried out by the beef improvement association. The association is trying to improve the marketing, the image of beef to the consumer in competition with other foods, as well as to improve the quality and the way that the cattle are grown.

I am not going to get into a battle of words about the bill itself. I will leave that to the legal lights which are so prominent here in the House, but I do believe that there is in the legislation—it is certainly my understanding, as I say I am not going to get into a battle of words—that the farmer, if he so wishes, can opt out of this plan and can advise the association that he does not want to participate. He can be deleted from having the check-off taken from the sale of his cattle.

I believe that the standardization of the weighing and marketing; the inspection; the control of the shrink that is taken off the dressed carcasses for those who sell on the rail grade; the way the cattle are weighed—whether they are weighed with steel hooks and steel cross bars or whether they are weighed with aluminum—all makes a difference of quite a few cents on the price of a carcass. If this can be standardized, it will not only be fairer to the packer but it will be a lot fairer to the farmer.

The suggestion made by the hon. member for Brantford that this will bring about collusion and kick-backs to farmers from the packers, I think, is unrealistic and unfounded. A compulsory beef marketing plan such as has been mentioned by the hon. member for Yorkview another remark that was made here—which should be similar to the hog producers' plan—this is certainly not necessary, and is not wanted by the beef farmer. If it was brought in, it would never work anyway for one good reason, as mentioned by the hon. member for Ontario South: that with the small percentage of the beef that is produced in Ontario, compared to the North American market which is a wide open market, we just could not attempt to regulate the marketing of beef here. Beef is an import-export market; it moves rather freely back and forward across the border depending on the price in Chicago, or the price in Toronto, and the exchange rate on the money.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): It still could move under a proper marketing board in that department.

Mr. Snow: The hon. member makes an interjection here, I would like to cite the broiler marketing plan in Ontario—they have a broiler marketing plan and there has been some improvement. But as soon as you get the control of the production of broilers in Ontario—what happens? They start shipping them in from Quebec or from Manitoba, or from the United States.

Mr. Young: We need a national plan.

Mr. Snow: We do, sir, we need a national plan. Sorry, to you, Mr. Speaker, we need a national agricultural plan. I said, in my remarks in the Throne debate a little over a week ago, that the provinces cannot handle the agricultural problems themselves and a national plan is certainly needed. Our beef industry, I must agree, is growing. It is an important industry in Ontario in the cow-calf operations in the north, and in the feed lots in the corn belt of the south.

We are competing now a great deal more against western beef coming in in the dressed-carcass form where the cattle are fed in the west. Usually they have to be shipped down here live but now they are shipped down dressed, which is making the market more competitive here in Ontario. I believe that the beef improvement association broadly represents the beef producers in Ontario whether they be large or small.

There are beef improvement associations in practically every county in Ontario and every farmer, for usually a dollar, has the opportunity to belong to the county association. They elect their Ontario director and they have their voice in this association and the association is well able and willing to represent the beef producers of Ontario. With this

legislation, they will have the funds to do it. They have no intention of introducing a compulsory marketing plan.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my support to this bill.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, as a farmer from High Park, I would like to ask a question of the Minister. We have now had two members on the government side explain to this House that any farmer who so wishes may opt out.

I would like the Minister, in his concluding remarks, to explain to us where, under the bill, they have such rights.

Mr. Speaker: I am sure the Minister when he sums up, at the end of the debate, will answer all the questions which have been raised.

The member for Kingston and the Islands has the floor.

Mr. S. Apps (Kingston and the Islands): Mr. Speaker, unlike some of the members who have spoken on this particular bill, I do not pretend to be an expert on the raising and selling of beef. However, I might qualify as well as some of them who have spoken here this evening.

I would just like to go through this bill and take a look at it from the point of view of someone, who, although not an expert, did try to sell 40 calves this fall, and give you my opinion what I think this bill does.

The first part of it, in section 4, indicates to me that I am going to get five cents a head for cattle weighing less than 500 lbs.—young calves, of course.

Sections G and H would indicate to me that somewhere along the line there will be regulations saying that if I do not want to belong to this I do not have to. This is how it appears to me, anyway.

Subsection 1 to the balance of section 4 tells me that there is going to be someone who will inspect and weigh and measure the cattle and the carcasses. There are going to be regulations with respect to buying, selling, handling, weighing, measuring, shipping, transportation of cattle and carcasses; all those sections indicate to me that at least I, as a small producer, am going to have some protection when I go to sell my cattle or my calves and these things are being set out so that I can feel that I am going to be properly dealt with when I try to sell those things.

Now, maybe I am wrong, but this is what it appears to me to be. Granted when I sold the 40 calves the farmer who helped me raise them was a very competent person and I think he did a good job. Regardless, I do not think I got as much as I would have liked to have received for them and I do not know whether I was protected along the same lines as it would indicate that if this bill is passed I would be protected. So, as far as the small beef producers are concerned—

Mr. Sargent: In what way would you be protected?

Mr. Apps: Do you want me to read them for you? I will be glad to read them for you if you like.

Mr. Speaker: Order. Will the members please remember that they address each other through the chair.

Mr. Apps: Mr. Speaker, it indicates to me that section 4, subsection 1, right through to the end are all subsections giving me assurance that I am going to be treated fairly when I sell my cattle regardless whether I know nothing about it—

Mr. Young: That is right.

Mr. Apps: At least there is going to be someone around there who will be on my side and make sure that I get a good deal or a decent deal when I am selling my cattle. That is how it appears to me and I would like to say I am not an expert but I am telling you this. I look at this as protection for the small farmer, protection for the small beef producer, that he is going to get a fair deal when he goes and tries to sell his cattle. I am going to support this bill not because I am a Conservative, not because I am a member of the government, but because I happen to be a small beef producer and I am happy—

Mr. Nixon: There are other sources of income.

Mr. Apps: And I am happy to be able to stand up and be counted as a supporter of this bill.

Mr. MacDonald: I tell you, the Leafs need that kind of stick handling.

Mr. Speaker: The member for—

Mr. Apps: Maybe, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for York South might come down and he might help me in my beef producing business and probably after he has been there

for a year he might be very happy to have some of the protections that are indicated we are going to have in this particular bill.

Mr. MacDonald: I would be glad to assist the hon. member. We little beef producers must stick together.

Mr. L. C. Henderson (Lambton): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me tonight to have the opportunity to rise to speak on this particular bill. It is very interesting to me to hear the number of professional farmers in our opposition—

Mr. Sargent: What is your occupation?

Mr. Henderson: Well I, as a member for Lambton, try to serve the people of Lambton as they want to be served.

Now, this bill has received quite a bit of criticism from the Opposition and the NDP. I do have a great number of beef producers within the area for which I am the member, and as yet, there has not been one of these beef producers, Mr. Speaker, who has come to me and felt that this bill should not be enacted. But I might say that I have had several farmers come to me and ask that this bill be part of our legislation this year.

I have had Mr. Lawrence Markeuse—who is one of the top beef producers in the province of Ontario, who resides within the riding that I represent, who has phoned me, as late as last Sunday, and suggested that he will be very happy to come to this building any day of the week on three hours' notice in support of this bill. This bill to me is not only a bill regarding the marketing of beef but it is a bill in protection of the farmer. I have had the pleasure of selling cattle on the hoof. I have sold them dressed weight and I have bought them on the hoof. When you sell the cattle on the hoof we all know that we are at the mercy of the buyer and, of course, you are at the mercy of the scarcity of beef—

Mr. Sargent: Canada Packers.

Mr. Henderson: I would not suggest the packers because anybody can sell their cattle any place they wish in the province of Ontario and they do not necessarily have to sell them to the packers. I have sold as many cattle elsewhere as I have to the packers and I produce stock cattle beef myself. However, this bill does give the Lieutenant-Governor in council the opportunity of passing regulations regarding the dressed weight of cattle.

I might say, in selling cattle as dressed weight, there are several different dockages. Some packers will extract three per cent or more on dressed weight. There are other methods. The ordinary farmer who is not ordinarily in the habit of selling his cattle dressed weight just sells them dressed weight —he does not know what the percentage of dockage is, he does not know he gives the liver, he does not know he gives the heart and the tongue free and gratis. When he receives 50, 48 or 42 cents a pound dressed weight he does not realize that these other additions are going free of charge. This bill, I believe, does give the Lieutenant-Governor in council, as I read the bill, the authority to make the necessary regulations so that all the farmers throughout the province will realize what the dockage will be.

Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me, as the provincial member for the riding of Lambton, one of the greater producing beef areas in Ontario, to support this bill.

Mr. D. M. De Monte (Dovercourt): Mr. Speaker, as a farmer from the riding of Dovercourt I notice that in examining sections 3 and 4 in principle, the sole discretion in this bill exists with the Minister and that when my friends across he floor refer to the fact that there is an option or that there is a freedom of choice, I submit, Mr. Speaker, that there is no freedom of choice because section 3 specifically says the Lieutenant-Governor in council may make regulations. It does not say that the Lieutenant-Governor in council must make regulations in relation to whatever follows.

So I submit, Mr. Speaker, that this bill is, in a sense, another compulsion at the discretion of somebody sitting in the Cabinet and I think that it is high time, in view of the McRuer report, Mr. Speaker, that we prevent or try to stop this type of legislation, and for this reason I would like to register my opposition to the bill.

Mr. O. F. Villeneuve (Glengarry): Mr. Speaker, I take great pleasure in supporting this bill because I think it is a good step for the beef producers of this province, because as my friend has said, dockage when you sell cattle, rail grade—I know a little bit about it because I was a drover for 30 years and a man can innocently sell cattle and not know what is happening, because there is going to be three pounds of shrinkage between hot weight, when the carcass weighs more, and when it is cooled. Are you going to get paid for the liver, the tongue, the heart? There must be standards.

The man who is in the business, and makes a success of it, knows all these items have to be considered.

Mr. MacDonald: Nobody has ever denied that.

Mr. Villeneuve: And, if you do not have standards that are going to protect the small man the same way as the other fellow—do not worry about the packers; they have experts. They know to take all these advantages and this is good legislation. It is in the interest—

Mr. MacDonald: That is the "baby step" forward.

Mr. Villeneuve: —of the producers. We are governed by supply and demand. We are running now at a very close margin of profit for the producer and this is legislation in his own interests; the people who confuse the legal technicalities with what is commonsense and need to the producer do not know what they are talking about.

Mr. D. Jackson (Timiskaming): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Downsview stated that he thought they were giving a blank cheque. Well I can feel the dollar bills, and many of them under the table.

Mr. White: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. First of all, surely that insinuation is completely unacceptable under the rules

I really feel entitled to ask for a ruling on this. The rules very clearly state that no such insinuation can be made about members in this chamber.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Jackson: You are putting it in the Act.

Mr. Speaker: I regret that I do not follow the reasoning of the member for London South.

Mr. Shulman: We all have that trouble.

Mr. Speaker: However, I do think that there have been occasions when there have been some similar matters referred to by way of innuendo, if you wish, or otherwise. I would certainly hope that the members would refrain from that, because eventually it will be quite plain—as it has been in the past and I have taken no action—eventually it will be quite plain that these things are being done and we will then as a House have to either decide that the rules of the House have to be carried out and followed or we will have to change the rules.

So perhaps the member for Timiskaming will proceed with his speech. Rather than have any trouble about it tonight, I will not rule on the matter unless I have to. He might perhaps re-start his address with respect to this particular matter.

Mr. Jackson: I would be glad to, Mr. Speaker. I will withdraw my remarks.

Previously, three speakers referred to the Ontario beef improvement association as the association mentioned in this Act. Nowhere in the Act does it say that this association is going to be the administrating body and unless the Minister actually puts it into the Act, I do not believe that it can be taken for granted that will be the administrating body.

Second, several speakers mentioned the fact that there is no chance to opt out and I think in section 2 it states quite clearly that, except under authority of a licence, no person shall sell cattle and every person who sells cattle shall be deemed to be the holder of a licence. Under that section no one has the authority to opt out.

Again I ask the Minister through your office, Mr. Speaker, that if he intends to permit opting out, it should be clearly spelled out in the Act. It should not be by innuendo, it should be clearly spelled out.

Mr. J. Root (Wellington-Dufferin): Mr. Speaker, I do not want to repeat some of the remarks that have been made by hon. members supporting this bill. I agree with what they have said. I have noticed with great interest that the opposition to the bill is coming from hon. members who have little or no knowledge of the marketing of beef. Prior to my election to this House I spent some 20 years in the market and I am aware that this bill has within it the means of making for a better system of marketing. I also agree that the beef people, producers, as a group are not at this time asking for marketing legislation.

Most of the speakers in the Opposition represent urban ridings and, as I said, they probably are not familiar with their subject. I did think as I listened to the member for Huron-Bruce that he made a very sound contribution when he pointed out that under the free enterprise system for the sale of beef cattle in Ontario, the price is the highest in the world. That is the reason the beef farmer is not anxious to have a marketing scheme when the price has reached the peak. What more can you accomplish? Why go to

the expense of a scheme if you are already getting the highest price in the world? I must say that I was a little disappointed in the concluding remarks of the hon. member for Huron-Bruce but I realize that his party is not dominated to any extent by rural-minded people—now, perhaps "dominated" is the wrong word and I will withdraw that; I will say that the caucus is controlled not by people representing rural ridings and that is true of the third party.

Mr. Singer: Was your caucus controlled?

Mr. Sopha: You never do a thing without seeking their advice—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Root: Mr. Speaker, I will take those comments in the spirit in which they were made. I do want to say that I realize that the hon. member for Huron-Bruce did point out the feeling of many of the farm people in his area, but when he finally said that he was going to vote against this bill I realized that the caucus had made up their mind, indeed the leader of his party has said they have made up their minds, and we know of 28 members—I think they have about five that have rural backgrounds so I can quite understand his position. I am sure he is probably slightly embarrassed tonight that he will have to vote against this bill if they do force a vote.

Mr. MacDonald: Oh you are a tricky politician—

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

Mr. Root: Mr. Speaker, I will take those interjections in the spirit in which they were given.

I am going to support this bill. I think it is a forward step. I think it is what the beef farmers want and I am sure that the hon. Minister and the Lieutenant-Governor in council when they make regulations are going to provide an opportunity for farmers who do not want to pay the small fee, to opt out.

Mr. Singer: How can you be sure?

Mr. Root: The fact that it has been stated here in the House, and I agree with it, that under the free enterprise system today, beef prices in Ontario are the highest in the world, should convince the House that they should not interfere with the free enterprise system of marketing, and they should not interfere with the right of the beef producers to collect a levy to promote the sale of beef and the regulations regarding weighing and that I am in complete agreement with.

As I said, I spent 20 years on the market; the bulk of the cattle I sold over the open market, some, when the farmers wanted to go direct to the packing plant, were sold on the dressed weight basis. I can see nothing but good in this bill; I think we should pass it and I would hope that the urban members who are perhaps ill-informed of the intent of this bill would change their position and vote unanimously for the principle of the bill.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex Kent): Mr. Speaker, I might say that I did not really intend to speak on this bill, I think it has been well taken care of by our caucus, but I am a little disturbed over the comments of the gentleman who has just spoken and I might say that we do represent a large area of farming in our caucus and I might say myself that the majority of my people are farm people. I talked with a few people with regards to the bill and the only comment really was, "Well, it might not do much good and it might not do much harm." Well, personally, if you cannot pass legislation that is not going to do some good let us not pass any.

Mr. G. Bukator (Niagara Falls): Mr. Speaker, I have a few words to say about this bill because we have been accused on this side of the House of not being farmers. If that were the case and we had to talk about the bills that are presented to us on issues that we are experts on, some of us are not lawyers and we could not talk about law. Others are not farmers and could not talk about farming.

My colleague, the hon. member for Downsview, made an exceptionally good presentation on this bill, he claimed that the bill is not drafted the way it ought to be. Even I as a layman would understand that this man is an expert in this field because he is a lawyer. I only read section 4—and lawyers are supposed to know these things. You, Mr. Speaker, can understand as I can, notwithstanding section 3, the Lieutenant-Governor in council "may" make regulations, and then it goes on in (f) and (fi) telling you what they may charge you in fees but not how much.

I think too, and my friends have said, that unless it is spelled out in detail telling us what the Minister intends, then we ought not to support the bill. It is as simple as that. It does not require a farmer to understand an issue such as we have before us.

I cannot understand why we have to give a *carte blanche*, yes, a blank cheque, which is signed without any detail in it, to any Minister of this government, as much as we think of that Minister. We are here to protect the public and in so doing I am saying to you, Mr. Speaker, that this cannot be supported in this form. This does not require anything more than common sense. The member for Wellington-Dufferin made reference to the fact that we are not farmers. I want to touch on that point again.

Certainly we are not farmers. Certainly we do not understand the problem, but I can assure you, having sat here the years that I have, and many others like me, we are here to do what we believe is right for the people of this province. And this bill does not do for the farmers, in my opinion, as I have heard the debate, what it ought to do, and therefore we cannot support it. It is as simple as that.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Mr. Speaker—

An hon. member: Oh, here we are!

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Lewis: I am prepared to speak off the hoof on this matter, Mr. Speaker, without any equivocation. One of the things which interests me about the principle of this bill, judging from the member for Ontario South, the member for Wellington-Dufferin, the member for Lambton, the member for Halton East, the member for Glengarry, and the member for Kingston, is that the bill was inevitable because this is a government beef producer and that is why the bill is before us in this shape this evening.

It is a highly aristocratic kind of content as has been demonstrated from this side of the House. We accept the fact, Mr. Speaker, that the principle of the bill which is purported by the Minister, has something akin to what we have been advancing in the House before. The members of the Cabinet have frequently complimented this party on the proposal that contributions to a political party should be made on a universal basis, with the opportunity to opt out. It is nice to see that the government has now accepted that principle as part of its legislation in the field of agriculture. We will remind them of it on other occasions.

But I do want to say, Mr. Speaker, as others have said, that any examination of the bill demonstrates that there is no flexibility, there is no basis for an alternative, there is no provision for choice whatsoever and that the Minister, in this bill, is omnipotent and no Minister should be given that right. That is precisely the point we have made on this side of the House—the Opposition has made collectively on this side of the House.

Mr. Speaker, there are, within the bill, clauses which are invidious and pernicious in content; you do not have a clause which says "notwithstanding a section the Lieutenant-Governor may", having spelled out the section which has thus exempted the possibility of some choice. You cannot have a series of sections in a bill, one against the other, one juxtaposed to the other, which, in some, violate the principle of the bill. It is surely within the right of the Opposition to say to the Minister that if he intends to bring in a bill which purports to take a modest step forward in the improvement of beef marketing—albeit not a marketing policy, then at least the drafting of the bill, the substance of the bill—he should give weight to that position.

Otherwise, he violates the position, he gives some force to the fears amongst the farmers that apparently exist and have been alluded to by his supporters as well as members on this side of the House, and he robs the bill of what it might otherwise do. And that is why we will oppose the bill, and why we urge the Minister to accept the logic of the argument and moderate it. That is our position.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to make any observations, but representing an area very close to the part of Ontario that the hon. member for Huron-Bruce represents, I think I would like to make certain brief observations.

I must say that I was impressed with the comments of my running mate, if you like, in Huron county. I thought he expressed the situation, in broad terms, rather well. The main observation I would like to make is that this is not a new bill in the sense that it has not been examined for a long time. It has been under consideration for a very great length of time, long enough, I think, for the beef producing community of this province to be very familiar with its contents.

I am frankly constrained to say, representing an almost typical farm community riding, and I am sure my hon. colleague from Huron-Bruce will recognize that because he is very familiar with the part of Ontario which I

represent, that on the basis of the examination that has been given to this bill over a very protracted period of time, that the preponderant number of beef producers in Ontario support it. Basically I suggest to the House tonight that there is not a very much better reason for a bill, than one in which we can be convinced that the majority of the beef producers are in support of it.

I am not even going to comment on what has been assailed as "imperfections" in the legislation. I do not think that is as important right now, as the premise that I have just referred to, and that is that I believe, and I believe I have some reason to believe, that it has the support of most of the beef producing industry in the province of Ontario.

I am also inclined to suggest to you—and I say this with respect to the hon. member for Huron-Bruce—I rather felt, as I listened to him, that was really what he intended to imply. I do suggest to the leader of the Opposition that possibly, with the few numbers representing what might be called essentially rural ridings, that his caucus might have done well to listen to the recommendations of the hon. member for Huron-Bruce, maybe a little bit more than it is apparent you have done.

When you sit in the House here tonight and listen to comments—from the hon. member for Dovercourt, if you wish—and the hon. member for Downsview, on technicalities in a bill that, frankly, are not too important—

Mr. Nixon: It is a poor bill.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: It is not a poor bill. It is not poor legislation when the majority of the community involved likes it. That makes it good legislation in my opinion and that is all I have to say, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Singer: A blank cheque technicality.

Mr. Sargent: They do not know what is in the bill.

Mr. Nixon: Giving away civil rights.

Mr. Speaker: Is there any other member who wishes to speak before the Minister winds up the debate?

Mr. Olde: I do not want to lead the hon. members of this House to the point that they think I am a beef producer because I am not, but I want to tell the hon. members that I represent one of the finest groups of beef producers in the province of Ontario, the riding of Middlesex South.

I did not intend to speak on this bill but, after hearing members who have no interest in the farmers, get up and tell what they know about farming, it prompted me, as a representative of a great rural area, a great farming area, and a great beef producing area, to voice my support of this bill.

As I mentioned before, Middlesex county produces some of the finest beef in the province of Ontario, and many of these producers have got in touch with me and told me to support this bill. That is the reason I have given the government tonight my full support on this bill.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, I have listened with a very great deal of interest to the discussion tonight. As I listened to the points that were well made, I would compliment members, particularly the hon. member for Huron-Bruce, because I think he exemplified a very complete knowledge of this bill and what it does and the thinking of the farm people—no question about that.

I would like to say this. As I sat here tonight listening to this debate, my mind went back a great many years—far longer than I can recollect. I am the fifth generation of beef producers of my name in our own township yet I recall, very well, beef producers throughout the years when I was associated with farm organization wanting to have some type of an organization they could call their own.

The beef producers whom I knew were very vigorously opposed to coming under any type of a marketing plan, a commodity marketing plan, similar to that which pertains to marketing plans under The Farm Products Marketing Act. You may wonder why this is the case. Certainly members of the New Democratic Party tonight raised this point—why could it not have come under The Marketing Act as in other commodity plans?

I think there is a very simple reason for it, Mr. Speaker, because most beef producers usually sell their cattle perhaps once or twice a year. There are some of the large operators that sell a few every week or every month, and so on, but generally speaking the beef producer gets all his income at one time in the year as witness the fact of the hon. member for Kingston and the Islands who has a farm and sells all his cattle at one time. These beef producers, unlike the hog producers who sell regularly perhaps every week or every two weeks, or something like this, but on a much more regular basis, are most reluctant to put all their eggs in one basket

and turn the selling of their whole output of their farm and their effort and their labour over to someone whom they believe may be less qualified than they are to consummate the deal.

Now this I think is the reason why they are opposed to this and have always been opposed to it. I think it is well to recall, too, that throughout the years there has been a desire on the part of beef producers, as I said earlier, to have one organization which they could call their own and would be able to finance themselves and not have to depend on government for a hand out or anything like this.

I recall in the early days of my term in this Legislature in 1958 coming to Toronto on the train from London with a group of beef producers from the great county of Lambton. They were examining every possible means they could think of and discussing with me how they could develop some plan whereby they could finance their own organization.

A voluntary check-off was proposed, but they felt that under the then existing legislation it was not legal. They felt that it probably could be done under The Farm Products Marketing Act, but they were afraid to go under the Act because it would mean outright marketing, and they would not have any part of that.

The result was that after I became Minister of Agriculture we evolved the idea in 1963 that we might set up what would be known as the Ontario beef improvement association which would be drafted and established along similar lines to the Ontario soil and crop improvement association. We would make a grant to that organization to get them started and to see if there was some way that they themselves could come up with some type of a plan. Now this was done, and they have through these years made an excellent contribution to the improvement and to the stature of the beef industry in this province.

Now who are these people? Somebody said tonight they were not the small beef producer. They were the great big cattlemen. There are some big cattlemen in it, but everyone of the directors, representing every county and district in this province, is elected by the beef producers in that county and district. I do not know who they are.

I think the director for Middlesex county comes from the riding represented by my hon. friend, the member for Middlesex South. But I have the executive officers here—the past president of the organization is Mr. Harvey Eckardt, of Bruce County. I am sure my hon. friend from Huron-Bruce knows Harvey Eckardt. The president is Walter Beath, of Ontario county, a man who is long established in the beef industry.

The Beath name is known across the length and breadth of Ontario and Canada as outstanding beef producers, but I would say that Walter Beath would be comparatively a small beef producer in the number of cattle he produces. I believe he operates a cow calf herd and finishes the production of that herd. The vice-president is Mr. Vern Kaufman of Oxford county, an outstanding cattle man from Oxford county, and a large cattle feeder who made a great success of it, and was one of the early pioneers in transforming corn sileage into beef in the province of Ontario.

The executive director is Lewis Runnals, from Manitoulin Island, and I am sure my hon. friend from Algoma-Manitoulin will know Lewis Runnals. Clarence Milligan, of Lennox and Addington county, another comparatively small beef producer, and Lawrence Markeuse from Lambton, are the executive officers of this organization. I want to pay a tribute as well to Ross Beatty, a former president of the Ontario beef improvement association, who is now the vice president of the Canadian cattlemen's association.

These men, like a great many others, are associated with this organization, and have been dedicated to resolving some of the problems that have plagued the beef industry throughout the past.

I would just like to say this, Mr. Speaker, that there has been a publication made by the Ontario beef improvement association known as *Breeder and Feeder* and I have a copy of it here. This one is the issue for January, 1968.

Mr. Sargent: Which you finance.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I agree. We put up—

Mr. Sargent: So it is your publication.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, I listened to all of the hon. members of this House speak tonight. I did not interrupt one of them and I did not ask a question. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if I could be afforded the same privilege.

I simply point out to the hon. members a progress report of the marketing committee of the association. Here is enunciated the progress that they have made in correcting many of the problems to which hon. members

in this House have referred tonight, who really know the problem that does exist in the marketing of beef on the rail. A precise definition of a carcass of beef and carcass trimming specifications; the basis of settlement; hot carcass weight; carcass weighing procedures; supervision of carcass weights in packing plants; a policy for carcass condemnations; price reporting on cattle sold direct to the packing plant.

These to me are important steps forward and I could enunciate all the details in each one of those headings but I do not think this is necessary. I think, Mr. Speaker, it points up the effectiveness of this organization.

When I introduced this bill, Mr. Speaker, I thought that I had clearly stated its purpose —on page 623 of *Hansard* under date of Monday, March 11. I would like to read again two or three paragraphs that I think are rather important:

> At the present time, there is no standard set of rules or regulations governing many aspects of the marketing of dressed beef animals in Ontario or, for that matter, in all of Canada. Because of this lack of standards or ground rules, there has been demonstrated a great deal of interest in this Act by departments of agriculture in other provinces.
>
> It is quite clear that with the increasing trend toward dressed weight selling and rail grading of beef animals, there is a need for standardized procedures in the market place. The board of directors of the Ontario beef improvement association, under this legislation, will give priority to this need. In co-operation with the meat packers council, the meat processing companies and the purchasers of beef, they will turn their attention to the creation of a standard basis for rail grade settlement, a uniformed definition of a dressed carcass and the establishment of a system of market price reporting.
>
> It is not the intention of this legislation to regulate or control the sale of beef animals in Ontario. It is the express desire of the membership of the Ontario beef improvement association to retain the elements of free market choice while at the same time securing the benefits of an orderly marketing system.

This is the express purpose of this bill, and while my hon. friends may criticize it for not setting out specifically the exemptions in all of these things—and I must confess, Mr. Speaker that their points according to what their knowledge is of the intention of the beef improvement association, may be well founded—but let me assure you that the beef improvement association want this bill as it is, and that to me is most important.

Let me point out this, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. MacDonald: It gives them the finances to dominate the industry.

Mr. Sargent: We should take a vote on it.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, Mr. Speaker, may I be afforded, as I said earlier, that same privilege as I afforded everyone else, because I listened with great interest and I hope that the hon. members will permit me that same privilege. This is in section 3 of the bill.

> The board of directors may recommend to the Lieutenant-Governor in council the making, amending or revoking of regulations respecting any of the matters set forth in section four.

Now what responsible Ministers of the Crown would not pay attention to the directors who would operate this bill? It has been said by my hon. friend, I believe from Timiskaming, that the beef improvement association is not spelled out in this bill as a named association and I think his point is well taken. The reason it is not spelled out in the bill is, if you will notice, in definitions, association means such association under The Agricultural Associations Act as designated in the regulations.

Supposing that this organization has been known as the Ontario beef improvement association, then they get their own organization for which they can deduct licence fees, they can establish their own fund and operate under that fund, they may wish to change their name and if it was spelled out in this bill, it has to be the Ontario beef improvement association, we might offend the directors who will operate this plan. We should be very much aware of these concerns.

Regarding the refund, I explained that this is purely a voluntary plan. It is a voluntary plan, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Singer: Where does it say that?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well it does not say it in the legislation but—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, there is no great victory that you have won by having me say that, I readily admitted this. It is not a problem at all. But it is right here in the regulations providing for the refund by an association of any licence fees paid to it and describing the terms and conditions under which such refunds shall be granted. Providing for the exemption from any or all of the regulations of any cattle or class of cattle, or any person or class of persons. Providing for the inspection, weighing and measuring of cattle and carcass, respecting the buying, selling, handling, weighing, measuring, shipping, transporting of cattle and carcass.

Do my hon. friends, Mr. Speaker, suggest that we should have spelled out exactly how

this refund was to be made? Supposing I, as a producer, decide that I do not want to belong to this association and I want the five cents or the ten cents a head that will be deducted by this association refunded to me then I write into the association and I simply tell them that I do not want to be a member and I ask for the refund to be made back.

Mr. Singer: Where does it say that?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: It is in the provisions of the regulations.

Mr. Singer: But there are no regulations.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: This may be true, but it is right here in the regulations. It is the intent of the Act. If we were to spell this out, that every carcass or every animal that was sold and a farmer asked for a refund, if we were to say it had to be paid on every single one of those, immediately the carcass or the animal was sold, then we would just have a constant source of problems for the association in administering the plan. But—

Mr. Singer: May I ask the Minister a question?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, I did not ask the hon. member when he was speaking—

Mr. Singer: I just asked him if he would answer a question.

Mr. Speaker: The Minister is quite correct. He gave every courtesy to the member which is not being afforded to him. He does not wish to accept the question, therefore there will be no questions.

Mr. Singer: But surely Mr. Speaker, you are not suggesting it is a discourtesy to ask him if he will permit a question. If he does not want to, that is up to him.

Mr. Speaker: Will the member please give the House the courtesy of some quiet while a member—and in this case the Minister—is endeavouring to put his case before the members, because I allowed every sort of leeway—

Mr. Sargent: This is a special deal. He does not rate that.

Mr. Speaker: Would the members then wish me to enforce the rules of the House and cut out this crosstalk which has been going on, and which I think is essential to debate.

Mr. Sargent: Cut that out too.

Mr. MacDonald: Why cannot he ask a question?

Mr. Speaker: The Minister has declined to answer a question.

Mr. Singer: Then why, sir, did you suggest that it was a discourtesy?

Mr. Speaker: I did not suggest —

Mr. Singer: Certainly you did.

Mr. Lewis: Constantly lecturing—

Mr. Speaker: I must point out that if the Opposition — either side — continue to ignore the rules of the House I certainly will be endeavouring to have the Opposition obey the rules and I will do the same as I have done tonight with members of the government, as I have done today.

Mr. MacDonald: Under pressure usually.

Mr. Speaker: Not under pressure.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. If it is going to be obvious that the members of the House do not wish the House to be operated under the rules of the House, then of course we will have to change the rules. If the members of the Opposition—either party—do not like the rulings of the Speaker, it is very simple: They appeal the ruling and that is the position in which the members of the Opposition are endeavouring to place themselves.

Mr. Singer: Such nonsense.

Mr. Speaker: Now, I would like to say—the member for Downsview was referring a moment ago to something that the Speaker said and which the Speaker considered as perhaps nonsense, but he was much too polite to make such a remark and I would hope that the member for Downsview would extend to the Speaker the same courtesy that he has just now been requesting the Speaker to extend to him.

Mr. Singer: If the Speaker would start, Mr. Speaker, then you will get the respect.

Mr. Speaker: The Minister has the floor.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. MacDonald: We are not going to submit to partisanship without protest.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Oh quit intimidating us over here.

Mr. MacDonald: We are not intimidated.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I thought, Mr. Speaker, that all hon. members of this House had a fairly good opportunity to present their viewpoints. I was simply trying to present mine and then we can decide how the House wishes to deal with the bill.

I would wish to continue to say that, had we spelled out in the bill how the refunds must be made, it might have been in conflict—

Mr. Sargent: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the Minister says that they will make refunds. Subsection 4 says "may" make regulations, it does not say "shall", it says "may".

Mr. Speaker: Will the member state his point of order? He is making a statement now. The member must have a point of order which perhaps is that the Minister is misleading the House or is not quoting properly. Will the member state his point of order?

Mr. Sargent: May I say very respectfully that the Minister says that they will make refunds and the statute very specifically says in clause 4, "Notwithstanding section (c) the Lieutenant-Governor in council may make regulations."

Mr. Speaker: The member will please recognize there is a difference between an argument on interpretation and a point of order. Now, if the member wishes to make the point of order that the Minister is misleading the House or not putting the Act correctly, he will so state, and then he has a point of order.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, I would not suggest that, I suggest it is wishful thinking on his part that they will make refunds but they will not make refunds under this Act.

Mr. Speaker: Order! All the member is doing is endeavouring to make another speech.

Mr. Sargent: No, sir, I am not.

Mr. Speaker: The member has said he did not wish to make a point of order by stating that the Minister was not proceeding in accordance with the rules.

The Minister has the floor.

Mr. Sopha: I have a point of order. Will somebody go and get the Premier (Mr. Robarts)?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, the simple matter here is that the Act provides for the making of those regulations that provide for the refund. There is no question about it at all.

Mr. Sargent: Where does it say that?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I agree it does not say it as such, spelled out in the Act, and I have readily admitted this.

Mr. Sargent: It does not say it.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Stewart: The hon. members opposite said they are going to vote against it and that is their privilege, that is the privilege of democratic representation in this House, but I just want to have the opportunity of saying what the bill is really intended to do and what the beef improvement association wants us to do in the bill. If my hon. friend is suggesting that I am misleading the House in the effectiveness of the beef improvement association, then this is quite another matter.

They did not want us to spell out in the bill how this should be done, whether it be done on a monthly basis or a three-month basis or a six-month basis or a 12-month basis, but they specifically authorized that there should be a voluntary membership in this association and that licence fees be refunded on request. Now there it is. And as far as we are concerned, we think that the bill provides for the needs of the beef industry in this province. I would point out for the information of the members of this House that Ontario produces two per cent of the total amount of beef produced on the North American continent.

How we could have an organization set up under a commodity marketing plan that would do anything to improve the marketing of beef in this province—to the extent that it is now the highest beef market in North America, in fact it is the highest beef market in the world as far as live cattle and dressed beef is concerned—I just do not know, but we do know that the regulations under this Act will very specifically come to grips with the problem of dressing procedures that are carried on in the respective packing plants across this province.

It has taken months, Mr. Speaker, to reach agreement as to this standardization of these uniform dressing procedures. I would like to have seen it implemented at the federal level. Someone said to me, "Why is this not being done at federal level?" I said I agreed completely, it should be at the federal level. But the responsibility of the Legislature of Ontario is to the people of Ontario and this is why we have brought this bill forward right here.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the hon. members to reconsider; I ask them to recognize that an organization that has done as much for the beef industry in this province as this group has already done deserves their favourable consideration in a request such as this legislation enunciates.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry?

The House divided on the motion for second reading of Bill 34, An Act to amend The Brucellosis Act, and the motion was carried on the following vote:

AYES	NAYS
Allan	Braithwaite
Apps	Bukator
Auld	Burr
Bales	Davison
Belanger	Deans
Bernier	De Monte
Boyer	Edighoffer
Brunelle	Farquhar
Carruthers	Ferrier
Carton	Gaunt
Connell	Haggerty
Demers	Jackson
Dunlop	Knight
Dymond	Lawlor
Evans	Lewis
Gilbertson	MacDonald
Gomme	Makarchuk
Grossman	Martel
Haskett	Newman (Windsor-Walkerville)
Henderson	Nixon
Hodgson (Victoria-Haliburton)	Paterson
Jessiman	Peacock
Johnston (Parry Sound)	Pitman
Johnston (St. Catharines)	Reid (Rainy River)
Johnston (Carleton)	Reid (Scarborough East)
Kennedy	Renwick (Riverdale)
Kerr	Ruston
MacNaughton	Sargent
Meen	Shulman
Morningstar	Singer
McKeough	Smith (Nipissing)
McNeil	Sopha
Newman (Ontario South)	Spence
Olde	Stokes
Pritchard (Mrs.)	Trotter
Randall	Worton
Reilly	Young—37
Reuter	
Rollins	
Root	
Rowe	
Rowntree	
Simonett	
Smith (Simcoe East)	
Smith (Hamilton Mountain)	
Snow	
Stewart	
Villeneuve	
Welch	
White	
Whitney	
Winkler	
Wishart	
Yaremko—54	

Clerk of the House: Mr. Speaker, the "ayes" are 54, and the "nays" are 37.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE SANDWICH, WINDSOR AND AMHERSTBURG RAILWAY ACT 1930

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General) moves second reading of Bill 31, An Act to amend The Sandwich, Windsor and Amherstburg Railway Act of 1930.

Mr. H. Peacock (Windsor West): Mr. Speaker, I have a few comments on the second reading of this bill. While I cannot promise the House that it will enjoy the same kind of exchange that occurred earlier this evening, I would like to bring a few points to the attention of the House about the effect that this bill will have on the operation of a public utility in the city of Windsor. The explanation of the bill has already been given by the Minister, to the effect that this utility, the Sandwich, Windsor and Amherstburg Railway Company, which operates a bus line in Windsor, enjoys a privilege accorded to no other public transportation system in the

province, a privilege afforded only to municipalities, and a privilege that this company has enjoyed since its incorporation under the Act in 1930.

Where the facilities and the equipment of the bus company cause damage or injury to a person or property belonging to a person, an action must be launched within certain limitations. Notice must be given within seven days, and the action is barred unless brought before the courts within three months of when the damage or injury occurs. Mr. Speaker, this bill takes away from the company one of the most iniquitous sections of the Act incorporating the Sandwich, Windsor and Amherstburg Railway—a company which in Windsor, I think, represents the last vestige of autocracy in providing an essential public service.

In May, 1951, a small child was riding his bicycle through a main intersection of Windsor when he was struck by a bus operated by the company. In an action brought by his parents, to recover damages for the injuries he sustained, the chief justice of the high court of Ontario at that time found, after considering conflicting evidence, that the child was crossing the intersection with the green light, the bus against a red light. There was no contributory negligence on the part of the child whatever, the chief justice found.

But in this situation, the child and his parents were extremely fortunate. Damages were awarded to the plaintiff only because the company abandoned its defence after counsel for the plaintiff produced for the chief justice an Ontario municipal board order approving the change of operations from a street railway to a bus line. There was a provision in that order that any action pending at the time it was made would not be prejudiced. Mr. Speaker, the reason that I refer to this case, is that the chief justice noted in his judgment that there was an extremely important matter of law involved. I would like to quote from his findings:

> In view of the withdrawal of the defence . . . nothing further remains but to assess the damages. I have, however, set out the facts in greater detail than may have been necessary in order that the matter might be brought to the attention of the Attorney General, so that he would be in a position to consider whether it is in the public interest that it can be argued that a special statutory limitation of three months be applied to one injured by a motor vehicle owned and operated by the defendant company while the limitation in all other such cases in Ontario is one year.

Mr. Speaker, that judgment was handed down almost 17 years ago by the then chief justice of the high court of Ontario—the same person who has distinguished himself further by heading the Royal commission on civil liberties and further by acting as a commissioner on the Ontario law reform commission. His name, of course, is Mr. Justice McRuer.

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): A great man.

Mr. Peacock: Mr. Speaker, many times in the recent past—not just as far back as 1952—representations have been made to the Attorney General, more than one Attorney General, by counsel involved in cases brought against the Sandwich, Windsor, and Amherstburg Railway Company, asking that this Act be amended by deleting this unfair privilege contained in section 28. Those representations were not accepted at the time and were not given any weight.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to refer to the report which the Attorney General tabled this afternoon from the Ontario law reform commission. But before doing so, I would like to stress that in my opinion, this amendment to The SW and A Act would not be before the House were it not for the tabling of that report. As I have said, representations have been made, and the reasons why the representations were not accepted were offered by the Attorney General and officers of his department to the effect that his department wanted to have the whole matter of limitations dealt with collectively, and that this particular matter ought not to be singled out.

I am informed that that is the position that the Attorney General took in this case. It is interesting to refer to the report of the Ontario law reform commission specifically dealing with the limitation period under this Act—The Sandwich, Windsor and Amherstburg Railway Act of 1930. The last paragraph of page five reads:

> The commission is currently making an exhaustive study of the limitation provisions which are contained in The Limitations Act, and other Ontario Statutes, but it is felt that the anomalous situation existing with respect to the Sandwich Windsor and Amherstburg Railway should be dealt with at the earliest opportunity without waiting for the completion of the study of

the broader project. This is a special case which would appear to justify immediate remedial legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I think that the Attorney General's statement made on presenting this report this afternoon confirms what I have suggested. He said this afternoon that "the third report of the commission respecting the amendment to The Sandwich, Windsor and Amherstburg Railway Act has resulted in the particular amending bill which is already before the House. And as a result of the persistence of a number of members of the bar from this particular part of the province, over a number of years, we finally have an Act to eliminate an extremely noxious and inequitable section of this Act.

Mr. Speaker, the bill itself, welcome though it is in removing this protection for the company from here on, is deficient in several respects. The most important deficiency from which the bill suffers is that it will not countenance the bringing of any action before the courts—and there have been many of them—which have been barred from this section in the past, or which have been delayed for such a period of time that the plaintiffs or their counsel have given up hope of ever getting any resolution.

I suggest that the bill should not go forward to third reading without the Attorney General seriously considering in committee an amendment which will provide that this elimination of the company's privileged position will be retroactive and that any action initiated within a year of the damages occurring, will be countenanced under this law. And that, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, must be part of the bill before it is passed by this House. And I hope that, in committee stage, we will deal with that proposition and that it will come back for third reading amended in that form. This section 28, Mr. Speaker, has been a source of considerable discomfort, hardship and unnecessary delay on the part of those seeking equity in the courts.

In conclusion, I would say, Mr. Speaker, that its acceptance in principle is extremely welcome and it will be much improved by the amendment I have suggested.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor - Walkerville): Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to prolong the discussion on the bill. But the big concern back home was the fact that too many of the members of the bar did not realize that the limitation, as far as the SW and A bill was concerned, was three months, and as a result they did not institute proceedings until after the limitation period had expired. There was apparently no method at all for them to obtain redress, and as a result they are seriously concerned that this bill as printed here may not allow them to institute action at the present time if, say, the accident had happened four months ago, seven months ago or nine months ago.

They agree with the one-year limitation but they think the fact that the bill had had a three-month limitation only put them at a severe disadvantage. I would certainly like the hon. Attorney General to consider the retroactivity of the bill to a year from this date.

Mr. Sopha: I must say, Mr. Speaker, that this report of the Ontario law reform commission in respect of this matter, which has just very obligingly been brought to hand by the Clerk of the House, gives one reason to develop some curiosity about the activities of the law reform commision.

I would have thought that the provision, as has been described by the member from Windsor West and my own colleague from Windsor-Walkerville, was so obviously unfair, unjust and oppressive, that someone could whisper in the Attorney General's ear to adopt the phrase of the writer of the Mandarin article, and propel him to bring in an amendment without the necessity of a bound volume of some six pages. He does not really mean to report to the law reform commission to bring the same measure of justice in respect of limitation periods to the citizens of Windsor and the far west of the province, that obtains with the citizens of Metropolitan Toronto in respect of the TTC.

We, of course, must bear in mind that there are not one, but two limitation periods by reference to the operative section of The Municipal Act. My friends—my friend from Windsor-Walkerville being a school teacher and my friend from Windsor West being an economist—will never know just how harsh and oppressive this limitation period is, without the experience of having actual contact with it.

In respect of the seven day period, it is said in the statute that a judge may relieve against the failure to meet that condition under certain circumstances which, according to the language in section 443, I believe it is, of The Municipal Act, "It may be construed very harshly against the litigate towards the proposed and intended litigate," and may, in some respects, in the words of Mr. Justice

Holmes, depend upon what the occupant of the judicial bench had for breakfast as to whether he is willing to exercise his discretion in favour of the intended litigate.

However, if he gets past that pitfall, and did not give the municipality co-operation or, in this case, the Windsor-Sandwich Railway, notice within the required seven days, he is absolutely debarred if he missed the three-month period.

I, myself, in principle, am against all limitation periods. Against them all. But, I would be willing to limit them to something like five years.

The limitation period, if I may be permitted to say this, the several multiple limitation periods that operate in respect of different branches of the law, are in such a hopeless confusion—such a state of uncertainty—so difficut to find, that even lawyers with years of training are unable to locate them with any degree of speed or certainty. And I defy, I absolutely defy, any layman to pick up, in an idle moment, a copy of The Limitations Act of this province and be able, at the end of several hours' study, to aver that he has even a smattering of understanding of its meaning and those things in human affairs to which they pertain.

Of course, that able young lawyer from Armourdale, and his friend from Halton West, another of my colleagues, they, of course, nod in agreement because they know in their hearts, like Goldwater, the truth and accuracy of what I say in this respect.

All right, I am willing to say tonight, what are we getting from the law reform commission? What really are we getting for our money? Really, I am absolutely flabbergasted that a simple amendment like this—to move a statute forward into the realm of justice, simple justice to the individual—needs a six page report signed by five people, all of them eminent in the field of law, and then have it covered over with a blue cover. The Attorney General, it might be added, did not favour any of us on this side, not even the leader of the Opposition, with copies of the report when he tabled them. We had to—

Mr. Singer: Yes, we got one.

Mr. Sopha: Forgive me. No doubt he has filed them away with his memoir material—

Hon. Mr. Wishart: But we have placed in the mailbox of every member of the House, Mr. Speaker, copies of these four reports that I have tabled today, and I trust that if they have not received them now—

Mr. Sopha: No, we have not received them.

Mr. B. Newman: They are in the mail.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: They are in the mail box.

Mr. Sopha: We have not received it.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: They are in your mail box.

Mr. Sopha: I said the assistant clerk went down to the offices and got the copies that were tabled.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Any member could have got them. They are in the mail box.

Mr. Singer: They deliver them to the press and not to us.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Not delivered, they were in the mail box.

Mr. Sopha: I merely want to add, Mr. Speaker, that this will serve notice that perhaps sometime, at the appropriate time, we will be given an explanation why we could not have had a report from the law reform commission about all limitation periods—all of them—

Hon. Mr. Wishart: The commission is reviewing all of them.

Mr. Sopha: —instead of one that is devoted entirely to this rather simple thing.

But it strikes me, and I am going to add this, that with all the applause given by the Attorney General to the Canadian bar association about their assistance in this regard, I merely make so bold as to add this qualification; that it is no small wonder that it is to rubrics of the law that they direct their attention. They will assist with modification of The Wills Act, which means that the lawyers—and I know them—who assist that law reform commission will look after those areas that concern themselves first.

I never saw a man of mean estate or little estate that I ever had any trouble in construing his will. It is only with those who leave a big pile that difficulties develop about the method of language or the words used in the document. I would like to see that law reform commission get around to dealing with some of the laws in this province that affect the lot of the common man, rather than occupying their attention in respect of minor matters and property matters in the other sphere to which I refer.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): I have only a brief comment. If I sensed what my hon. colleague from Windsor West wished to convey to the Attorney General, it is a point distinct from the point made by the member for Windsor-Walkerville. That is that the Attorney General, to expedite the passage of the bill, should consider an amendment which would not be just for one year retroactively, but would be an amendment which would apply whether the cause of action arose as a result of damage or injury before or after the coming into force of the Act, so long as the writ of summons were issued within the 12 month period after the injury was sustained or the damage was suffered. Regardless of whether it was one year, two years, three years or four years ago, so long as the writ had been issued within the one-year period, then it should not matter whether or not that accident or the injury was suffered, or the damage suffered before the Act came into force or after it came into force.

I would ask the Attorney General, if I sense my colleague's wish clearly, that he would give consideration to that type of amendment.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, I am much indebted to the hon. members who have spoken, apparently all in approbation and approval of this legislation, although with some suggestions for amendments which I am quite prepared to consider, and in that case I think the bill should definitely go to the committee on legal bills. I take nothing away from the credit given to the law reform commission by the hon. member for Windsor West, but perhaps he might permit me to say that at least the law reform commission was created by this Legislature in 1964 and given certain tasks to do and this was one of them.

With respect to the remarks of the hon. member for Sudbury, I would point out to him that perhaps there is some benefit in this very modest report, which is really just three pages, but if he were prepared to read the first paragraph of the report he would observe that the Sandwich, Windsor and Amherstburg Railway was created by a statute of this Legislature in 1930. I would suggest that we might reflect that other Legislatures down through the years since 1930 had the opportunity to remove this section which worked hardship, perhaps, on many people, but the Legislature is the one to act and remedy the situation.

Mr. Sopha: Could I ask a question?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Yes.

Mr. Sopha: I do not want to take anything away from the aura of respect that has surrounded the man, but if the member for Windsor West reads a judgment of Mr. Justice McRuer's—in what year? 1952—then why does it take Mr. Justice McRuer all these years since he has been on the law reform commission to get this amendment in?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I think the hon. member will have to ask Mr. McRuer that, himself.

Mr. Sopha: I will ask him in the hallway.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Might I just say it is curious that until this night when I moved second reading of this bill I have not heard a solitary single member stand up and plead for this amendment, and I have been here four years, and the section existed there for 47 years.

Mr. Peacock: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. Minister a question? Mr. Speaker, in the light of what the Attorney General has just said, did I understand him correctly when he said that in 1962, the year the commission was formed, his department specifically referred this question to the commission?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I did not say that, Mr. Speaker, the commission was not formed in 1962; the commission was created in 1964. I said it had been given many tasks to do and it was a creation of this Legislature and I take no credit away—and, with respect to the report, may I point out at the foot of page 3 in that paragraph the Ontario law reform commission, and I quote,

> is currently making an exhaustive study of the limitation provisions which are contained in The Limitations Act, RSO 1960, chapter 214, and other Ontario statutes.

I think it is interesting and valuable to know —and for the members' information—that that work is being carried on by the Ontario law reform commission.

Mr. Sopha: Better have a layman on that commission.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, the thing I could perhaps suggest of most value in this great discussion would be that since the Act reads:

> this Act comes into force on the day it receives Royal assent,

perhaps the greatest service we could do would be to hasten its passage. I would be glad to have it referred to the committee on legal bills and I trust the hon. members will assist its passage there so that we may get it forward.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow morning we will proceed with the Budget debate.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 11:00 o'clock, p.m.

No. 34

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

First Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Friday, March 22, 1968

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1968

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Friday, March 22, 1968

Questions to Mr Gomme re Highway 401, Mr. Jackson 1120

Questions to Mr. Robarts re French language instruction, Mr. Peacock 1120

Questions to Mr. Bales re the workmen's compensation board, Mr. Peacock 1120

Questions to Mr. Wishart re Magistrate Kurata, Mr. Nixon 1120

Questions to Mr. Robarts re French language instruction, Mr. Knight 1121

Presenting commemorative booklet of Aurora United Church, Mr. W. Hodgson 1121

Question to Mr. Robarts re OMSIP, Mr. Ruston 1122

Questions to Mr. Wishart re Constables A. Bayliss and P. C. Garvey, Mr. Shulman 1122

Question to Mr. Wishart re Magistrate Kurata, Mr. Nixon 1123

Resumption of the debate on the Budget, Mr. Nixon 1124

Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Nixon, agreed to 1134

On notice of Motion No. 16, Mr. Deans, Mr. Breithapt, Mr. Belanger, Mr. Peacock 1134

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to 1144

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

FRIDAY, MARCH 22, 1968

The House met at 10:30 o'clock, a.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: This morning we have in the west gallery the 277th Girl Guide company from Etobicoke and I am sure we are glad to see these young ladies with us.

This morning we are also pleased and, I think, honoured to have with us two parliamentarians, the Speaker and Deputy Speaker from the Icelandic assembly. I would ask them to stand as I introduce them and would request that the members acknowledge their presence and welcome them to our assembly. We have Mr. Sigurdur Bjarnasson of the Independence Party and Mr. Benedikt Grondal of the Social Democratic Party.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, I have a question. The Minister is not here again this morning so I guess I will have to hold it for a second time.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): Mr. Speaker, last March 20 I gave you notice of a question directed to the hon. Minister of Tourism and Information (Mr. Auld). As a result of information received from the hon. Minister of Energy and Resources Management I wish to withdraw that question. If I might state, sir, I have been advised by the hon. Minister that there is no longer any equivocation by the Ontario water resources commission in connection with the implementation of regulations with respect to sewage disposal as far as pleasure craft from outside the Ontario jurisdiction is concerned.

Mr. Speaker, I have a question that I wish to direct to the hon. Minister of Energy and Resources Management. It is of multiple parts:

What is the significance for Ontario Hydro of yesterday's announced merger of the Peterborough design staff of Canadian General Electric and the Sheridan Park design staff of Atomic Energy of Canada Limited?

Does this news mean that Ontario Hydro will now have only one design organization to look to in the atomic energy field—the agency of the federal government?

Will the Minister now consider the question of the retention by Ontario Hydro of independent consultants to offer a third opinion on technological developments in the nuclear power field?

Has the Minister noted the comment of the *Globe and Mail* reporter John Picton on page B1 of this morning's business section, to the effect that this merger will offer "stronger opposition to foreign designers who may bid on nuclear contracts in Canada"?

Are the best interests of the people of Ontario continuing to be served by the exclusive relationship of Ontario Hydro with Atomic Energy of Canada Limited?

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Mr. Speaker, I might say that this question was just handed to me as I was leaving my office and as it will take some time to get answers to all the questions, I wonder if the hon. member would place it on the order paper?

Mr. Bullbrook: I will, sir. Does the hon. Minister consider, if I might direct a question to him, that he might be able to answer the last part at this time? Are the best interests of the people of Ontario continuing to be served by the exclusive relationship of Ontario Hydro with Atomic Energy of Canada Limited? Recognizing that this is a question of his opinion, sir, might I submit with respect that he might be able to answer it at this time?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Speaker, I think perhaps I would sooner consult with the hydro commission before answering a question of that type.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the Minister might then answer that part of the question in the House next week after he has consulted, and the balance of the questions can go on the order paper? The Clerk will take note.

Mr. D. Jackson (Timiskaming): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Highways.

Is the cost of land of the cloverleaf construction, and all other entrances and exits, included in the price of $6 million per mile mentioned by the Minister in the building of Highway 401 from Highway 27 to Avenue Road?

Hon. G. E. Gomme (Minister of Highways): Mr. Speaker, all costs, excluding property, were included in the $6 million-a-mile figure referred to in the question. Most of the property requirements were acquired many years ago when the land was more or less rural in nature. The additional property requirements over this section amounted to approximately $750,000 per mile.

Mr. Jackson: Would the Minister permit a supplementary question? What was the original cost of the land?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Speaker, I have given that.

Mr. H. Peacock (Windsor West): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister. Can he indicate when instruction in the French language and the necessary facilities for it will be available for members of the Legislature?

The second part: If the government itself cannot provide the instruction facilities within its own departments, would the Prime Minister consider making a grant to the caucuses for the purchase of language training from private or university schools?

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, we are presently designing instruction for the entire civil service and part of the discussion we have had here relates to providing instruction for the members of the House. It is part of the total plan being developed, so that I am unable to tell the member precisely when this will be available. But I can say that the planning is taking place and as soon as it is completed I will be in a position to assess which members of the various caucuses want this kind of training and what type of training is needed, because there will, of course, be variation between the basic capacity people have. This is what we are working on at the moment.

Mr. Speaker: I believe the member had a further question to ask.

Mr. Peacock: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the hon. Minister of Labour.

1. Was the speech by Mr. W. R. Kerr, rehabilitation director of the workmen's compensation board, delivered in Windsor on Tuesday, March 19, approved by the Minister or the commissioners of the workmen's compensation board?

2. If not, is it now government or board policy to have employees of the board reply to statements by members made in the Legislature?

3. In view of Mr. Kerr's reference to several of the workmen's compensation board cases brought to the Minister's attention by the member for High Park (Mr. Shulman), has the Minister now completed his investigation into 30 cases in question?

4. Will the Minister make the results of his investigations known to the Legislature directly, and not to the Kiwanis club in Windsor?

Mr. Speaker: The member will please confine himself to the question as submitted to the Speaker's office. Would he please place the fourth question again?

Mr. Peacock: The fourth question, Mr. Speaker, is: Will the Minister make the results of his investigations known to the Legislature directly?

Hon. D. Bales (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, in reply to the question of the hon. member for Windsor West: 1. The speech was not approved by me and I have not been able to reach the chairman this morning. 2. The answer is no. 3. and 4. May I say that I referred these matters to the board and I expect to be in a position to report to the Legislature early next week.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Attorney General.

1. Does the Attorney General agree with Magistrate Kurata's decision to exclude a reporter from his court to protect the names and sentences imposed on three convicted men from being published?

2. What position did the Crown attorney take in the matter?

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I would like to take the question as notice and get all the facts of the matter in hand before attempting to give a complete answer. I might say that I have already had an interview with Magistrate Kurata—at least my deputy has done so—and we are getting further information from the

Crown attorney there. I will give an answer certainly by Monday, not later than that.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that. After I had filed the question, I noticed in this morning's paper that the Minister had commented quite freely on the matter and I thought perhaps he would give at least that information here.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I would be quite glad to say that what appeared in the press was reported quite correctly, and I think the hon. member will note that in that interview I said I would like to have all the facts before making any further comment, except to point out that section 428—the whole tenor of our administration of justice—is that trials should be had in public, in the most open way—

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Section 428 is completely irrelevant.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: —except for situations where the public morals may be affected and then there is a discretion; or for good order or in the interests of the administration of justice. In these cases, the court may be cleared and the public excluded. I did say in my comment to the press that I would want to know all the facts in the background of this to see what led the magistrate to take the action of clearing the court, and that is exactly my attitude at this moment.

Mr. Bullbrook: Mr. Speaker, am I permitted to direct a supplementary question in connection with this?

Mr. Speaker: No.

Mr. Bullbrook: Would the hon. Attorney General—

Mr. Speaker: No. If the member wishes to direct a question, he will direct it in the ordinary course for the next sitting.

Mr. R. H. Knight (Port Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Premier.

In view of the fact that in English areas of the province of Quebec, English classes have been phased out in favour of bilingual ones, and that the present trend in Quebec, as reported by the Montreal *Star*, is that bilingual classes are now being phased out in favour of French-only classes, what assurances will the Premier give the people of Ontario that such a trend will not be permitted in any area of our province?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, I have the question. I read it six or eight times and I still do not really understand exactly what it means or what its application is to the affairs in this province. I can give the member an assurance but I really do not know what assurance he wants or what assurance our people would want. He is referring to something that seems to be occurring in the province of Quebec, but I cannot even figure out what is happening there and I do not see its revelance to anything that is going on in this province.

Mr. Knight: May I ask a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, that might clarify this question?

Since Ontario's position seems to be that we will do for French-speaking residents in Ontario, what Quebec is doing for English-speaking residents there, is the Ontario government prepared to keep an eye on the fact that, as reported in the Montreal *Star* last week, English schools in Quebec were gradually phased out to bilingual ones, at least some of them were, and now the trend is for these bilingual schools to be phased out into French only? What I am asking is what assurance do we have that partially French schools in Ontario will not see the same thing happening—becoming completely French?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, I think the policies of this government are clear in relation to teaching in the French language, and I can only assure the member that what is happening in Quebec will have no effect on what we are doing in this province.

Mr. W. Hodgson (York North): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to perform a very pleasant task on behalf of the Reverend T. Edwin Hancock, the minister, the official board and the members of the Aurora United Church.

On Sunday March 17, it was my privilege to participate with the congregation in a service commemorating the 150th anniversary of this historic church, and to present to the congregation on behalf of the Prime Minister and the government of Ontario, a memorial scroll.

One of the important projects which the members of the Aurora United Church undertook as part of their celebrations, was the production and the publication of a commemorative booklet. This volume would cover in some detail the history and the

activities of the church during the lengthy period from 1818 until the present day. Thanks to a great deal of careful research and writing, and work by the various members of the congregation, this project was brought to fruition. The result is a finely bound attractive volume with records and sketches, photographs and written articles, depicting the history of the church and those dedicated members of the clergy and its congregation who have served throughout its 150 years.

It is interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, that one of the photographs contained in this volume is of the Reverend Edwin A. Pearson, B.A., who served with distinction as minister of Aurora United Church from 1900 to 1903. He was the father of the Prime Minister of Canada, the Rt. Hon. Lester B. Pearson, who attended Aurora United Church Sunday school as a boy, and received part of his early education in Aurora.

Mr. Speaker, it is a great honour to me today—on behalf of the Reverend T. Edwin Hancock and Mr. E. N. Clarke, chairman of the anniversary committee and members of the congregation of Aurora United Church—to present to you, and through you to the Prime Minister of Ontario, one copy of this commemorative book. It is the congregation's hope, Mr. Speaker, that the Prime Minister may see fit to have this volume placed in the provincial archives for safekeeping.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, I would like to tell the hon. members that the book will be placed in the archives, to take its place among the historical documents preserved there, I will, however, take advantage of the opportunity to read it before I place it in those archives.

It seems that there was a question asked of me. It is dated March 1.

Mr. Speaker: Yes, I was about to refer to that, if I might, Mr. Prime Minister.

On March 1 a question was placed in my office by the member for Essex-Kent (Mr. Ruston) directed to the Prime Minister. My notes indicate that it had been asked on March 14, but there can be no record of it found anywhere. I have arranged with the member for Essex-Kent and with the Prime Minister's office that it would be brought up this morning, and if I may I will read it and then ask the Prime Minister either to answer, comment or take it as notice.

It was from the member for Essex-Kent addressed to the Premier of Ontario:

> As the government's present Ontario medical insurance plan is available to groups, would it not be reasonable to assume that employees of the provincial government should have their medical insurance transferred to OMSIP, which is a government non-profit agency?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: When this present arrangement was negotiated there was no provision in OMSIP to deal with groups. We were dealing on an individual basis and the present arrangement was negotiated by the civil service association as a fringe benefit. It was for a period of three years starting from October 1, 1965. I assume that it will be renegotiated during the latter part of this year. At that time, of course, if in their wisdom they want to deal with OMSIP, and if OMSIP is able to offer them the services that they require, it will be available to them because in the intervening period OMSIP has moved into the group field. So, we will wait until the latter part of this year, and the entire arrangement will be renegotiated.

Mr. Singer: Colin Brown had better get to work.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Well, probably so.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, on March 19, 1968, I was asked a question by the hon. member for High Park which I then took as notice, and I should like to answer the question now. The question was:

In view of the complaint that Constable A. Bayliss was discharged from North Gwillimbury police, and Constable P. C. Garvey has been kept on night shift for four months because these two officers informed their superiors that the chief had beaten up a prisoner as indicated by news reporters, will the Attorney General order a further investigation?

The facts are that Constable Bayliss was taken on to the North Gwillimbury police department on June 12, 1967, as a probationary officer, and as a result of a resolution passed in the council. In November, one non-commissioned officer indicated that Bayliss was not suitable for police work in the department and a second non-commissioned officer thought it was too early at that time to have fully appraised Bayliss's suitability as a police officer. The chief of police thought also that Bayliss was not perhaps qualified for work as a police officer in the department, but no action was taken at that time.

On Saturday, February 3, 1968, the police chief was advised by a citizen that he had witnessed Constable Bayliss firing two shots in the air in trying to apprehend a 16-year-old youth who appeared to be intoxicated. The youth had previously been placed in the cruiser by Bayliss who had left him alone in order to assist another police officer with another person.

Bayliss returned to the cruiser and observed the prisoner running away from the car and approaching the rear of stores of Jersey shopping plaza, and he claims and admits that he fired one shot in the air. The chief of police considered this a very immature act as the person appeared intoxicated and was known to the officer Bayliss. This event took place during daylight hours. On February 19, 1968, in the light of these circumstances, a resolution of council was passed releasing Constable Bayliss of his services in the police department.

Constable Garvey, the other officer mentioned, has been on the 12 midnight to 8 a.m. shift for the months of January, February and March of this year. The reasons are as follows. One sergeant of the force is attending the fingerprint school in Toronto, and one constable is attending the police college at Aylmer. The chief of police has assigned Constable Garvey to this shift in those circumstances. At no time has Constable Garvey complained of ill-treatment or about the shift, either to the committee of council which is the governing authority, or to his chief of police.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): Would the Minister accept a supplementary question?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Yes.

Mr. Shulman: Has the Minister investigated the allegation of beating up a prisoner?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I did not check it in this connection. I was asked for the reasons why these officers were abused, if I would investigate these circumstances.

Mr. Shulman: I am sorry, perhaps it was ill-worded. Would the Minister be willing to look into this aspect of the case?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, yes, although I must say that the government of municipal police forces in each municipality is by either a board of police commissioners—which consists of a head of the council, a judge of the county or district court, and one other person, sometimes that other person is a magistrate, but it may be a citizen—or else we have a committee of the local municipal council. That body or committee or board of police commissioners would ordinarily make a first investigation, and if there were to be a further investigation, these are usually reported to the Ontario police commission.

It would not necessarily come to the attention of the Attorney General in every individual single case. I have no objection in this matter to making myself informed about those circumstances, but I think the hon. member can understand that not in every such case where an allegation of this kind is made—and as I have indicated here, there are sound reasons why one of these officers was assigned to a duty, and the other discharged—is the Attorney General required or expected, nor would it be possible for him, to get down to the detail of such cases. But I would have no objection to the hon. member's request, if he feels that it would be helpful, to look into the circumstances of this matter.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, a comment from the member for Wellington South (Mr. Worton) has just been handed to me, which has to do with Magistrate Kurata's decision. Perhaps if the Attorney General would, in these rather unusual circumstances, permit us to ask a supplementary question? He could help with it. Evidently the Guelph *Daily Mercury* still feels that it is prevented from publishing these names because of the direction that Magistrate Kurata has given its reporter. These names of course have appeared in other newspapers. What would the Minister's advice to the Guelph *Mercury* be?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, it is for this very reason that I wanted all the facts before I tried to make a full and complete answer to the hon. member. I did mention that I had seen Magistrate Kurata through my deputy this morning, and I am informed this moment that the magistrate did not put any restriction on the publication of the name of the accused person or the sentence which he was given. I believe the facts at this moment to be that it was in the discussion of the man's background after the hearing and conviction that the magistrate felt there was no good purpose to be served by bringing out background facts. I am informed that he did not restrict the publication of the name of the accused or the sentence, and that when he found out that this impression had been taken from his remarks, he corrected it. But again, I am not in a position to know all the facts. I want to

see the Crown attorney, and I want to get the record so I shall know. I will then answer fully, as I told the hon. member.

Mr. MacDonald: How can the Guelph *Mercury* be so apprehensive?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I do not know that they are apprehensive.

Mr. MacDonald: They said that they would not publish it.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I do not know that the *Mercury* has not published the facts. I have reason to believe it has.

Mr. MacDonald: Perhaps their lawyer is timid.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): Maybe their lawyer has not got a QC?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Here again we are talking about something on which I do not think anyone knows or is fully informed of the facts. I intend to be fully informed of the facts, and then I shall give an answer.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The 1st order, resuming the adjourned debate on the motion that Mr. Speaker do now leave the chair and the House resolve itself into the committee on ways and means.

ON THE BUDGET

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, it has been ten days since the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. MacNaughton) brought down his Budget in this Legislature. Other business, some of it important, has intervened and prevented the beginning of the discussion of this important document in the House. But this has not, of course, kept the people of Ontario from expressing their views, and also some people outside of Ontario. We have heard from the president of Air Canada on the increase in the fuel tax, from the president of Imperial Tobacco on the increase in tobacco taxes from 2 to 6 cents per pack, and even from the Treasurer of Saskatchewan who felt that the decisions of this government were irresponsible and that they affected the economy of the nation to the extent that they do.

But I would say to you, sir, that the most important reactions that have come to me as the member for Brant and the leader of the Opposition have been associated with the regressive nature of the impositions of new taxations and charges that have been the decision of this government. The Provincial Treasurer, in a very querulous voice, indicated that all of the good taxes were levied by Ottawa and he had to levy all the bad taxes here. He used the phrases "progressive" and "regressive", but essentially that is what he meant. And believe me, sir, I think that he is the author of his own misfortune. To begin with, there are no good taxes that I know of, but more than that he put himself into an unnecessarily restrictive political situation in the last election campaign when he and the Premier (Mr. Robarts) of the province indicated that they would not tamper with the income tax situation in this province, which is the one that he identifies as the progressive one that evidently he would like to increase.

So, of course, the situation has been a real problem for the government and the Provincial Treasurer. Political commitments associated with an extra $190 million plus certain other commitments with highway construction and auditoriums and things like this that were promised during the election campaign have required us to increase our level of expenditure tremendously—to the point, I suppose, where the Minister of Education (Mr. Davis), who has not been with us all of this week, has said publicly that he felt that the province was headed for bankruptcy if we were expected to continue the support of education at its present level and at the extended levels that were predicted by recent increases.

I think we can expect the Minister of Education to talk with more frankness in this session and the next two or three sessions. It is generally accepted by political observers who have some objectivity that he is probably in his last few years, perhaps few months, as a member of the government, and he is looking elsewhere for a place where his political abilities can be more appreciated. So we look to him for some frank statements, perhaps independent to some extent of the usual solidarity of the Cabinet and the whip of the party.

When he talks about the approaching bankruptcy of the province, I would say that he does not do the government nor the province itself much service, since we cannot even contmplate retrenchment in the expenditures for education. It does not take the economic council of Canada to warn us that this sort of investment is essential if we are going to stay in the forefront of the education systems in Canada, and our young people are going

to be in a position where they can compete in the western world with the sort of education that we would hope that they would have. In my view, we can expect increases in education expenditure and the Smith report bears this out when it makes the prediction that would extend to the year 1975.

When we talk about the debt of the province, there have been those who have expressed serious concern that we have this year budgeted for a deficit of $252 million. The Provincial Treasurer has stopped using that term "deficit"; he was brave enough to use it last year when he had the largest deficit, $162 million, that we had suffered until that time. He has not fallen back on the practice of his predecessor in referring to these matters as "shortfalls", but instead of calling it a deficit he simply refers to the amount of money that it will be necessary to make up by increased borrowings and increases in the imposition of taxation.

But we are imposing $100 million of new taxation in very rough terms, and all of these new impositions are extremely regressive, falling extremely heavily on the small and middle income groups. There seems to be something sacred in the minds of the Provincial Treasurer and his advisors that indicates that unless we find one-third of the cost for Ontario hospital services and OMSIP from premiums, the whole house of cards that he and his predecessors have constructed will collapse. Now, we on this side disagree with that position, and we disagree with it violently. The increase in hospitalization premiums by more than 60 per cent, close to 70 per cent, is an unreasonable imposition; it is one that surely should have been paid largely out of the general revenues of the province. It it was reflected in higher taxes so be it, but these taxes must be progressive. In my view they should be associated with our share of the income tax availability, and I want to talk about that in some detail before I finish my remarks this morning or perhaps on some future occasion.

But the Treasurer himself has complained about the lack of access that we in the province have to progressive forms of taxation. He knows that The British North America Act does give us access to direct taxation, this does include the personal income tax, and I do not believe he or this government has taken the kind of initiative that is necessary if we are going to work out the sort of agreement at the federal level that will give us access to more progressive forms of taxation and, beyond that, a more important say in what the base for this particular tax should be.

So I would say, sir, that the impositions that I have referred to briefly have been of a very serious nature, hitting violently and very tragically a good number of the families in this province who pay directly their costs of hospitalization and medical services. Surely the type of reform that the Provincial Treasurer, through his colleagues on the front bench of the government, should be bringing to us, is some sort of an amalgamation of our health services in this province, some sort of a unification of an approach to subsidies, the doing away with at least two of the three boards that have to do with health services. In this way we can at least see that the Provincial Treasurer is interested in efficiency and modern application of our programme.

But I believe there is no reasonable excuse why the Ontario hospital services commission and our medical insurance programme cannot and must not be amalgamated without the imposition of a third board—a health insurance registration board—on top of it and why we cannot give single billings for those people who avail themselves of both of these facilities. It will not be long, of course, before this will include well over 90 per cent of the people in this province—I would predict within the next three to five years—and we can increase efficiency in these billings by automation, and we should definitely extend our programme of subsidization that we presently have in OMSIP, to Ontario hospital services.

There is an area of inconsistency in the thinking of the government that should have been cleared up in this particular Budget, particularly if they were going to insist on imposing 60 to 70 per cent increases in the premium level, as they have done in the last ten days.

Mr. Speaker, one of the most interesting parts of the document that was presented to us by the Provincial Treasurer was the background papers that take up about half of the well-bound booklet. These background papers indicate the thinking and the research that went into the final decisions that were taken by the Provincial Treasurer and the senior members of the government, although, not knowing too much about these methods, I am under the impression that even the senior Cabinet Ministers did not know about the decisions that were taken by the Provincial Treasurer before the Budget was handed down.

This brings to my mind just a brief comment that I might make at this stage, and that is the accepted need for close secrecy in these matters. I am not aware of the procedures that are taken by the Cabinet in reaching the decisions that are read to the House by the Provincial Treasurer on Budget day, but I do know that it is essential that members in Opposition, the hon. leader of the NDP (Mr. MacDonald) and myself, as well as the press, should have access to this information so that when the time comes for us to make at least some immediate comments following the release of these decisions, we can do so, having within our knowledge some of the information that led up to the decisions taken by the government.

I appreciate very sincerely the problems that the Provincial Treasurer has. He went to a great deal of trouble to lock the press in committee room No. 1. He eventually had to give them access to the television room and the press room there so that he himself could confer with them and give them some of the additional background material as well as his own political views on the importance of the decisions that he had made. While that is his decision surely he must accept the need in our democratic society and the way the situation works in this House and across this province, that at least representatives of the Opposition parties should have this information as well.

Coming from statements that he made on Budget day, a small cloud has been hanging over the Opposition parties and certain people on Opposition staffs, and I want to assure him that we are as interested as he is in proper procedures and that any decisions that might possibly have an undue effect on the stock market or the decisions that individuals might make in making purchases before new taxes were imposed, would be safeguarded by us. He can have that assurance from me and I will back it up to the fullest. But I would say to him that if and his party supporters are going to say that our comments following the Budget or the Speech from the Throne are gratuitous, repetitive or ill-thought out, he must bear the responsibility for making the statement himself. Surely our comments must be based on the facts that are available to him. It is now ten days since the Budget was brought down and this is the first opportunity that I have had to make any public comments about it, other than those that were made immediately following the presentation of the Budget, based on the very limited information that we had at that time.

These Budget papers are of considerable interest. They indicate some of the changes in the economy of the province and I want to refer to them briefly at this time. Budget papers clearly show the inflationary pressures exerted on the Ontario economy. The figures related to Canada as a whole indicate the decrease in productivity growth because of the poor performance of the construction industry. While Ontario was slightly better than average, and in fact, held the line on the graph of increasing productivity, the wisdom of cancelling $50 million in provincial construction is questionable in this connection, particularly when it appears to be designed to fill the gap left by Expo and other centennial projects. It appears also that it was necessary, not so much as an anti-inflationary move, but to keep our 1967 deficit from growing beyond predicted levels.

It was a year ago that the Provincial Treasurer predicted a deficit of $162 million and he was able to say, in a presentation of his Budget last week, that he was very close in these predictions. This is the first time, almost in living memory, that the very black picture drawn as far as deficits are concerned by the Provincial Treasurer, has not turned out to be a cloud with a silver or gold lining when the figures are all in. So, while we congratulate the Provincial Treasurer for the carefulness of his predictions, he realizes better than anyone else, that the full deficit of $162 million that we are suffering is a very serious matter; much more serious than the prediction of such a deficit the year before.

It has been pointed out by careful observers of past procedures in the presentation of the Budget, that even yet the full statistics are not with us. We have not completed the fiscal year and it may very well be that the situation will improve and that the $162 million deficit that was predicted may not eventually come into being.

But, we have to relate this with his predictions for the coming year. We have to relate it with those predictions, and certainly the indications are that the cancellation of those building programmes were designed to give him the situation where he met his predictions and, in fact, our deficit was not much larger than predicted.

Nevertheless, the wage and price spirals still exert inflationary pressures here and elsewhere in Canada and in North America. The federal government, in setting up a wages and prices review board, has drawn commendation from many sources, including

Louis Rasminsky, the governor of the Bank of Canada, who is often quoted in this House.

Such a board would operate more effectively if it had a provincial counterpart that would extend over all guidelines into fields of provincial jurisdiction. It has been indicated very clearly by us, on this side this year, in reference to the amendment to the amendment to the Speech from the Throne and on other occasions, that this sort of a review board is one that could very effectively have a place in the economy and the programmes of this government.

I remember in my discussions and comments on the Budget a year ago, that I suggested and urged the Provincial Treasurer to set up some sort of a situation where the standing committees of the Legislature would have the right, and the power, to call before them those people and groups in our economy who make decisions that affect the costs of living, and those other people living in Ontario who must meet these new payments. At the time, I was talking about new costs for automobile insurance and I felt that the insurance industry should be called before the standing committee of the Legislature in order to justify these changes and to show in a full light of publicity why the changes were needed, and what effect they would have on the premium-paying population of the province.

I indicated at that time that a similar procedure should be taken with the Ontario medical association, which had unilaterally announced new standards for payment that even surprised and outraged the Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond), who is just coming to his seat. I felt, as well, that the same procedures could be used by labour unions, farm groups, commodity groups of every nature, so that there would be a properly conducted public forum with the press present and the members of the Legislature present, so that the people of Ontario could be assured that an objective assessment of these unilateral decisions would be made.

This was followed by comments made by the NDP in suggesting that there be a rents and prices review board. They do not normally talk about wages in this connection; they are very anxious to control one aspect of the economy, that is, those costs to consumers, without having any guideline in any way having to do with wages—

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Last year, the hon. member did not even want a prices review board.

Mr. Nixon: —and as a matter of fact the leader—

An hon. member: Grumble, grumble!

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, the leader of the federal NDP has indicated that even the review boards that are advocated by the NDP itself in the province of Ontario, would be toothless and inadequate in his comments at the federal level.

Mr. MacDonald: Under the direction of the federal Liberals it certainly would be toothless.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Nixon: So it is apparent to us, on this side, that the wages and prices review procedures that have been announced federally can be brought into effect much more realistically if the provinces, led by the province of Ontario, implement a similar review board here.

Mr. MacDonald: They changed their policies since last year.

Mr. Nixon: Not at all. The member is just completely unaware of the facts. Your federal leader shot your position down. There is absolutely no consistency in what you are trying to do.

Mr. Speaker, I would say that the Ontario economic council should be given the added responsibility for this and it should be developed in conjunction with the federal board.

My views a year ago, and I still hold to them, were that the standing committees of the Legislature could fulfill this function. But since it has to be a continuing programme, one that is related to federal initiatives, there is no reason in the world why the economic council of Ontario, which has a new bill before us in the House right now, could not have this additional responsibility.

Our provincial growth fell off from 10 to 7 per cent last year and in real terms amounted to only 3.7 per cent, according to the papers that were provided by the Provincial Treasurer. To keep this reduction from turning into a negative figure, a wage price review board would complement a far more expansionary position taken in basic budget philosophy. It is gratifying that the United States-Canada auto agreement finally is exerting a real advantage to Ontario. Our provincial exports are up ten times over 1964

in this particular field and amply justified the original initiative. In fact, the pact is credited by the provincial government papers as the major force behind the economic advance since 1965.

However, I think we should bear in mind, Mr. Speaker, that this increase by a factor of ten will not continue, that we have come up to new standards of productivity in the automobile field but this will not be subject to the same initiatives as the auto agreement had two or three years ago, so we cannot depend on increases there to cause the provincial growth to be reflected in continuing buoyancy as far as our economic development is concerned.

The most ominous figure in the Budget papers is associated with non-residential construction, that is in association with the expansion of industry particularly. The growth of new manufacturing facilities dropped by 13 per cent in 1967, while housing construction, normally associated with a similar figure, grew by the surprisingly inadequate figure of 3.8 per cent, and this was largely related to apartments and multiple dwellings.

The employment statistics are not heartening, since the Budget reports unemployment up from 2.5 per cent to 3.1 per cent in 1967, representing 89,000 people. The unemployment rate among young workers was considerably higher than the average, being close to 8 per cent in the under 19 years bracket of those not attending school.

The prediction of a 4 per cent unemployment rate for 1968-1969 is one that must give policy makers grave concern, and surely we can order our affairs so that during the next session of the Legislature we are not going to have one of those high unemployment rate debates that surely should be fading into the dim and distant past.

This is really a major policy area, particularly as it relates to those people under 19 years of age, 8 per cent of whom are unemployed; it is the large group that is not attending school. It has been put to the government repeatedly that they have a responsibility in this field for bringing about some orderly plan whereby we can work out employment for young people whether they are students, or whether they have left school.

It is not my intention to take a long period of time to describe again the facilities that we might have, but there are at least seven departments of government that can, during the summer season—and perhaps on a year-round basis—have a specific number of jobs that would be available to students who are away from the classroom for summer vacation, or away from the classroom because of the tri-mester system that is becoming more and more popular in the schools, universities and community colleges.

The response of The Department of Lands and Forests in setting up the junior ranger programme has been an excellent one, and almost uniformly commended in this House, but there is no doubt that the Minister of Energy and Resources Management (Mr. Simonett), through the conservation responsibilities he has, has at least as large an area of student employment that he could use some initiative to develop if it were the wish of the Minister and the policy of the government.

When the world's financial community trembles, as it has done on more than one occasion recently, we have been constantly reminded how very much real wealth lies beneath our feet and in our forests, rivers and lakes; in power generation, in primary and secondary industry and latterly in our urban and cultural development in the province of Ontario.

Our province thrusts itself like a ploughshare down into the heartland of the North American continent, inviting comparison with the United States which lie in the same region. Last year, Expo 67 and the other centennial events brought our American neighbours north in unprecedented numbers and they liked what they saw as they passed through Ontario.

As a result of that memorable year, Canada is becoming an attractive proposition for more and more thinking people and the immigration of large numbers of men and women who have much to contribute to our future seems likely to grow. Soon we may have not a brain drain, but a brain flux—a movement of educated and productive people to the centres of action, many of which will lie right here in Ontario. In fact, the government should be planning now to open immigration centres in each major region of the United States to further this kind of immigration.

For years we have seen our best young people, those with top education provided by the universities of our own province, leave in larger and larger numbers to take up the positions of greater opportunity in the United States. Some have left to go to Europe, but there has been a significant drain of the

very best intellectual resources away from this province and this nation.

I believe wholeheartedly that pressures are going to reverse that flow and that we are in a position not only to attract many of these people back to our province, but to bring with them many of those people now living in the United States and elsewhere who will be looking for a way of life that we on this side would certainly say is more attractive than that offered in the United States at this time.

The New Hampshire primary results and Robert Kennedy's challenge to President Johnson have shown the extent of the division which is now rending the United States. Its Treasury strives to uphold the dollar in the face of mounting international pressure by investors, who recognize that the United States is not confident that it can bring to any kind of logical conclusion the sink-hole of expense and broken ideals that is Viet Nam.

Internally, the United States is facing a summer of strife and violence. The people themselves are divided within their own continental boundaries as they have not been since 1860. Thinking men increasingly look northward for possible alternative modes of existence that are intellectually rewarding and morally acceptable. Here in Ontario, not only competent professional, but pop-intellectuals see possibilities for living the kind of life that appeals to them.

This is a matter of great concern. There is no aspect of cynicism in my remarks. I think as many of us read the development of events in the United States, associated with Viet Nam and the summer racial strife, with really a sinking heart. The numbers who have come from the United States have not been uniformly welcome here. Some of them are draft dodgers; others have come for other reasons, and yet all of us appreciate the tremendous pressures that have made these people make these terrible decisions. We can only look for an increase in those pressures and the fact that Ontario is going to be a place to which many young people and others will come. This is bound to work a considerable change in the development of our province, and it is a change that we must be ready for. It is a change that we can accommodate.

Mr. J. H. White (London South): It is the province of opportunity!

Mr. Nixon: Many of these potential immigrants are familiar with our business climate and our academic achievements. While this trend has as yet by no means reversed the brain drain, I predict that the immigration of top flight management and intellectual talent from the United States into Canada is one of the greatest advantages that will accrue to our province over the next 30 years. They are going to come not simply as representatives of American industry setting up more branch plants. That probably will continue, too, under the policies of this government, but they will come as *bona fide* immigrants, seeking to carve out for themselves a way of life here as Canadian citizens.

Other nearby jurisdictions are subject to difficult but certainly less tragic circumstances that have a direct effect on us. In particular the current situation in Quebec has resulted last year in the significant migration of capital from that province to Ontario. I quote a figure used by Jean Lesage, an unimpeachable source in this connection, in which he indicated that last year the industrial expansion of that province became really a contraction of a figure amounting to close to 6 per cent. There have been other statistics made available by more objective sources, which indicate that this is so and that Ontario is the beneficiary of at least a share—a large and significant share—of the relocation of this capital.

Industrial expansion is reported to be down in Quebec, and while we regret this check to the growth of our neighbouring province, we must nevertheless recognize that for at least the next few years events that may ultimately result in a new form of stability, economic and otherwise, are meanwhile working very definitely in Ontario's favour. Perhaps for Quebec this is the price of so-called emancipation and a temporary trend that federal-provincial co-operation can reverse. Meanwhile it is a fact of economic life of great importance to Ontario.

The situation in the Maritime provinces is less one of the people's making and more of a combination of geographical and historical facts and chance events that have resulted in a lower economic growth rate than in the rest of Canada. In my view, the continual public discussion of these factors at Premier's conferences and other places gives them bad publicity without balancing help. The Premier of Ontario made some indication that he was prepared to provide a $1 billion development fund to be used by those provinces of Canada that need some special assistance, and the Maritimes would certainly fall into that category as well as Quebec. But while the suggestion was made with some bravado,

there has, of course, been no follow-up, and while it did give increased publicity to the difficult financial position in the Maritimes, there was no help forthcoming.

There is no doubt that a wideawake growing commercial concern is looking for more than tax concession grants from government. It is also seeking a growth location that will afford it a strong and expanding local market. The lack of such a base is an additional difficulty faced by the maritime provinces in persuading industry to locate or expand there. The migration of top men and women to Upper Canada over the years has only compounded the problem.

Now for these and other reasons, our growth potential is an exciting prospect and one which is fully confirmed by scientific analysis of the future that we can look forward to up to the year 2000. We now know that our thinking should be geared to that year and the developments that must take place before it—a year which our children will see and which we ourselves may see with aging eyes. The forward look must condition all of our thinking. We must understand the techniques of fiscal and monetary policy that have done so much to keep the economy on an even keel ever since John Maynard Keynes discovered that the real trick is not to balance the budget but to balance the economy; that a budget is the public relations vehicle par excellence which indicates to the people just what the government will do, how it will do it, and the degree of resolution with which it will pursue its chosen objectives.

This function of the Budget as an economic and public relations intrument is a key role simply because the Budget is a catalyst that causes so many other things to happen that are not in the direct control of this House or this government. It sets the whole economic mood of the province. This 1968 Budget is a document which radiates gloom, not only throughout Ontario but beyond its borders. The Premier has accused the Opposition of responding to gloom and doom techniques—to quote his phrase. Yet he and his Ministers, predicting economic bankruptcy and resorting to positions of retrenchment without initiative, are certainly the ones radiating this attitude across our province. The Budget says that we have little faith in ourselves and we have no faith in our resolution or our ability. It sells Ontario short. It does not, in fact, catalyze expansion. It dampens what should be an optimistic mood in Ontario.

Mr. Speaker, the Budget, of course, is second only to the Budget of the federal government in its fiscal impact. Within Ontario it is the paramount control measure and economic lever. It is the major device by which we can strive for full employment; for a high rate of continuing economic growth; for reasonable price stability, and for the equitable distribution of rising incomes. With the right approach, it can be the key document of progress of its year. It can instil confidence and accelerate our growth, and in this purpose the Provincial Treasurer has failed.

The document that is before us in 1968 does not recognize these key purposes, but is instead the vehicle of retrenchment, the indicator of a fearful approach to economic policy on the government's part. As a solution to fiscal difficulties, retrenchment is no longer effective. The lessons of experience have taught us more significant control techniques over our economic destiny.

We have now enjoyed a period of economic expansion unparalleled in our history. It has lasted since March, 1961, the longest uninterrupted expansion in Canadian business experience. And so the economists and bellwether specialists in the Frost building look for the chill, with ever keener eyes scanning the statistics for signs of an economic downturn. They feel it has got to come, grudgingly acknowledging federal responsibility and skill in that government's successful and widely applauded efforts to maintain confidence in the Canadian monetary system.

But we are more fortunate. We are in the enviable position in this province of being part of a continuation and acceleration of the post-1961 expansion and so I condemn the attitude of mind of a government that would bring down a lacklustre Budget completely devoid of initiative, a stand-pat Budget with no new ventures, no new programmes to lead to the future economic expansion of this province. The natural fears that float on the surface of the Tory mind have dominated government thinking once again, and the result has been the production of this disappointing document.

The Budget delivers a resounding slap at the lower and middle income citizens of Ontario. The Treasurer bemoans his dependence on "regressive taxes". He sees no alternative to raising hospital premiums 65 per cent, an amount paid directly by many families. It is also closely connected with a significant increase in the cost of employment where industry pays this premium on behalf

of the worker. The foolish election promise not to raise the income tax is the source of the Treasurer's lack of manoeuvrability now. This is a matter of continuing concern and one that I want to deal with in some detail.

Ontario continues to enjoy a general level of high economic activity and high employment. True, there have been holes in this fabric, owing entirely to government attitudes and policies. Agriculture has not shared in Ontario's growing economy since 1950. As the hon. member for Huron-Bruce (Mr. Gaunt) has pointed out so well, this may well be due to a basic lack of concern for the situation as exemplified by the government's handling of the sugar beet problem in southern Ontario. The federation of agriculture and the farmers' union have both recommended that the government place the Dominion Sugar Company's processing plant in Chatham in trusteeship and operate it on that indefinite basis. While this may not be the best solution, there are many other alternatives which have been presented to the Minister and to the administration, but the Minister has rejected all proposals. The authority of this government can be used, and should have been used to sustain the industry.

However, their lack of action now finds it completely folded. Consequently a plant which last year processed a $4 million crop closed down on February 29 by decree of a foreign parent company and this government, by its unwillingness to act, has cut off not only the employment associated with it, but $2 million of federal support for the sugar beet crop which will no longer be grown. The Minister has deliberately created more pressure on the farm industry by his refusal to act. He has $2 million out of circulation in this part of Ontario. He has written the obituary of the sugar beet industry in Ontario.

Only the federal government — and so often the people sitting opposite turn to them for the sort of decision they themselves should be taking — only the federal government to whom the growers are now talking, can save the situation. This is surely an utter abdication of responsibility on the part of this government. We sometimes wonder why we should have a Department of Agriculture and Food here when we find the buck being passed to the Ministry of Agriculture in Ottawa all the time without the leadership that should be forthcoming from this department, and this Ministry.

An hon. member: He sets himself up as God, like he did last night.

Mr. Nixon: They do not need to be apologized for; they are taking strong and firm action in this regard. While a national sugar policy is legitimately the concern of Ottawa, surely what goes on here in Ontario is our concern. But when the responsibility does accrue to this government as it so clearly does in the equality of industrial opportunity programme, the results are patchy and uneven. I remember the announcement; I think it was made in northern Ontario after the Premier had come out of Kenora saying "No promises for northern Ontario". He unveiled a programme in the middle of an election campaign which was finally going to provide the sort of assistance, he said, that would develop the community of Ontario in a more equitable way.

Since that time, of course, the hon. Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Randall)—unfortunately he is not here this morning—has had to apply the fuzzy decisions taken by his chief in this regard. We have seen this develop as a patchwork that looks as if it contains the seeds of political preferment. I hesitate to make that as a comment or a charge in this House and yet there is no other explanation for the reason why certain communities are designated in the EIO programme and others are not.

I would like you to take, for example, the representations made by Peterborough to the Ontario development corporation. Listen to this letter written by Mr. R. H. Ribbans, assistant secretary of the ODC, to Mayor J. J. Behan, of Peterborough, and I quote from the letter dated December 5, 1967:

> Dear Mr. Behan:
>
> The application of your municipality for registration under this programme was very carefully reviewed. We have been unable to include your municipality on the list of those that are eligible for assistance for the following reasons:
>
> (a) In the last five years there have been three new plants and six expansions adding 125 and 143 jobs respectively.
>
> (b) Total commercial and industrial assessment is $40,765,000, compared with $60,794,000 in residential assessment.
>
> The intitial listing of areas to which the programme applies will be in effect until June 30, 1969, and you may apply to have your municipality reassessed just prior to this date. If any adverse change occurs

you may also re-apply to be placed on the current listing.

Although not at present eligible under the grant programme, industries in your municipality may be considered for conventional mortgage financing.

Yours sincerely,
R. H. Ribbans,
Assistant secretary.

I need not remind the Minister of Economics and Development that 15 days later he was waited upon by a delegation from Peterborough, including the mayor, and that on January 15 of this year—

Mr. W. G. Pitman (Peterborough): And the member.

Mr. Nixon: And the member, yes, pardon me. He received a most explicit letter from the mayor setting out in detail the nature of the misconceptions which the ODC had formed in respect to the Peterborough situation. That letter pointed out that while Peterborough had had three new plants and five expansions as indicated in the original letter, Lindsay, according to its own application under the same scheme had had an increase of five new plants and five expansions for a total number of additional jobs of 390.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Well, some are more equal than others.

Mr. Nixon: Cobourg, a very equal place, had had three new plants and six expansions. The three new plants resulted in 122 additional jobs, while the number resulting from the expansions was not given, although the combined total was thought to be far in excess of that which had accrued in Peterborough.

Mr. Singer: Both are equal too?

Mr. Nixon: Both Lindsay and Cobourg had greater increases in jobs due to new plants and expansions than Peterborough had, yet both qualified for this so-called equality scheme while Peterborough did not. Similar cases have been detailed by other members in earlier debate. In my own constituency, the town of Waterford was bypassed for some time while nearby towns were recognized by EIO designation with statistics comparable to the ones, Mr. Speaker, that I have read into the record this morning.

Mr. Singer: Shame, shame!

Mr. Nixon: There is no rational explanation for the pattern of decision that has been reached by the Equality of Industrial Opportunity organization. While we on this side stand four-square for a programme that will assist the location of industry to give more even and regular development for this province, we will not stand for the sort of approach that has been taken by the government which is unfair; it cannot be justified, it smacks of political patronage, and it is surely out of date in 1968 and the years that lay ahead.

The most conservative estimate says that 80 per cent of the world's population will live in cities by the year 2000. It is predicted that there will be three super-cities in Canada, one along the St. Lawrence valley centring on Montreal, one along the Canadian shore of Lakes Ontario, Erie and Huron, and I suppose, centring on Toronto, and one along the sheltered British Columbia coast centring on Vancouver. We tend to forget in all these projections that the year 2000 is only 32 years away. It is not a science-fiction date, it is only a generation beyond us.

But an even more astonishing fact, revealed only on Monday in a United Nations seminar by Lloyd C. Gunby, chairman of the national home building association's economic research committee, is that Canada has the highest urban growth rate of any nation in the western world; 4.1 per cent are moving into cities and other urban communities each year. The corresponding growth in population is about 2 per cent. In plain words, no one in the western world has a bigger urbanization problem than Canada and no part of Canada has a bigger urbanization problem than Metro Toronto. Metro Toronto needs help from the province if the problems of such places as Los Angeles county are not to be repeated here on a scale that will make the California experience seem insignificant.

We are in the grip of change but we do not have change within our grasp. In order to seize the nettle of change in Metro development, we must give to Toronto's metropolitan government the necessary new authority to properly develop the city and, in particular, its waterfront. There have been many remarks said about the inadequacies of the present Toronto administration, headed by Mayor Dennison, in bringing about the sort of spectacular growth that we have seen in Montreal. Most of us going to Expo have been deeply impressed with what has been done there, and yet Mayor Dennison's hands have been tied—I would submit to you, Mr. Speaker—by lack of leadership at the provincial level.

There is sometimes a tendency for this government to be jealous of the growing responsibility and power of the metropolitan government of Toronto. On the other hand, there is a tendency for them to shirk their responsibility in giving the sort of leadership that is obviously needed. Everything seems to concentrate around London. There was a time, you know, when John Graves Simcoe had designated that as the capital of the province, and I may have said it before but I will say it to you again, sir, it is closer to being that now than it ever has been.

Mr. Singer: It just lacks the member for London South on the front benches.

Mr. Nixon: But he attends regularly, he is a very assiduous fellow. First, we must give Metropolitan Toronto new and powerful planning powers to suit the unique nature of its forthcoming responsibilities, as revealed in survery after survey on the urban crisis.

Second, we must negotiate with Ottawa to give the Metro council control over all of the lands along the waterfront, including the Toronto harbour commission, that are not directly used for the shipping of goods.

Third, we must support with provincial credit, major redevelopment projects which are felt to be important to the life of this city and other centres with similar problems such as Hamilton and Windsor. This should be a feature of a modern, expansionist budget.

Let me deal first with the Toronto situation. A major reason that redevelopment on the waterfront is being held up is that no one group has enough authority to initiate an integrated programme covering the whole area. At present, authority is spread among the Toronto harbour commission, Metro and some of its municipalities acting independently, the Canadian Pacific Railway, the Canadian National Railways, the Canadian national exhibition board, this government, and the owners of private property.

In Montreal, the problem was dealt with before and during Expo 67, and the result is that now everyone is aware where authority lies. Now Toronto must similarly rationalize its waterfront jurisdictions under one central planning authority, vested in Metro and backed by the provincial credit. When this is done, Toronto can become the finest capital city in North America.

In this connection, the area from the Humber—

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Provincial Treasurer): One of the finest now.

Mr Nixon: It is one of the finest, yes.

Mr. Singer: It could be better.

Mr. Nixon: I agree with the Provincial Treasurer and I trust he will agree with me, that it can become the finest. Our growth certainly has been inadequate and, in this connection, Mr. Speaker, the area from the Humber to Simcoe Street—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: The member for Grey-Bruce (Mr. Sargent) does not like that.

Mr. Nixon: A different problem entirely. The area from the Humber to Simcoe Street is of prime importance, containing, as it does: the parks of Metro and the city, the exhibition grounds, Old Fort York, the combined holdings of the two big railways south of Front Street, federal and provincial holdings to the south of the railway lands and, as I have mentioned, the harbour commission property.

Many of us drive through the area every day and we are becoming very familiar with the development that has gone on there with the Gardiner expressway. And we are also aware of the benefits that would accrue to this city and to this province, if there was a co-ordinated approach to the downtown area.

Montreal took advantage of a similar situation to develop the Queen Elizabeth, Place Bonaventure and the Place Ville Marie complex. In Toronto, the railway lands and adjoining property could contain a transportation terminal, obviously; a new hotel for the Canadian National Railways, which is evidently in the planning stage; the Canadian broadcasting corporation's regional headquarters, office buildings, restaurants and a revitalized Canadian national exhibition. If the provincial educational television studios do not form part of the centennial centre, they ought then to be linked with the new CBC headquarters for reasons of efficiency that are obvious. These are the only two reasonable alternatives.

The provincial government has been involved in two redevelopment plans for the CNE, but neither plan has taken into account the land adjoining the exhibition. The CNE must not be treated separately, it must be linked with the redevelopment of the whole waterfront area. It represents an important recreational resource just a little over a mile

from the heart of our capital. Its present weakness is that it is isolated from the life of the city, easier to skirt than to enter. Apart from trade shows, it is a dead unused space outside a period of brief activity at the end of each summer. However, the success of the Sportsmen's show last week—an event attended by close to 300,000 people, 282,000 people—has made us realize that this facility is capable of full utilization on a year-round basis, by the general public.

An enlarged CNE would become a year-round recreational complex similar to Copenhagen's Tivoli or even Montreal's LeRonde, containing a permanent midway, an aquarium, museums, Fort York, restaurants, a sports stadium and entertainment facilities.

Mr. Speaker, it is now 12 o'clock, and this is a convenient time for me to interrupt my remarks. If it is your will, sir, I would move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

NOTICE OF MOTION

Clerk of the House: Notice of motion No. 16, by Mr. Deans:

> RESOLUTION: That, in the opinion of this House, it is advisable that legislation be enacted to establish a prices review board for the purpose of investigating what seems to be, in the opinion of the board, unwarranted increases in the prices of goods manufactured or sold in the province of Ontario, by such inquiry to publicize situations where increases in price are not justifiable in the public interest, and by such publicity to inform the consumers of Ontario of the results of their investigation.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Mr. Speaker, I move resolution 16 standing in my name. I view this resolution as having embodied within it, the very finest democratic socialist principles, and for the benefit of my good friend, the Minister of Reform Institutions and his cronies, I thought that I might just define for him the democratic socialism that I am referring to.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): We are "colleagues" over here, not "cronies".

Mr. Deans: Ah, yes. It is a choice of words, as you will see in a minute. I refer, Mr. Speaker, to Funk and Wagnall's *New Practical Standard Dictionary*, one of many that are available on the market today, and if I my read from "socialism":

> The philosophy that holds that reform in social conditions may be brought about by collective effort distinguished from individualism, capitalism—

Definitely distinguished from capitalism,

> —communism and anarchism.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Deans: Hon. members do not like that one? I say it is a much better definition.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Would the hon. member mind sending that over?

Mr Deans: Yes, I would be very happy to do so.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We had better have these dictionary printers get together.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, in arising to discuss this resolution I must confess to a feeling of futility and perhaps despair, a feeling that this government has drifted so far from the affairs of our citizens that those on the Treasury benches have been so long removed from the much-needed exposure to want, if indeed any of them ever were exposed to it, that only a change in government will bring about the implementation of this much-needed legislation.

But be that as it may, the need does exist and as one who recognizes it, I will proceed to put on record some of the documentation supporting my resolution, while in the meantime uttering a silent prayer that somewhere hidden away in the self-satisfaction and the complacency so evident among the government, a member exists with some degree of compassion, no matter how small, for our citizens.

In reviewing my resolution I must first state that I recognize some of its inadequacies. Let me hasten to say that if the Prime Minster of the province would consent to implement the principles involved, I would be quite prepared to agree to include a wage review board, provided — and let me say "provided" because this is of some major significance — provided this wage review board resulted in a public disclosure of the numbers of people who are existing on the totally inadequate minimum wage, and if the subsequent change brought about would introduce into this province a minimum wage of no less than $2 per hour, thereby enabling dignity to creep into this capitalist system.

Mr. Speaker, a properly implemented prices review board would have the power to demand justification from any industry, or group of industries, who invoke price increases which in the opinion of this board were unwarranted, or when some doubt exists as to the justification of the increase. There is a growing suspicion that many of our price increases are not in any way necessary, but are based on a cold-blooded assessment of what the traffic will bear. I believe that this is borne out by the reaction of the major food industries in the prairie provinces to the then pending release of the Batten commission, and I would like to quote from the newspaper article in the *Globe and Mail* on March 15, 1968, the heading of which states: "Food chain price war precedes Batten report". I would quote from this article and it says:

> Possibly anticipating the criticism they received in the report of the Batten Royal commission investigating the cost of living in the prairie provinces, the food chains reduced prices shortly before the report was issued. The commission, headed by Judge Mary Batten of Saskatoon, alleged that excessive profits were being made by large grocery retailers in the three provinces—

Over which she had jurisdiction. The report goes on to say:

> This report made its appearance in the midst of a vigorous price war in the grocery field. It was precipitated by Westfair Foods Ltd., a subsidiary of George Weston Ltd.—

And I would say that George Weston has many, many subsidiaries.

> —which opened an Econo-Mart in a sprawling warehouse-like building, advertising warehouse savings on food.

I feel sure—and I doubt if any would criticize—that these decreases in price just would not have occurred without the fear of public disclosure resulting from the commission's investigations.

Mr. Speaker, the proposal for a price review board is not to be confused, and I stress "not to be confused," with price controls of wartime years. But the need is self-evident. The continuous price increases, in the food industry in particular in Ontario, must be investigated and where necessary checked by use of public opinion. Let me give you the benefit of the opinion of one who even in the Conservative circles I am sure would be considered to be knowledgeable, and this is Helen Gagen, the Toronto *Telegram* food editor. This was written some six months ago and it says:

> Food Prices Rise to a New Level
>
> Last year, when food prices took a sudden upward surge, I was inclined to blame consumers. This year has seen some prices increase by a third in a few months, some almost doubling. I begin to wonder to what extent wholesalers and retailers are pushing prices as far as the traffic will stand. A year ago in the fall we saw the result of a loud consumer protest at government level. For a while prices evened off and some even fell. In the past months food prices have climbed to a new plateau. Steaks are selling at $1.39 a pound.

She goes on to mention a number of things that have gone up. The producers explain that it is the old story of supply and demand with more people able to pay higher prices than ever before and buyers outside Canada buying Canada-produced fruits. She goes further into this and in another portion of this particular report she states: "Beef particularly, especially tender cuts, is starting to price itself out of reach." I think that is an understatement if ever I heard one. Producers admit that the wholesale price of steers has not increased at the rate of some retail prices, but they point out that increased numbers of people are demanding tender cuts, and why not?

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): The proletariat is rising.

Mr. Deans: And this is the food industry's answer, again I quote: "Let us face it, there is just so much tender meat to be had from one animal." I have never heard a more ridiculous reason for raising prices in my life.

I would say, too, that we could have a look at something a little more recent perhaps than that report. Some may doubt that what took place six months ago still exists. So we take a look at yesterday's *Globe and Mail*, March 21, and we see: "Steer prices lower." Why are not beef prices? We look at this report and we find out that a statement from the Ontario Department of Agriculture and Food showed that the wholesale price of good steers on March 19, 1967, was 50 cents a hundredweight more than it was on the same day of 1968, but, and this is important, the cost of the average cut has not come down, in fact it has gone up and this requires investigation without a doubt.

Mr. Speaker, surely this must serve to indicate the need for this investigation. Had this

government taken the necessary steps even six months ago we would, in my opinion, be enjoying a higher standard of living due to lower prices. But, Mr. Speaker, the increases continue. Just yesterday milk prices went up. Bread prices increased not too long ago. I might add that the milk increase announced yesterday is the second milk increase in less than a year.

I think we could take but a few brief moments to recall an incident which, in itself, I believe would provide proof of the need for a price review board. I am sure that everyone in this House can recall the sugar crisis that reigned over the North American continent, and particularly this area, a few years ago. At that time the price of sugar increased and increased and increased even more until it had gotten to the point of no return, apparently. But public pressure prevailed. It did not stay there long. It came back down, but in the meantime, the cost of all the manufactured foodstuffs using sugar also went up in price. It went up a cent a can, two cents a can, three cents—even more in some cases. Size of the product went down in many cases —as in chocolate bars, reduced in size but the price remained the same, so it resulted in the same effect.

When we take a look at this, we see the price of sugar did come back down but the price of these products just did not. They just remained where they were. These additional cents that were added to the cost of the product remained on the cost of the product and were never removed and this was unjustified. What should have happened, at that time was a government investigation but it just never came.

I believe that the implementation of such a thing as a prices review board would assist immeasurably in bringing to the public's attention these unjustified increases.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): The report says "no review board".

Mr. Deans: Which report?

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): It is right in the book. It is right in the report. It says "no review board".

Mr. Deans: I do not know what report is referred to. Perhaps at my leisure it could be sent over and will attempt to read it.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: The member should read it and understand it, and look at page 364; it says: "we recommend against—" Right in there.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, if I may refer to the Batten commission that took place on the prairie provinces and a little article that appeared in the Toronto *Globe and Mail* on Tuesday, March 5, 1968, which stated that the commission seeks the combined probe of the prairie grocery field. This article has said it is clear that the grocery trade on the prairies is making excess profit.

The largest sellers—to name them: Canada Safeway and Weston stores—have acquired sufficient pull to enable prices to rise above competitive levels, resulting in excess profits of the large chains. For 1966, excess profits were declared to have cost consumers of Winnipeg and Regina, Saskatoon, Calgary and Edmonton, in terms of reduced well-being, a total of $3.5 million, or $9.40 per family of four.

I think it would be interesting to note that the profits of the major food chains have always been maintained above the level of the average profit for manufacturing. In the year 1966—the latest result that I personally have—Dominion Stores had a percentage return after taxes of 15.92 per cent; Loblaws 14.66 per cent, Safeway 12.05 per cent, A & P 9.81 per cent, and so on. The average was 12.56 while the average for all manufacturing was only 10 per cent. I think that this in itself is sufficient evidence at least to make someone consider looking into the profit margins of the food chains. Mr. Speaker, I have no reason to doubt that the conditions that exist in the prairie provinces exist in this province too. In fact, I have every reason to believe that they do.

Now, Mr. Speaker, a question that might be asked is: Does consumer pressure really do any good? Does advertising excessive profits bring about a repentance on the part of the food lords? I think it might be interesting just to take a look at what two of their own say, and I quote from an article from the Ottawa *Citizen*, it says:

> BUYER BOYCOTTS USEFUL—LOEB
>
> Bertram Loeb, president of M. Loeb Ltd., IGA, said in an interview that the housewives protests were useful in calling attention to spiraling food costs, and their efforts did produce a decline in retail food prices.

Mr. J. H. White (London South): Oh, that is wonderful!

Mr. Deans: I think it is. Yes, I think it is wonderful, you see, because I happen to be one of the people who have to purchase food and watch my dollars.

Mr. White: A very objective authority.

Mr. MacDonald: Is the member a consumer?

Mr. Deans: The boycott caused wholesalers and retailers to become more price conscious. Let me go on from the Toronto *Daily Star,* from another gentleman who is very much involved in the grocery food chain. It is a Mr. Leon Weinstein, who is the president and general manager of Power supermarkets. He said—

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Speak kindly; be friendly to Leon.

Mr. Deans: He said:

> There is no doubt about it, Mr. and Mrs. Consumer came out of last year's rebellion a winner and rightly so.

And I think quite frankly that it is evident that even those in power in the food chains recognize the value of consumer protest and the value of public disclosure.

Mr. Speaker, the next obvious question, at least from the political viewpoint, is with the implementation of a prices review board—will it be politically acceptable?

Last year this question was placed in a survey that was conducted. It says that the question asked was whether women favoured price control by government; 78 per cent were in favour of it—78 per cent. That is almost twice what the Conservatives got in the last election.

And if we take a look, we find that in a Gallup poll that was conducted recently, the question was asked about the implementation of a consumer department: What do you think is the most important thing such a department should do for people? And the largest, by far the largest, group responded: "Control profits and prices."

Mr. Speaker, so that we do not get the opinion that all these things come from people who might be the poor people of the province, I think it would be interesting to read a few excerpts from the Bank of Montreal *Business Review* of November just to indicate what is going on, and it states that—I will be very brief:

> During the early years of the decade one of the most favourable aspects of economic environment was that employment and incomes were rising strongly without much erosion of the purchasing power of income by rising prices.

And it goes on to say that the year-by-year increase in general price levels has accelerated from 0.6 per cent in 1961 to 4.6 per cent in 1966 and has been increasing at a greater rate in Canada than in the United States. Figures for the first half of 1967 indicated that this year Canadian prices are rising at a rate comparable with that of 1966, and that rising prices might well account for more than half of the phenomenal growth of the gross national product—a condition that cannot be allowed to prevail. And if we take a look at it, we find that they state that the area which is perhaps the most prominent in the minds of all consumers is that of food costs. Rising food prices have been a major contributor to the general increase in prices throughout the 60's. They increased approximately 23 per cent since 1960.

Mr. Speaker, there is very indication that the law of the market place has lost its relevance. Evidence is that with packaging and cold storage techniques the law of supply and demand is man-manipulated and no longer satisfies the need. Let us take the steps now to ensure that the industrial barons can no longer extract, unmercifully, the very bread from the mouths of our citizens.

For heaven's sake gentlemen—through you, Mr. Speaker—show some compassion for the poor people. Thank you.

Mr. J. R. Breithaupt (Kitchener): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise to speak in favour of the principle of this resolution. The review of prices of all items should surely be kept under close public scrutiny. Where I believe I differ from the hon. member for Wentworth is that I believe that the resolution simply does not go far enough. We are all aware that the prices of goods manufactured or sold in the province of Ontario, to which this resolution refers, cannot be separated from the prices of their component parts.

In addition, there are surely other pricing conditions which can well be looked into by the board which is suggested. The prices of accommodation, which are rents, must have their rises justified; and the price of labour, which are wages, must have their increases justified. Inflationary pressures are surely harmful to all of us. The basic principles of the wage-price spiral surely need no amplification by me to the hon. members of the House. The federal government has now

created a wage-and-price review board, and if a provincial board were created to co-operate with the federal one, surely some good effect would be the result.

I congratulate the hon. member for Wentworth for calling for publicity so that any of the abuses in all three of these areas can be openly shown. If there was a provincial board to review prices and wages and rents, our provincial government would see its hopes for the present budget greatly aided. The Budget calls for activities which are supposed to be mildly expansionary. If this administration is serious in its views of the economy of Ontario for the next financial year, it must organize the board now and put it to work. The annual report of Mr. Louis Rasminsky, governor of the Bank of Canada, has called for a board of review to judge whether wage and price increases are in the public interest.

When the Prime Minister, Mr. Lester B. Pearson, announced the board, Mr. Rasminsky is reported in the *Globe and Mail* of March 13, as having observed—and I quote, as he was quoted apparently:

> I hope that the public authorities will take the lead in seeking to influence the various groups in the economy who wield market power; to relate their demands for increases in money incomes more realistically to increases in their real output than has been the case during the past couple of years.

Labour, management and consumer representatives can all legitimately represent the interests of their groups on this board. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the publicity that will result will have only the effect of moral suasion, but that this effect can be worthwhile. If it is not, then effective legislation which may be needed can be implemented. All sectors of the public must co-operate to hold the increases in rents, prices and wages in check.

If this co-operation is not forthcoming, then in Mr. Rasminsky's opinion at least, the result may well be an increase in the number of unemployed in Canada. In the ordinary case, the lesser pace of economic expansion, which we now have, would normally call for policies to stimulate demand. Instead, we have in Canada and in Ontario an aggravating upward push of costs and prices. This morning the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Nixon) has called for this government to co-operate in this area with the federal administration. It is surely vital for Ontario to take the lead in provincial co-operation in the matter. This administration has a serious responsibility in promoting our econmy so that we can continue to compete in world markets.

The federal wing of the party to which the hon. member for Wentworth belongs would probably not support this resolution as it now stands. They claim that a lack of enforcement ability would make the work of the federal board meaningless. My authority for that view is an apparent quotation from the leader of the New Democratic Party in Ottawa, and he is reported to have stated as follows by the *Globe and Mail* of March 8, 1968: "Mr. Douglas dismissed Mr. Sharp's planned wages and prices board—"

Mr. MacDonald: That is Mr. Sharp's wages and prices plan.

Mr. Breithaupt: "—as a toothless watchdog that would help nobody. The board, he predicted"—and he is apparently quoted here—"will be a glorified better business bureau located in somebody's office, collecting statistics in order to state two years after a price increase has taken place that it is not really necessary."

Mr. MacDonald: That is the way that Mr. Sharp operates.

Mr. Breithaupt: He goes on to say:

> Let me suggest to the Minister that if he is really going to grapple with rising prices, he is not going to fool the Canadian people by providing a toothless watchdog that has no power except to bite and that softly, because it is old and weak and has been given no authority by the government.

This is apparently his quote, and yet the resolution as it stands here, Mr. Speaker, refers only to the publicity that might accrue to benefit the public because of the organization and work of the prices review board.

Now the leader of the federal New Democrats continues in his views and was supposed to make the comment, and he is quoted again in this article of the *Globe and Mail* of March 8:

> The NDP, he said, would continue to press for a genuine prices review board with the power to impose selective price controls in cases where prices have risen without justification.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Ah, well, they did not say that this morning, did they?

Mr. Breithaupt: This morning we were not talking at all at that point about selective controls.

Mr. Singer: No, of course not. They did not have the courage to do it.

Mr. Breithaupt: And certainly I do not agree with this point about selective controls, because they cannot be of any effective use to the long-term benefit of our economy. Publicity of abuse in any area will bring worthwhile results. This can be the value of the board which is suggested today. Mr. Speaker, I can support this resolution with the knowledge that a review of wages as increased must be included as part of the general cost structure, as the resolution reads, in the prices of goods manufactured or sold in the province of Ontario. Let this board be created. Let it bring into the open any abuses in rents and prices, and wages. When the abuses are known, surely common sense can prevail, and if that is not enough, legislation can then be presented to this House, passed here, and then enforced.

Informed public opinion can be the most useful tool available to our economy if it is wielded by a government that is awake to its obligations. Knowledge of our problems must be clearly set out and be of immediate use to all our citizens who are in various roles of decision-making whether as to producers; as workers in a factory, or as consumers. With knowledge we can come to grips with the problems in our economy. And surely a board, structured as this is, that would have initially the value of publicity, can be of assistance in showing us where our problems lie, and in pointing to solutions.

Provincial co-operation, by setting up a review board which will work with the federal board, is surely mandatory. I trust that all members will support this first step to the publicity that we need in Ontario to correct these abuses.

Mr. J. A. Belanger (Prescott and Russell): Mr. Speaker, I feel that this resolution before us is simply another example of the irresponsible manner in which the socialist party here in Ontario attempts to deal with one of the most serious problems facing this province and this nation. Indeed, it is a world-wide problem. It was confirmed in an article in the *Evening Post* dated January 13, 1968. This article entitled "What's Happening Abroad?" by Mr. Gene Fleet indicated that Britons will be faced by higher prices in 1968, as the effects of devaluation in that country spread from imported goods to domestic goods. The indicated increase is something less than 2 per cent, with the most rapid rise in the costs of housng, coal and transit fares. In that country, although most materials used by industry have been declining in price, many industries raised product prices last year to compensate for higher labour overhead costs.

In Germany consumer prices, boosted by rising service costs, are 1 per cent higher than a year ago. In France, because of the more rapid climb in service costs such as public transportation, utilities and medical care, the consumer price index measures a rise of almost 3 per cent from a year ago. The article goes on to say that Japan's consumer price index is now nearly 6 per cent higher than a year ago.

The first point for us to bear in mind is that this situation is by no means confined to the province of Ontario, and the solution to this situation will not be brought about by anything that we alone can do in this Legislature.

I can readily appreciate, Mr. Speaker, the purely political advantages that accrue to the socialist party by their repeated attempts to place the full blame for the present economic situation in Ontario on the government of this province. But this simply will not wash.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Belanger: I also suggest that it is a most irresponsible approach to this problem to consider the aspect of prices in isolation, as this resolution seeks to do. In the lead editorial of the Toronto *Daily Star* of March 20 we read, and I quote:

> If our rate of productivity does not increase substantially then higher wages and higher profits can only be achieved by the strong—at the expenseof the weak. This is exactly what is happening. Big, tough companies are able to raise prices at the expense of the consumer; big, tightly-organized unions are able to win wage increases at the expense of the unorganized workers. Big companies and unions feel obliged to look after their own interests first. That is why they are in business.

Mr. D. Jackson (Timiskaming): Give us the $2 minimum wage.

Mr. Belanger: Many of us on this side of the House feel that the business of the socialist party and our unions is synonymous. The New Democratic Party effectively represents the views of one segment of our society alone and delights, as we have seen throughout the Throne Debate, in casting aspersions upon every industry and commercial enterprise in this province, upon the professions, including

those represented within their own party, and not least, of course, upon every department of government and the civil servants.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the remarks on Wednesday, March 20, by the chairman of the NDP caucus, the hon. member for Scarborough West, supports my contention. In attempting to rationalize his party's policies, he stated what has already become obvious to all of us in this House, that his party has moved farther to the left, they have become more radical in analysis and more aggressive in language.

"Aggressive," Mr. Speaker, is a rather polite description for some of the terms which have been hurled from the socialist benches at members of the government and others during the recent Throne debate. But this is fine; the more radical their analysis, and the more irresponsible their charges, the less credibility they will have as a potential government of Ontario.

I think it is true to say, Mr. Speaker, that on their benches beside me here, one will look in vain for a single successful businessman either large or small, or for a successful member of a large corporation, or for a successful farmer, either large or small.

An hon. member: What about the member for High Park (Mr. Shulman)?

An hon. member: Their one millionaire!

Mr. Belanger: If we remove from this province of ours its business, its agriculture, its commercial enterprise large and small, and its corporations, there is very little of substance left. Yet these wealth-producing areas are unrepresented on the socialist benches, and hence their irresponsible charges which issue from those benches and which include the resolution we are debating here today.

Mr. Deans: On a point of order.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order. Will the members please take their seats? The member has a point of order which he will state.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, my point of order is that the member for Prescott and Russell is not addressing himself to the resolution.

Mr. Speaker: I would suspect—

An hon. member: The script writer has given him the wrong script.

Mr. Speaker: The Minister took the words out of my mouth. I would suspect this would be groundwork and we will have the member proceed till we ascertain whether it is when he comes to the meat of the resolution.

Mr. Belanger: Mr. Speaker, there are two sides to every coin and it is our responsibility as legislators to consider carefully, every aspect of every problem that is presented to us here. I believe that stability in prices is of paramount importance and that it is incumbent on each of us—

An hon. member: There you go!

Mr. Belanger: —to do our part to achieve that stability.

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): Especially the government.

Mr. Belanger: We must put the public good first, and avoid taking action which would be offensive to either business or labour. The problems we face today are serious indeed and I think their gravity must be communicated to all levels of society if attempts at required restraint are to be meaningful.

We are facing a period when all of the human and intellectual resources, at all levels of government, will be tested to see whether we can sustain a desirable rate of growth, and at the same time curb inflationary trends. This is the immediate task that faces each one of us and it ranks in importance with the need to strengthen and maintain Confederation as an item of first priority.

Finding a solution to this problem will not be simple, as this resolution might indicate, but will require the combined efforts of all governments—provincial, federal and municipal—as well as the co-operation of labour and management. It will require a responsible approach from all of us. It will require a measure of restraint from every segment of society and those leaders, political and otherwise, who say differently, are doing a disservice to the people they purport to serve.

It seems a pity to me that when wage and price guidelines are being suggested as one means of voluntary restraint, almost at once some organizations announce that they reject the idea. Surely it is the responsibility of all of us at least to look at the question with an open mind, and then make a judgment, based on the facts.

Here I would like to refer to a statement by Mr. Donald MacDonald, acting president of the Canadian labour congress, as men-

tioned in the periodical *Canadian Labour* of November, 1967. I quote:

> Donald MacDonald, acting president of the Canadian labour congress, has flatly rejected a proposal by Finance Minister Mitchell Sharp for voluntary wage and price restraint. In an October 13 statement, Mr. MacDonald said he was singularly unimpressed with voluntary wage and price restraint as the best solution the Minister could apparently suggest for coping with the country's present economic ills.

He added:

> "Such action is all the more difficult to understand when one realizes that wage and price guidelines policies have met with failure in other countries where they have been tried, such as the United Kingdom and the United States."

He went on to say:

> "We are fearful that the wage and price restraint proposition which we do not believe can be effective might be used to lay the blame for any unpopular tax increase next year at organized labour's door."

At the same time, I have no doubt that Mr. MacDonald would heartily endorse the resolution before us, which seeks to control prices, while leaving wages free to continue their upward spiral.

In Mr. MacDonald's statement, mention was made of experience in the United Kingdom with this problem of inflation. There, as the members will know, they have had a prices and incomes board somewhat similar to that proposed in this resolution, except that it recognizes the part that wages play in the inflationary spiral. In *The Economist* of January 27, 1968, we read of the difficulties experienced in England from labour's unwillingness to act with restraint. The problem arose from a demand for a 7.5 per cent rise in the urban bus industry, one of the worst-managed and most over-manned industries in Britain. This demand for 7.5 per cent was well in excess of the most optimistic guesses of the trade union congress of what the country could afford as an average.

Mr. Lewis: That is the most simple-minded explanation of Britain's economic difficulties anyone has ever heard.

Mr. Belanger: No improvements in efficiency were contemplated.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Belanger: As of the date of publication, the busmen's delegates from 90 municipalities had decided to take legal action against local authorities who refused to meet the pay rise. The article goes on to say that all the responsible Minister can do is to defer the matter to the prices and incomes board.

However, this board had already reported on bus pay and recommended a maximum flat rate rise half the size demanded by the busmen. Without any teeth the prices and income board is really helpless to resolve the problem and the article suggests that the government must bring in permanent machinery for vetoing inflationary pay rises. With the latest run on the United Kingdom pound, we have seen where Mr. Wilson was finally forced to take the drastic action of a wage and price freeze.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Belanger: I think it is reasonable to suggest that if we are unwilling to adopt voluntary restraints, the situation in this country could well deteriorate to such an extent that we could be forced to adopt a similar solution to that of the United Kingdom. This year the Treasury board of Ontario took a very hard look at all departmental estimates before the Budget was presented to this House. Rigorous restraint, sir, was exercised in every area except for the most pressing needs of our growing society for education, housing, health and aid to municipalities. For the other requirements, particularly departmental activities, the government adopted a virtual "hold-the-line" attitude.

Mr. Deans: What about horse breeding?

Mr. Belanger: We hope that others throughout the province will make a similar attempt. We wish the federal government would exercise similar restraint so that all may benefit through our realistic approach to this serious problem. We must realize, as the resolution fails to do, that we are interdependent, that it is incumbent upon each of us, whatever our philosophies may be, to co-operate for the common good. For that reason I feel certain that the government of Ontario will co-operate fully with the federal government in discussions regarding the wages and prices review board suggested by the Prime Minister of Canada recently.

This review board, we are told, will not attempt to deal with price or wage rises affecting individual firms or products. It will keep an eye on national trends in wages and prices and attempt to determine whether

increases are justified. An example of an investigation for this board would be the wage parity drive by the united auto workers. The Canadian consumer initially will bear the burden in the form of higher prices. This means the union raises in pay come indirectly out of the pockets of those workers who are not organized and who do not have the same bargaining leverage.

As the push for wage parity grows, the results could well be disastrous for the nation as a whole. Parity in industries less productive than the automotive industry cannot be reached without inflation and higher export prices, which would make our goods much less competitive abroad. These matters, as well as increases in prices, must be discussed so that public opinion may be brought to bear upon the review board. To deal more specifically with this one-sided resolution before us, I think it invites a one-sided response and for that reason I would like to point out briefly some of the factors which must be considered in a prices review board.

It is obvious from the resolution that the board visualized here would be an information body only and would have no regulatory powers. This would appear to be a remarkable concession on the part of the socialists. If the board is to investigate the whole range of goods manufactured or sold in this province, I think we would agree that this would require an exceedingly large staff of permanent employees.

If these people are to do an effective job they must be very knowledgeable in the particular business under investigation. Such people are necessarily in very short supply and their services are very costly. Unless the board is prepared to investigate the whole range of goods it will be subject to charges of discrimination. It would be difficult to divorce its activities from political charges of one sort or another.

As we have already seen from the example of the United Kingdom, the board is unlikely to be effective unless it has the support of all political parties, the public, as well as management and labour. There is also another aspect which has been proven out by the British experience, as well. This stems from the time lag between the period of investigation and when the board receives its reports. The *Economist* article, which I quoted earlier, mentioned that the research carried out by the TUC was irrelevant because of the rapid changes in economy. The same situation is likely to apply here as well.

We have another problem here in Canada which stems from our geography—with the vast distance from factory to consumer, with our regional differences, and with the federal structure of our government. In addition we cannot overlook the fact that outside influences play a much greater part in our economy than in the United Kingdom, and that this is as true in the wage sector as it is on the price side of the problem. Mr. Speaker, these are only a few of the difficulties which are likely to be experienced by a wages and prices review board. It is clear, I think, that this must be organized on a national basis and that success will only be possible through the closest co-operation with provincial governments as well as labour, management and the public generally.

It would seem to me essential for governments to provide leadership in any policy of restraint, and that this restraint should be evident in their own expenditures and in the pay increases authorized to civil servants. Other segments must also play their part, and those would include our doctors, dentists, teachers, and so on. An example of this is a recent report of the boards of education getting together to agree on a 3 per cent pay increase for teachers' salaries. This is the type of responsible action which will be required of all of us if we are to rid ourselves of the spiral of inflation which exists at the present time.

I cannot support the resolution before us, but I sincerely call upon the New Democratic Party of Ontario to foresake its new radical and irresponsible policy and to join with others in this Legislature in attacking the problem rather than aggravating it.

Mr. H. Peacock (Windsor West): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. member who just spoke, the member for Prescott and Russell, harked back to remarks on this problem made by his colleague, the member for Renfrew South (Mr. Yakabuski), just about a year ago at this time. As I listened to him, and as I read over the remarks of the hon. member for Renfrew South a year ago, I was struck by the tremendous contrast in the way in which each presented his case on a very similar problem. The member for Prescott and Russell delivered at length and with great deliberation a carefully prepared discussion—even though it wandered across the ocean to the British Isles and around and back again to Canada—but a fairly deliberate presentation before arriving at his conclusion that he was not going to support this resolution. Let me contrast his presentation with

that of the member for Renfrew South just less than a year ago. Speaking on June 22, during the Budget debate, on page 5099 of *Hansard* for 1967, he said:

> Today in my Budget speech I want to dwell on a matter which I feel is of national importance—the tornado-like and leaping cost of living. I do not say "rising cost," because that is too moderate a term to describe the situation. "Leaping" is the shoe that fits. I say "tornado" because it is destroying the economy of this nation and it is destroying the very soul of our people.

Mr. Lewis: And the government applauded.

Mr. Peacock: Mr. Speaker, something has occurred between June 22, 1967, and today in the offices in which the material and the research is carried out for the members of the government, or else something has occurred in our economy that we have not been informed about and that is a moderation, perhaps, of that steeply rising rate of prices.

I suggest though, that from my observation and that of the other members of the House who are supporting this resolution, it is not anything that has happened in the economy, because the price increases are going on and on and on. But something has occurred in the offices of the government members who are preparing this material. They have suddenly decided that this is an issue which they have to dampen down even though they are not prepared to dampen down the actual price increases that are occurring each day.

Mr. Speaker, let me refer to the remarks of the leader of the Opposition this morning in the Budget debate and to the member for Kitchener who followed in this debate. I want to point out to them there is a great deal of confusion in their minds about what we are talking about here. We are talking about a prices review board, not an incomes policy, Mr. Speaker—the same kind of confusion about a prices review board function and an incomes policy existed in the mind of the member for Prescott and Russell. An incomes policy of this kind was talked about in the economic council, and was found in the economic council's third annual review to be unfeasible.

Mr. Speaker, this is what these hon. members are talking about—the kind of incomes policy that Mr. MacDonald, the acting president of the Canadian labour congress, rejected on behalf of the entire Canadian labour movement—an unworkable policy, Mr. Speaker, within the context of the Canadian economy. But it is not unworkable, Mr. Speaker, to stand up and face charges of discrimination as the member for Prescott and Russell suggests we would face. It is not unworkable to do that when you zero in on those corporate leaders in the major industries of this country who have the ability to set prices at will without regard to market pressures.

That is what we are suggesting in this resolution, that we zero in, that we face, if necessary, the charge of discrimination. Wherever you have a concentration of market power, as we do in this country, where anywhere from 60 to 100 per cent of the total output of an industry such as automobiles or rubber—and in some cases in the food industry—is controlled by a few corporations—say six or less, and in our major manufacturing industries in this country far fewer than six, often account for almost 100 per cent of the production—then you have these corporations in a position just as though they enjoyed a virtual monopoly.

I suggest that the only way to deal with this is through such a mechanism—such as a prices review board. The scepticism that the hon. leader of the Opposition referred to on the part of the federal leader of the New Democratic Party, when he greeted Mr. Sharp's announcement of a so-called prices review board which would deal with the general trends in price and wage increases, is very well founded indeed if you look at the experience in Ottawa under the present administration there dealing with unwarranted price increases.

Let me take you back, Mr. Speaker, to 1966, when the Steel Company of Canada announced a substantial price increase for a wide range of its products. The Minister of Finance said, "No, I cannot permit this, this is not justified." How did he make up his mind? How did he make up his mind that this increase was not justified at that time? He did not explain, and it is beyond us how he came to that conclusion, but the Steel Company of Canada acknowledged itself as spanked by the Minister of Finance for the time being.

When the attention of the Minister of Finance was diverted to another serious financial problem shortly after, the Steel Company of Canada and other major steel producers in this country, following the example of their counterparts in the United States, made very quiet and selective adjustments over a period of time so that they accomplished exactly what they had been told not to accomplish by the Minister of Finance in one block.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Sharp was just bluffing.

Mr. Peacock: Let us take another example, Mr. Speaker, of the Minister of Finance's handling of this problem. In 1966, the fall of 1966, when 1967 model cars were being introduced on the market, we have again an example of this capricious and arbitrary manner in which unjust price increases are handled by the federal administration. There was no justification whatever for this, in the light of the profits that these manufacturers were making; in light of the substantial savings that the industry was making through the automotive trade agreement in the terms of complete elimination of tariffs on the importation of original cars and equipment; and in the substantial savings that these companies were going to achieve through the rationalization of their facilities and integration with the United States firms.

But in that instance, the Minister said, "No, there is no justification for me to intervene." When the matter was referred to the consumer credit committee sitting there under the chairmanship of Senator Croll and Mr. Basford, the credit consumer committee said, "No, we are too busy to deal with this matter at this time." They paid no attention to it at this time. Now how, in one instance, in the case of Stelco, could the federal government intervene, although ineffectively, then again, in another instance of flagrant price abuse and one aimed directly at the consumer, could it refuse to intervene? I suggest that this anomaly is justification for the kind of price review that we are asking for.

Let me touch on one other matter before the motion is discharged. The federal prices review board has not got any teeth, because as I have already indicated, as has the member for Prescott and Russell, it is concerned only with general wage and price levels, and I have said that we have to zero in on particular price leaders in our major industries. If we do this, Mr. Speaker, we propose a mechanization like an office of consumer counsel, a permanent public agent acting on behalf of the public whose duty it is to investigate matters about pricing referred to him from the commission or the price review board on behalf of members of the public. Not only will he have to sit around waiting for these referrals, once a corporation gives notice—as it must do surely under this type of mechanization—that it has to increase its prices, he should have the power to initiate investigations so that in an industry like farm machinery and automobiles, like food packing, like steel, where the productivity increase has been spectacular, the consumer counsel—the agent representing the consumer interest—can say, "This industry is enjoying a level of productivity which not only does not justify price increases, but calls for price reductions and the passing on to the consumer of the savings that the industry is enjoying."

Mr. Speaker, I know that these resolutions are not voted upon, but I predict that within the next few years we will have such a public scrutiny of prices and the public will know whether or not they are justified.

Mr. White: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, the hon. member for Wentworth quoted from the report of the Royal commission on consumer problems and inflation of the provinces of Manitoba, Alberta, and Saskatchewan, and inadvertently left the impression that this committee had recommended a prices review board. I think that in the interest of accuracy, page 364 of the recommendation should be quoted:

> This commission recommends against the creation of a prices reveiew board, price control boards or guideline policies. These are much more apt to conceal the real problems underlying and causing inflation, and to confuse the issues, than they are to achieve any substantial success.

Mr. Speaker: This order is now discharged.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister: Mr. Speaker, on Monday I would like to deal with the second reading of Bills 46, 47, 48, and then we will resume the Budget debate.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 1:00 o'clock, p.m.

No. 35

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

First Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Monday, March 25, 1968

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1968

5

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Monday, March 25, 1968

Announcing appointment of Mr. Arthur Maloney to membership on MACTO, Mr. Grossman 1147

Questions to Mr. Robarts re the Niagara escarpment conference, Mr. Nixon 1147

Questions to Mr. Davis re interim school organization committees, Mr. Nixon 1148

Question to Mr. Davis re anti-smoking campaigns in schools, Mr. Edighoffer 1149

Questions to Mr. Wishart re John Ridge, Hugh Smith and Richard Gillet, Mr. Nixon 1149

Questions to Mr. Wishart re Magistrate Coon, Mr. De Monte 1153

Question to Mr. Lewis re Brown Camps Limited, Mr. Kennedy 1153

Questions to Mr. Gomme re Lorne Park station, Mr. Innes 1155

Question to Mr. Brunelle re hunting and fishing by Indians, Mr. T. P. Reid 1155

Questions to Mr. Grossman re Middlesex county jail, Mr. Burr, Mr. Bullbrook 1155

Question to Mr. Dymond re children with cerebral palsy, Mr. Martel 1156

Question to Mr. Stewart re milk producers, Mr. Martel 1156

Question to Mr. Dymond re drug addiction, Mr. Gaunt 1156

Questions to Mr. Connell re dairy barn at Elora substation, Mr. Spence 1156

Questions to Mr. Randall re Ontario housing corporation, Mrs. M. Renwick 1158

Question to Mr. Yaremko re comfort allowances to persons in chronic hospitals, Mr. Shulman 1158

Question to Mr. Randall re government housing units, Mr. B. Newman 1158

Question to Mr. Wishart re Magistrate Kurata, Mr. Nixon 1159

Question to Mr. Randall re wage parity in the automobile industry, Mr. MacDonald 1160

Family Benefits Act, 1966, bill to amend, Mr. Yaremko, second reading 1161

General Welfare Assistance Act, bill to amend, Mr. Yaremko, second reading 1161

Vocational Rehabilitation Services Act, 1966, bill to amend, Mr. Yaremko, second reading 1161

On notice of motion No. 18, Mr. Meen, Mr. T. Reid, Mr. Lawlor, Mr. Bukator, Mr. Snow 1172

Resumption of the debate on the Budget, Mr. Nixon 1180

Recess, 6 o'clock 1182

Errata 1182

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

MONDAY, MARCH 25, 1968

The House met at 2:30 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: Today we have as our guests in the west gallery pupils from Central Peel secondary school, Brampton; at 3:30 this afternoon we will be joined in both public galleries by people from the Ryerson polytechnic institute, Toronto. I am sure we welcome the young people who are with us now.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I wish to announce the appointment of Mr. Arthur Maloney, QC, to membership on the Minister's advisory council on the treatment of the offender.

Formed in 1953, the Minister's advisory council on the treatment of the offender, which includes distinguished representatives from the judicial, legal, educational, rehabilitation and ministerial professions, acts in an advisory capacity to the Minister.

Mr. Maloney graduated from St. Michael's college, University of Ottawa, and Osgoode Hall. He was called to the bar of Ontario in 1943 and created Queen's counsel in 1953. He is a bencher of the law society of Upper Canada. An honorary degree of Doctor of Laws was bestowed upon him in 1961 by St. Dunstan's University, Charlottetown.

Mr. Maloney is an outstanding member of the legal profession. His vast experience in criminal law, and his interest in criminology make him a most valuable addition to the advisory council.

Hon. J. A. C. Auld (Minister of Tourism and Information): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I would like to draw the members' attention to the very colourful brochure which has been placed on their desks today. This is a completely new booklet for use by The Department of Tourism and Information to attract tourists to our province.

We call it our major lure book, and as last year it will be complemented by a series of regional booklets with more specific details on the attractions of the various regions of our province.

Members may be interested to know that we are planning a press run of 450,000 of these booklets, of which 50,000 will be in French. The distribution in the United States will total about 250,000 and the remainder will be distributed in Canada and abroad.

No doubt some of the members may wish additional copies and my office will be happy to make extra ones available. I would stress, however, that we cannot undertake to supply these in quantity for distribution within Ontario, which would be defeating our own purpose and, in many cases, would be a duplication.

Mr. B. Gilbertson (Algoma): Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity of bringing to the attention of the hon. members that, being from St. Joseph's island and as this is maple syrup time, the page boys are going to place a little maple candy leaf on your desk—compliments of the maple syrup producers of St. Joseph's island.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Premier.

In view of the comments by James Woodford, executive director of the federation of Ontario naturalists that:

> Ontario has rather a poor record with respect to making funds available for the purchase of land for parks and outdoor recreation.

I believe this was said at the Niagara escarpment conference—will the Premier indicate why the government has only spent $12 million under the land acquisition programme he announced in 1962 or 1963?

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I can say that as of a year ago, the amount that we had spent on this programme was over $15.5 million, rather than the $12 million in the question. This was a programme announced to be based over a period

of 20 years, and, of course, ever since it was announced in that form it has been considered a fair assumption that we were to spend $10 million a year because that would be 20 years divided into $200 million.

That is not our programme; our programme is to see what lands are available and to acquire them at the best possible price we can. The figures that I have been able to gather in the time available, indicate that since the programme was announced up until a year ago, March, 1967, we had acquired approximately 149,000 acres at a cost of some $15.6 million.

This programme is continuing all the time. We have properties presently under negotiation and we want to acquire the property that we deem necessary. At the same time, we have to have some respect for the amounts of money that are available for all the demands that are made upon this government.

I can assure the hon. leader of the Opposition that the programme continues and I think, if I were to get into the statistics of the thing, I would be able to demonstrate that Ontario has more parkland per unit of population—and this was true at least a year or so ago—available for recreation in the form of parks and so on in Ontario per capita, than any jurisdiction in North America. We really have a great deal of land available and this is, as I say, an on-going programme. There are very few members who are not affected by it or not aware of what we are doing in their particular areas, in terms of conservation authorities and what we do within the provincial park system and with municipal parks. It is all part of the total programme so that while Mr. Woodford may think we have rather a poor record, I think, perhaps statistically, I would be able to demonstrate that we have rather a good record.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, if the Premier would permit a supplementary question.

He is aware of the fact that Mr. Woodford's remarks were associated with the Niagara escarpment development conference and that I also am associated with this. He was quite critical of the fact that the government sent no representatives whatsoever to that conference and not even represented us from the Premier's or the government's Niagara escarpment study group.

I wonder if the Premier is aware of any explanation for this lack of interest that would lead Mr. Woodford to this conclusion?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I read this news report, of course, myself and I do not know who sponsored the conference, but certainly the fact that we were not represented there, I can assure you—while I have no explanation of it at the moment because it is not included in this question—it is not a question only of finding out for you. I will find out for my own information. But, all I can say is that it does not indicate any lessening of our interest in the Niagara escarpment. Nor does it indicate that what we are planning to do in that area as embodied in plans that have been announced at one time or another, has been abandoned, altered or that our enthusiasm for them has waned.

Mr. Nixon: They were announced a year ago.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Well all right. If the leader of the Opposition read the full report of what happened there, he will find that there are a great many conflicting interests involved in this, and we are charged with the responsibility of doing it and in due course we will make a report to the House as to what we have done. But, in the meantime, I simply want to assure you that there is no lessening of our interest in the whole problem.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): The Liberal Party had no representatives there either.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Education.

Who is expected to pay travelling and other expenses for the members of the interim school organization committees?

How is provision made for secretarial and administration expenses for these committees?

Do members qualify for additional per diem payment of any kind, and was there any direction on these matters made available to the school boards or the committees at the time of the original white paper, or subsequently?

Mr. Speaker: I wonder if before the Minister answers that, I could ask him when he has finished answering this question to give us the answers to a number of questions which were placed last week and which the Minister promised me he would have some time this week for us.

Hon. W. G. Davis (Minister of Education): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would be delighted to do that and in answer to the leader of the Opposition's question:

The answer to the first part of the question is that it is assumed that the responsibility of the boards will exist for the payment of the expenses to those members on the interim committee; this has been made known to them.

With respect to the secretarial or administrative expenses of the committee, as I explained in answer to another question two or three weeks ago, Mr. Speaker, this varies from one interim committee to another. In some instances perhaps one of the senior boards, or larger boards, are actually providing the material. In some cases the consultative committees have obtained a great deal of it and our regional offices have been instructed that they can make secretarial and administrative help available to the interim committees if it is so desired.

With respect to question No. 3, we do not anticipate any additional honoraria being paid to the members of the interim committee but, as I said in answer to question No. 1, they do qualify for compensation from their boards. These matters have been discussed with the interim committees, by the regional superintendents. The procedures are not identical in each county.

Mr. Speaker: Will the Minister give the answers?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have answers here to three or four questions. I was just checking and I do not see the hon. members who asked the questions here present this afternoon, with one exception, and I was wondering if I might wait until they are here, because I am sure they would be anxious to be here when the answers are given.

Mr. Speaker: Yes, the only reason I mentioned it was because it was an unusual procedure last week, and I wished the members to know that the Minister had co-operated.

The leader of the Opposition has a further question?

Mr. Nixon: Is there one answer that the Minister would like to give to the hon. member?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes, I believe there is a question from the member for Perth (Mr. Edighoffer), Mr. Speaker, relating to anti-smoking campaigns in Owen Sound and Lindsay. Very briefly I might point out that the programme consultants of The Department of Education in physical and health education who assist teachers in those areas where anti-smoking campaigns are being conducted, have been active in the programmes of this nature for some time. They are working with the teachers in the schools which are involved in the community wide campaigns and, of course, other officials of the department have been involved in the planning of these programmes providing, therefore, every possible support for these valuable projects.

The hon. member was not a member at that time, but in 1964 an information kit was sent to every school teacher in the province. The materials found in this kit included medical publications, descriptive booklets, illustrations suitable for classroom bulletin boards and for discussion within the classroom itself. Films which give the scientific results of modern research with respect to the effects of the use of tobacco are available to schools from The Department of Education. In addition, the textbooks on health which have been approved provide additional data for the students.

The curricula in physical education and health which are issued by the department as guides for the teachers in the schools include the topic of smoking and health from grade 4 to grade 12 and the students learn why people smoke and discuss why people should not smoke—in other words, they are being involved in, shall we say, the discussion type approach. They study the history of the use of tobacco, its chemical and physical characteristics, and the research that is being done in this matter and the health aspects of the use of tobacco and, Mr. Speaker, this is—as perhaps the hon. member is aware—part of the regular physical and health education programme within the school system.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Attorney General. Will the Attorney General consider compensation for John Ridge, age 34, who was held in Don jail for six weeks awaiting trial, but was released on Friday last when the prosecution dropped the charge for lack of evidence?

Will the Attorney General take all the necessary steps to assure Hugh Smith and Richard Gillet, the others charged with John Ridge and held in Don jail for six weeks, that they will have their trial immediately?

Will the Attorney General indicate why substitute legal aid lawyers were not engaged in this case in view of the fact that the case did not proceed on March 6 and March 14 because of the lack of available legal aid?

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I have not considered compensation for John Ridge, age 34, who was

released from custody after the charge upon which he was held was withdrawn by the prosecution.

I am advised, Mr. Speaker, that the charges against Hugh Smith and Richard Gillet have been dealt with as expeditiously as possible, but it must be remembered that these men are represented by counsel whose duty it is to advise them of all their rights.

With regard to the third question, Mr. Speaker, the selection of counsel is a matter for the person charged. It may well be that this accused did not desire alternate counsel to take the case. As you know, Mr. Speaker, time is required to instruct counsel in order that the case may be presented in court and I would not impose other counsel on an accused in order that the trial could commence.

I would like to say further that one of the underlying principles of our legal aid plan is that there is freedom of choice to choose and select counsel. I would not want to get into the precedent or the routine of saying to the accused, "You must take someone named by the Minister or by someone in the administration of justice. Ye must take such a person as your counsel."

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question that really asks for an opinion of the Attorney General. I will put it to him and he could, perhaps, give me his views if he chooses to do so.

He must be aware of the fact that Mr. Ridge was held for six weeks in Don jail on $500 bail which he was not able to raise and then, after that time, his case was dismissed. Surely there is an area here where the Attorney General might take steps to improve the situation, because those people observing it from Mr. Ridge's point of view must feel that he has been poorly served by our system of justice?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, the hon. leader of the Opposition is good enough to say this is a matter of opinion and, therefore, perhaps I would not be called upon to answer. But I would point out that there are many situations in the administration of justice—not necessarily just persons held in custody or held on bail. Persons come before the courts, perhaps on very serious charges. They may spend perhaps weeks, or even months, in the course of a trial, be put to much expense and loss of time and the evidence goes to a certain point. They are tried before a judge, or a judge and jury, and there is a great deal of evidence on one side as to their guilt, a great deal of evidence on the other side as to their innocence and they are freed. Does the hon. member suggest that in all those cases because the court finds the evidence does not convict, that those persons must all be compensated?

I think it should be pointed out—

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): But the Crown withdrew the charges.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I know, I realize this.

Mr. Nixon: The $500 bail was prohibitive for him.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I am pointing out that there are situations in the whole administration of justice. Our principle which we follow is that it is far better that 90 guilty persons go free or 100 go free, rather than that one innocent person be convicted.

That principle, I think, is recognized and I would not want to say that in this case, because the Crown withdrew the charges, that there was not evidence which justified his arrest in the first place, insofar as the Crown could judge. These were narcotics cases and the other two who are being held are being tried on those charges.

I am suggesting to the hon. member that in the whole administration of justice, there are necessarily situations where persons must suffer monetary loss, expense, embarrassment, perhaps, and spend time before the bar of justice and be freed; but justice must work in this way. If the hon. member is suggesting that in every case that a person comes before the bar of justice, and there is not evidence to convict him, and a jury or a judge frees him, that he should be recompensed. I think this would be a very far reaching principle which we have not accepted yet.

Mr. Nixon: One more supplementary question, if you will permit, Mr. Speaker, and the Attorney General. The point here really is that the $500 bail would not normally be considered prohibitive, but it certainly was in his case. The decision taken by the bench in this particular case would surely have allowed anyone else to have his freedom for that six weeks while the Crown was gathering their evidence. This was not possible under these circumstances.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I think I would like to speak to that, Mr. Speaker. As I have pointed out more than once in this House, the matter of bail and the procedures that relate to it, are laid down in the criminal code. The amount, the discretion as to how much bail

is required, what type of bail, whether it is a personal recognizance, whether it is a surety, whether it is a monetary amount, or whether it is property, is within the discretion of the magistrate or the judge who sits on the bench. With this, apart from studying, holding seminars and studies, endeavouring to establish certain principles which our courts would apply, I do not think the hon. member would suggest that a Minister of the Crown, who is by virtue of his standing in the House and being a Minister there—a political person—should go to the court and say, "You should only require this amount of bail, or you should require no bail."

I think this must be left to a judicial person; surely we must not interfere, apart from endeavouring to establish reasonable and just principles, in a specific case and say, that bail was too large or too small. The only way we can do that, is through our Crown attorney by suggesting that we would be satisfied with a lesser amount of bail. But, to take a specific case and say that this was unjustifiable in the circumstances—perhaps that is so, but the discretion of the bench of our judiciary must not be interfered with. Perhaps we can mould the thinking of people who administer justice with respect to certain principles but I will hesitate a long time before I go into a specific case and say, "Let this fellow off light."

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): The government has no principles about bail procedures.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Oh, yes we do have principles.

Mr. Singer: The Minister could tell the Crown attorneys what to suggest.

Mr. Speaker: Order, does the member for York South wish the floor?

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I have a point of order which I would like to draw to your attention and through you, to the Minister of Reform Institutions. On Thursday last, March 21, according to the typewritten transcript of *Hansard* which is not yet available in its printed form, the Minister, on a question of privilege before the orders of the day, is quoted as saying in part:

> A report in today's press states that I made certain assurances to Mr. John Caulfield, president of local 878 of the Canadian union of public employees.
>
> I wish to make it clear that I did not speak to Mr. Caulfield today, nor to my knowledge have I spoken to him at any time regarding issues reported in the press, including the posting of notices on the bulletin boards at Don jail.

That is the end of the quotation, Mr. Speaker. As those who have read the press will be aware, on Saturday, we were informed that Mr. Caulfield has resigned his position in Don jail, because he felt that this was the only way that he could avoid another walkout—the reason being that the staff are so exercised over what they feel is a breach of contract, in not permitting the posting of notices on the bulletin board, which was permitted on the old contract.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, may I interject on a matter of privilege? May I have your ruling on that?

Mr. MacDonald: May I finish? The Minister will see in a minute when I fill in the background that it is a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: If you will finish your point.

Mr. MacDonald: Either the Minister informed the House, misinformed the House, or else somebody else was impersonating the Minister in calls to the Don jail last Wednesday morning.

According to my information this is what happened. Last Wednesday, at 9:30, a telephone call was received by the guard on telephone duty, one Mr. Rennie, who passed it on to Mr. Caulfield. Mr. Caulfield indicated that he was not in a position to take a phone call; he was on duty and it would have to go through the office.

He then received instructions from the assistant deputy governor, one Mr. Cole, that he should go to the magistrate's room and take a call from Mr. Grossman, which he did. Mr. Caulfield contends that he knows the Minister's voice, and never at any point doubted that it was the Minister. In the course of the discussion this man, purporting to be the Minister, discussed the question of postings on the bulletin board and indicated that he thought that the union under the contract had the right to do so.

Now, Mr. Speaker, one of two things happened. Either the Minister wittingly, or otherwise misinformed the House, or somebody is impersonating him in calls to the Don jail. Either—

An hon. member: Or impersonating him.

Mr. MacDonald: The member is suggesting that Mr. Caulfield is misinforming.

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Minister of Municipal Affairs): The member is suggesting that the Minister apparently is lying. I think that the reverse could be equally true, couldn't it?

Mr. MacDonald: I am suggesting that this House is entitled to an investigation—to an explanation in the first instance—and that if the explanation is not a satisfactory one, I think that it is entitled to an investigation. I would think that the Minister would like to know who is calling on the phone on his behalf, if he was not calling himself.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Now, Mr. Speaker, on this matter: I did not misinform the House. I informed the House on my honour, as a member of this House, and a Minister of the Crown, that I never spoke to Mr. Caulfield on the telephone at that time, nor as far as I can recall, at any time about anything. I think that it is ill-becoming the member to suggest on such flimsy information that there was a possibility that I misinformed the House, because some man said that he got a call which he thinks was from me. Now, how in the world—if I thought it was possible by having an investigation to establish who might have called Mr. Caulfield, if somebody did suggesting that it was I—how would I ask for such an investigation?

How in the world you can establish that? I do not know.

But again I want the hon. member to get up and accept my statement that I did not speak to Mr. Caulfield. As a matter of fact, at the time that Mr. Caulfield said that I was speaking to him, I was at a staff meeting at my office.

Now, I have asked the hon. member to get up and accept my statement as an hon. member of this House.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I am glad to get up and accept the Minister's statement. But I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that somebody is responsible for discovering what happened in this instance. If the hon. Minister wants us to accept his word, I suggest that the word of Mr. Caulfield—who having resigned his position to avoid a walkout—

Mr. Speaker: Order! Order! The Minister has replied and stated as a member that he did not do that which has been alleged, and of course this House does not have the other party to the reported conversation before it.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Minister a supplementary question?

Mr. Speaker: Let me finish first. The member for York South has accepted it as should be done. Now if the member has a supplementary question that is not a statement, I will be glad to have him put it, and if the Minister wishes to answer it, he may.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, on a factual point, Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions this? After the alleged call to Mr. Caulfield on Wednesday morning, did the Minister call to have the governor come up, and did the governor come up and visit him for some length in his office?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I had a meeting in my office because there was trouble brewing at the Don jail, and I had the governor up to find out what it was all about. It was at that time that the governor advised me that the rumour was floating around the Don jail, that I had in fact gone over the governor's head and spoken to Mr. Caulfield about a matter, and this of course upset the governor very much. That is why it was important for me to make the statement, because there was some attempt to create at Don jail a cleavage between staff and the top echelon of the staff, the governor, and his assistants, by a suggestion that I was, in fact dealing directly with Mr. Caulfield.

I wanted to make it quite clear that there are channels of communication in my department and in every jail, as there are in every department of government, and in fact that Mr. Caulfield would have had to carry through those same channels of communication as anyone else would. Now, I am not too clear yet, Mr. Speaker, even you have said so, that the hon. member has accepted my statement. I made no such call, nor did I speak to Mr. Caulfield at any time. As a matter of fact, if there is anything going to be said about this, perhaps in the future we will go into the matter of who is creating or attempting to create trouble at the Don jail, and who is responsible for such trouble if it erupts.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. Minister is still—after listening to the English language in simple terms—not comprehending, may I tell him that I have withdrawn any suggestion that he misled the House. I draw to your attention, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister has now conceded that he had a meeting with the governor of the Don jail, and my information was that he requested—

Mr. Speaker: Order, order!

Mr. MacDonald: —the governor to come up after the alleged—

Mr. Speaker: Order, order!

Mr. MacDonald: —call from him went to Mr. Caulfield.

Mr. Speaker: Order. This matter has been explored and the point of order has been dealt with. If he has a further one, he can deal with it another time by question or otherwise. The member for Dovercourt has the floor.

Mr. D. M. De Monte (Dovercourt): Mr. Speaker, I have a question to the hon. Attorney General. Is the Attorney General aware that Magistrate David Coon said in a Toronto court on Friday that a grand jury, which recommended that tougher bail standards would be applied to persons with records of crimes of violence were a bunch of housewives? In view of that statement, will the Attorney General proceed to implement the bail recommendations in the McRuer report?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: It is curious to note that this is a question where a magistrate on the bench was objecting that the bail asked was too great and refusing the substantial amount of bail as was asked. The other question today was from the other point of view. The answer to this question is that I am aware of the report of the comment made by Magistrate Coon, and I dissociate myself from it. If he indeed made such a comment as was attributed to him in the press, then I do not agree with his view of the grand jury.

The report of the Hon. J. C. McRuer, Mr. Speaker, is receiving consideration in all its aspects, including those relating to bail.

Mr. R. D. Kennedy (Peel South): I have a question for the hon. member for Scarborough West.

Did officials of Brown Camps Limited consult with members of the Chinguacousy township council regarding the company's plans to purchase homes in Bramalea, for use as treatment centres prior to the purchase of the houses?

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Mr. Speaker, may I preface my reply by indicating to the House that I did call you on Friday morning last to clear the matter of questions being directed to private members, recognizing that if the practice became current, the question period might never end in this House, and I appreciate the opportunity you gave for a full reply.

Mr. G. Demers (Nickel Belt): I feel the same way.

Mr. Lewis: The answer to the member's question is "no" for the following reasons, which I hope will commend themselves to the member and to the House.

One; the houses in Bramalea were purchased for the purpose of accommodating therapeutic families in the community. With the sole exception of blood relationship, such Brown Camps' families are meant to approximate as closely as possible any normal family in nature. There are usually four children to a house. They vary in age and sex and their full time child care staff assume parenting roles and relationships in respect to the children. Just as a regular family does not consult township officials before purchase of a home, so do we think that therapeutic families should not have to submit to such a screening process.

Two; we did, of course, inform the builders of the Bramalea suburban city of our intended use of the homes at the time we purchased them. I might say that Bramalea consolidated showed a most heightened sense of social responsibility in facilitating purchase arrangements for the treatment houses to which the member refers.

Three; community mental health is an oft-abused objective. While everyone—individuals, social agencies, departments of government—would doubtless wish to see mental health programmes firmly rooted in the community, such programmes are often subject to abuse from a tiny minority whose expression of discontent is sufficient to kill the objective. Thus the Catholic children's aid society was recently forced to vacate a group home in Etobicoke. It has taken years for the same society to run the gamut of bureaucracy for approval of a similar home in Scarborough; and all of us remember the sad shutdown of the Clifton Road after-care home for former female patients of the Toronto Ontario Hospital.

Fourth; experience, Mr. Speaker, shows that to clear all channels is to invite unwarranted opposition. Experience also shows that where therapeutic families can live in the community for an appreciable time, the community relationships grow to be excellent, even though occasional opposition from a local council may persist.

Five; where such opposition results in the laying of a breach-of-bylaw charge, as in the case of Scarborough, we are prepared to go to court to contest the issue. Moreover, even when the bylaw is upheld at magistrate's court level, we are prepared to appeal.

Indeed, in every such case we will appeal, if necessary, to the highest court in the land, confident that at some level in the judicial process, bylaws which tend to discriminate against children will be declared invalid. Our own legal counsel believe that a therapeutic family sufficiently parallels any family in a residential zoning area so that the point will one day be won.

There is no wish to be provocative in all of this, Mr. Speaker, although we know that bits and pieces of irrational prejudice will always be directed against those in this society who suffer mental or physical disability. But just as the Ontario housing corporation does not prejudice the future of its geared-to-income families by announcements in advance of purchase, so we have adopted the same principle.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, it is our hope that in the life of this Parliament, government might amend the general legislation and prohibit bylaw abuse directed against halfway houses, aftercare homes, group homes, treatment homes, or what have you. Surely it is in the interest of government to see that community mental health cannot be delayed or violated by so petty a strategem?

That is surely what is at the core of this question. At the moment almost every children's aid society, or children's institution, or government department—and there are scores of them in Ontario—is frustrated in its efforts to care for people in the community by unrelated community prohibitions. As a result, all of us tend to place children and adults in closed settings, large and conglomerate, away from urban centres. Most would agree that such a policy is inconsistent with good treatment principles, and that it caters to a very small element in the community indeed.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. While I am always glad to hear the member for Scarborough West speak in this House—and I find his points this afternoon particularly well taken—I certainly would protest against your permitting a continuation of a practice of asking questions of private members by private members. Surely the question period should be used for the membership in general to question the Ministry? The last time this occurred was when a question from this side was to be directed to the hon. member for Haldimand-Norfolk (Mr. Allan) in his capacity as chairman of the Niagara parks commission. It was my view that when there is not a Minister responsible for some particular area of jurisdiction, as in that particular case, that the Premier of the province might very well accept the responsibility, which I believe he would be prepared to do to answer such questions. I know you are of the feeling, sir, that the rules permit this type of question but, speaking as the leader of the Opposition, I must protest against this practice.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, on the same point of order, may I say that the last time this "half occurred was" when a question was put to me, and reached my office from the hon. member for Grey South (Mr. Winkler) and then before 2:30 o'clock of that day it was withdrawn.

I was puzzled at the time. I would agree that if the government and you, sir, with your eyes wide open, wish to permit the asking of questions by any member of any member in this House, that is a decision we can collectively make, but I suggest that this is something that we should consider rather carefully.

Mr. Speaker: I would say that the leader of the Opposition is quite correct that the whole problem arose from a question from his party caucus. At that time I certainly considered that it was quite proper, because it was directed to a member with respect to his duties as a member. I also feel that a wide construing of this particular rule is not going to be beneficial to the proceedings of this House so far as the business of the province is concerned.

But it is also my opinion that the rule 37(a) as it now is worded does not give me the right, without the approval of the House, to say that we will not have questions of private members by other members on matters in which they are interested as members of this House.

I do welcome the official expression of views here by the leaders of the Opposition and of the New Democratic Party, and I anticipate that the leader of the government would be likewise agreeable, because it is the government that has the responsibility for moving business in the House.

Oh, yes, indeed. The clerk has advised me that the questions must be connected with the business of the House. So far they have been, because all the matters which have arisen have either been raised in the House previously or are matters of parks commissions or government commissions.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, I am always a little reluctant to place any inter-

pretation on the rules of the House as they exist that could possibly be construed as an attempt by the government to muzzle the Opposition. This has been a recurring theme as far as the Opposition is concerned over the years that I have sat here and certainly I would do nothing to encourage it. If the rules say that these questions are permissible that is what the rules say.

Now the rules may be altered by the House as you have pointed out, sir, and this suggestion having come from the other side of the House, I would be quite prepared to consider what our position might be. We have made quite a few changes in the rules in the last three or four years, I think all directed to more open and freer discussion in the House. These changes have been accomplished by consultation between the three parties and by agreement. I would be quite prepared to enter the discussion with the leaders of the two other parties to see if we cannot reach an agreement on this point that would be acceptable to the whole House.

Mr. Nixon: Speaking to just that point, Mr. Speaker, I must say it was my understanding, having discussed this on some other occasions, that we would avoid these questions and maintain the period as a question period directed toward the Ministry on the affairs for which they are responsible.

It just occurs to me, sir, that while you say this House may, quite conveniently, change the rules, I am not just sure how convenient that is. As you know, we have endeavoured on previous occasions to have rules committees set up, with little success in this regard. I am not convinced that the three leaders meeting under your chairmanship, sir, can accept this continuing responsibility in view of the fact that there are, from time to time, items such as this that perhaps should be put to the House as a whole.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: My thought, Mr. Speaker, is that if we three agree then one could assume that if it were put to the House it would be accepted. If this assumption is incorrect then we will deal with that when we come to it.

Mr. Kennedy: Mr. Speaker, in the light of the reply which was "No," would the hon. member accept a supplementary question?

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, in the spirit of what has been said in the House, I think I should decline further participation and would be pleased to discuss things with the member subsequently.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, if Cabinet Ministers insist on a reply, I am sure the hon. member for Scarborough West has no objection.

Mr. Speaker: The supplementary question has been declined and I must say that I would agree with the member in declining under the circumstances, any supplementary question.

Mr. G. W. Innes (Oxford): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Highways.

Has the Minister received representations from the citizens of Lorne Park for the continuation of the twice daily passenger service of the Lorne Park station?

Will the Minister assure the residents that the service will not be discontinued?

Hon. G. E. Gomme (Minister of Highways): Mr. Speaker, the answer to number one is, "Yes;" and number two is "No."

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Lands and Forests, notice of which has been given.

In view of the historic villages of Indians on reservations in our province, and in view of the special position of the Indian community in our society, will the Minister permit our native population to continue to hunt and fish without the imposition of licences?

Hon. R. Brunelle (Minister of Lands and Forests): Mr. Speaker, in reply to the hon. member for Rainy River, provincial regulations do not apply to the Indians on reservations, therefore, they do not require the provincial licence on these lands. In other areas where Indians retain treaty rights on lands that have not been leased or deeded by the Crown, these Indians do now, and will continue to hunt and fish without licences.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Sandwich-Riverside.

Mr. F. A. Burr (Sandwich-Riverside); Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Reform Institutions.

In view of a grand jury's recent description of "despicable" sanitary conditions in Middlesex county jail is the Minister taking immediate steps to remedy this situation?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I have not as yet had the opportunity to study the report of the grand jury and the report of

the local medical officer of health which, according to the press, appears to be in disagreement with the report of the grand jury. Also, as I have ordered a complete investigation by my own staff of inspectors, I feel it would not be in order for me to comment on this matter at this time. When all the facts have been collated and examined, I will be in a better position to assess the situation.

Mr. Speaker: I wonder at this time if the member of the Opposition would allow me, in the interest of the member for Sarnia (Mr. Bullbrook), to place a similar question to the Attorney General about the same matter and perhaps it might expedite this. The question is addressed to the Attorney General from the member for Sarnia:

> Will the Minister act immediately to improve conditions at the Middlesex county jail as revealed by the report of the grand jury last week?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: The question, I believe, Mr. Speaker, was directed or referred, I might say, to my colleague, the Minister of Reform Institutions, and that is his answer.

Mr. Speaker: And was covered by the previous answer. I felt that they should be covered at the same time. The member for Sudbury East.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Health.

Will the Minister make arrangements for the payment of the cost of transportation to treatment centres for children suffering from cerebral palsy who have to travel considerable distances to reach such centres?

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, arrangements are usually made for these things at the local level. This is actually embodied in the Easter seals campaigns. However, if there is a specific instance and the hon. member would give me the name and particulars, I will see that something is done about it.

Mr. Martel: Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister of Agriculture and Food.

In light of the impending strike of milk producers in the Warren-Verner area as reported in the Sudbury *Star* March 23, can the Minister advise the House what steps will be taken by the department to clear up that grievance with the farmers and avoid this strike?

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): Mr. Speaker, I must confess that on receipt of this question, some of my staff tried to find out the source of the information the hon. member refers to. We have no knowledge of any threatened strike or impending strike of any kind. I wonder, if he has information on this subject, if he would be good enough to forward it to me.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Health, notice of which has been given.

In view of the statement in the Daily *Star* of Saturday, March 23, that Donald West of Elmer Avenue, Toronto, was unable to get assistance to break the heroin habit from the alcoholism and drug addiction research foundation or from public health authorities, will the Minister indicate why no help was forthcoming from these organizations?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, I did not read this report from the newspaper and I have not been able to get any practical information about it from the staff at the addiction foundation. But I can say this to the hon. member, this is one of the most discouraging fields in the whole of the practice of medicine.

For four years now, the foundation has been experimenting with different methods and procedures and none of them has proven successful as yet. Addiction to heroin is one of the most difficult of all to break. The patients are difficult to deal with. I do not know, of course; this might be too much of a generality in this instance but this we do find.

In view of the fact that the four year experience of the foundation has been so discouraging, they are now in the process of reassessing and re-evaluating all that they have done to see if there are some other directions in which they might bend their efforts.

I have to repeat, whether the man had been refused admission or not, I cannot say.

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent): Mr. Speaker, I have a question before the orders of the day to ask of the Minister of Public Works, of which I have already given notice.

The question comes in two parts.

1. In view of the fact that The Department of Agriculture and Food has advised farmers that the cost of a building, complete with silos, paved yards, modern milking, feeding and manure disposal systems, should cost between $300 and $550 per milking cow, what does The Department of Public Works estimate to be the total cost of the 300 cow dairy barn at the Elora substation?

2. Have tenders been called for the construction of this unit?

Hon. T. R. Connell (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, the answer to the hon. member's question has allowed me to seek from The Department of Agriculture and Food information presently being used in its advisory services to farmers. I have been provided a document entitled "Dairy Cattle Housing and Management" in which figures are set forth supporting the cost of a barn with free stall housing for 60 cows, plus replacements. These figures indicate an investment per cow and replacement animal at $1,065.

The investment for a 40-cow tie stall barn indicates a requirement of $781 per cow and replacement animal. If the hon. member wishes the detailed estimates of how this cost per cow is arrived at, I am sure the Minister of Agriculture and Food would be pleased to provide it for him.

As the hon. member knows from his experience as a farmer, any costs that are prescribed by contractors, builders and other professionals, can be quite often modified considerably by farmers supplying their own labour and material. As you know, the ingenious nature of farmers and their own planning and hard work allows them to provide facilities by adapting various kinds of recommended procedures to their own liking. So, I accept the hon. member's statement that a dairy barn complete with silos, paved yards, and so on, may very well be constructed for $300 to $550 per milking cow.

However, I would like to point out and clarify for the hon. member, and for all members of the Legislature, that the dairy barn presently being planned for the Elora research station is, in fact, only slightly related to what the hon. member for Kent and I might think a traditional dairy barn would be.

What is planned, in fact, is a dairy cattle research barn—or, perhaps a dairy cattle research laboratory, sir, would more closely describe it. We all know that the operations which are performed in a dairy barn on an operating farm are considerably unlike those performed where long-term research programmes with living animals are required, and where many operations not common to farm production must be done on a scientific basis.

Individual feeding of animals in the laboratory will increase the construction cost. Various types of feed stuffs will have to be stored separately requiring additional silo costs. A number of smaller silos will be required, rather than one or two large, more efficient sized units as we find on operating farms. Feed mixing and milk handling will also be more complicated and more expensive. Feed additives will be researched and these will require sophisticated equipment to assess this new requirement in dairy cattle feeding.

Some features of the laboratory which are different from an ordinary barn are as follows:

a. The use of ordinary bedding will not be possible. Therefore, special floor covering is necessary.

b. There will be ten silos and six bulk feed arrangements.

c. Special liquid manure handling equipment.

d. Mechanical ventilating equipment will be necessary to provide reasonably constant temperatures.

e. There will be special areas provided for digestion studies, special stall areas, a hospital, areas for record keeping and special feed preparation.

f. Special heating and lighting requirements are above ordinary barn standards.

It is estimated that of approximately 42,000 square feet in the laboratory, 12,300 of it is deemed to be special construction for research work.

And, now, to answer the question of the hon. member, "What does The Department of Public Works estimate to be the total cost of the 300 cow dairy barn at the Elora station?" The staff of The Department of Public Works, working with the staff of The Ontario Department of Agriculture and Food has developed initial cost figures which are considered by all concerned to be much too high, even to provide a dairy cattle research laboratory. In the past ten days, I have engaged a firm of highly qualified agricultural engineering consultants to work with us and agriculture. Our objective is to reduce the estimated cost of this laboratory by 30 per cent to 40 per cent. I am informed that this is a reasonable objective, and the co-operation of the Minister and officials of The Department of Agriculture and Food has been assured me in attempting to reach this objective.

When the final estimate is determined and approved, I would be pleased to provide the hon. member and the House with the information. Therefore, the answer to the hon. member's second question is "No."

I wish to thank the hon. member for raising this question and allowing me to state the position of The Department of Public Works. This statement, I hope, will clarify what I feel is a misconception—that we are planning to build a dairy barn at Elora in the normal traditional style, and that the costs are extremely high.

Mrs. M. Renwick (Scarborough Centre): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Economics and Development. How many of the files on record at Ontario housing corporation can be attributed to high rent increases rather than a lack of accommodation?

Hon. S. J. Randall (Minister of Economics and Development): Mr. Speaker, in answer to the hon. member's question:

Of the Metropolitan Toronto applications currently on file with Ontario housing corporation, 10.8 per cent indicate their need is related to the amount of rent which they are presently paying rather than to lack of adequate accommodation.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Would the Minister accept a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker?

Is the Minister aware that Mr. Walley of that department volunteered information to me on Thursday last that, in his view, it would be 25 per cent of their files?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I am not aware of that. I would be glad to check into it, but the information I got this morning from my people is this is the percentage. They have probably got it and checked it out.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Social and Family Services.

Will the Minister introduce legislation this session providing a comfort allowance for persons confined to chronic hospitals who receive no pension or other income?

Hon. J. Yaremko (Minister of Social and Family Services): Mr. Speaker, may I first say that apart from the procedural niceties involved, I noted that the member for Scarborough West, in answering a question which required only a simple "no", took the opportunity of expounding a whole philosophy.

Mr. Lewis: I followed the lead of the Minister.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Yes. I think that they will give us "permission" in the future.

Needless to say my answer to this question will not be of that kind. However, I reserve to myself that right, in the future, once the precedent has now been clearly established.

Mr. MacDonald: Is the Minister not glad he got himself off the hook?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, there are no monies available in this year's estimates of the department for such an extension of our programme. That, I think, would answer the member's question.

Mr. Shulman: Will the Minister allow a supplementary question?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: In keeping with the precedent set by the member for Scarboorugh West, no supplementary.

Mr. Shulman: The answer is no?

Mr. Speaker: No. The member has a further question?

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Attorney General.

Upon payment of the proper fee, will the Attorney General release the sworn testimony of Mr. Murray Mehlman as given in the "seniority" investigation?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, I will take the question as notice and consider an answer.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Economics and Development. I had originally submitted it on Friday.

In view of the verbal report by officials of the Ontario housing corporation that the cost of storm sewers would be included as part of the development costs of the plan to construct 265 geared-to-income government housing units in ward 7, Sandwich East, Windsor: would the hon. Minister explain why the department has now reversed its stand and what steps the Minister plans on taking so that the above housing development will not be cancelled and will be proceeded with as early as possible?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Speaker, Ontario housing corporation has not reversed any stand with respect to the provision of services for the proposed 256 Ontario housing units in the city of Windsor.

The proposal document issued by the corporation called for the provision of services

to the standard established by the municipality. The proponent, Essex Cabinet Makers Limited, met with officials of the municipality regarding drainage requirements for this particular project. The deputy solicitor of the city of Windsor confirmed that as owners of the land, Essex Cabinet Makers Limited had already paid a levy for outlet liability with respect to the drain, and furthermore that Essex Cabinet Makers Limited would have the right to make use of the drain.

Subsequently the city's commissioner of works reported that the Ford Boulevard drain is presently overloaded and took the position that no additional connections should be made to this drain. The commissioner of works further stated that drainage from the proposed development should be connected to the Hawkins drain requiring a small pumping station at an established cost of $130,000. This is a matter of negotiation between Essex Cabinet Makers Limited and the municipality.

On March 14, 1968, Ontario housing corporation advised the city clerk of Windsor that its officials were prepared to review this matter with the municipality in the interests of proceeding expeditiously with this development. To this end a meeting has been arranged for Thursday, March 28, 1968, between officials of Ontario housing corporation and the city of Windsor.

Mr. Speaker: I would like to ask the co-operation of the members with respect to a matter which can affect each one of us, and that is, that upstairs on the third floor there is the machinery for reporting for *Hansard*, the debates in this House. The door has marked on it, "No Admittance" and it can be very disturbing if during the session, while the House is sitting, there be other than the staff in there.

Last week, unfortunately, so many guests of one of the members went into that room that the operator could not even get in the door. I would ask that the members of the House please observe the courtesy of observing the "No Admittance" admonition on the door.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Call the constable.

Mr. Speaker: We cannot do that; we would not do that. The member for Sudbury would not want the constabulary in on this.

But in any event, I am sure that if there are special reasons for a member wishing to enter that room, that it can be arranged through the Speaker's office. I would ask this courtesy and consideration for those who do their best to record the debates and proceedings of this House.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, just before the orders of the day; the Attorney General said last week that he was going to have something more to say about Magistrate Kurata's decision. I wonder if he is prepared to do that at this time?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I was just about to rise, Mr. Speaker, when the hon. leader of the Opposition was too fast for me.

The question, Mr. Speaker, was: "Does the Attorney General agree with Magistrate Kurata's decision to exclude a reporter from his court to protect the names and sentences imposed on three convicted men from being published; and what position did the Crown attorney take on the matter?

The answer, Mr. Speaker, is that I have now had an opportunity of reading the transcript in this matter, which I have here, and I have also caused the facts to be reviewed with Magistrate Kurata and with the Crown attorney.

First, Mr. Speaker, may I say that the transcript clearly indicates that the magistrate did not, by his action, prevent the reporter from publishing the names and the sentences of these three particular convicted persons. The transcript indicates that the magistrate asked the press to leave the courtroom—this was after conviction—and he indicated that he would consider it contempt of court if anything was "printed with regard to what takes place after you leave the courtroom". The matter of the name, the conviction and the sentence, is a matter of public record available from the information and other documents of process. It was not the intention of the magistrate to prevent—nor did he in fact prevent—the publication of those particulars. This appears very clearly from the transcript.

In the light of the particular and personal circumstances relating to the one accused, which the magistrate wished to review and discuss with one of the convicted persons after his conviction in open court, the magistrate felt that the evidence relating thereto—that is, those personal circumstances—before he gave sentence, should not be made public. Therefore, he exercised a discretion that he felt he had under section 428 of the criminal code of Canada. In exercising that discretion he acted in good faith and in what he thought was the interest of the proper administration of justice.

It is entirely possible that another magistrate would not have exercised that discretion. I would say, for my own part, that the names of all accused adults and the results of their trials should be made public in the best interests of the administration of justice.

But I would not presume to say that a judge should not have some discretion, as recognized in the criminal code, to exclude the public where it is in the interest of the proper administration of justice. It would be very easy for me to consider this matter in the light of the subsequent circumstances and, with hindsight, to come to some conclusion different to that of the magistrate, but from the facts disclosed in the transcript, I do not think that any useful purpose would be served in my indicating my agreement or otherwise with what was, in fact, the exercise of a judicial discretion.

I would, however, Mr. Speaker, repeat that the matter of the name, conviction and sentence is a matter of public record and that it was a matter of public record here in this particular case, and with that I must affirmatively agree as does the magistrate.

In answer to the second part of the question, Mr. Speaker, I would say that the Crown attorney was not consulted by the magistrate, and that when the decision was announced he did not take a position for or against the order, since it was within the discretion of the magistrate and not the discretion of the Crown attorney.

Mr. Speaker: The Minister of Economics and Development.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Speaker, I have two questions—one from the hon. member for Port Arthur (Mr. Knight). I do not know whether he wants to ask it today, or not. If he does, I will be glad to answer it.

Also, I received one from the hon. member for York South who is about to leave the room, addressed to the Prime Minister and transferred to me. I do not know whether he has asked the question or not, but if he wants to ask it, I will be glad to answer it.

Mr. MacDonald: Now that I have become with voice again, may I request the answer, yes. My question was: Last year the Minister of Economics and Development indicated in *Hansard*, 1967; pages 1828 and 3192 that his department was studying the issue of wage parity in the automobile industry before coming to any conclusions regarding its validity.

Has the study been completed, and if so, what are the conclusions?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Members of my department have been systematically keeping under review all the issues relating to wage parity and productivity in the automotive industry. It is not a subject that lends itself to any final once-and-for-all answer.

As I said last year, and I quote:

> The United States is the highest productivity country in the world, and an ambition to achieve equality with the United States, through equality of productivity, is to my mind the only realistic way of achieving a competitive standard of living.

I also said that:

> The government of Ontario recognizes and supports the principle that wage differentials be consistent with productivity differentials, both within a national economy and between countries, if competitive prices for the commodity or service are to be the ultimate result.

Finally I said that:

> If wage parity is justified on the basis of productivity, and not simply arrived at in order to justify equality of pay between automotive workers in Canada and the United States, regardless of the consequences involved, then this government would welcome any move that would assure higher incomes for the employee, with continuity of employment, and increased sales for the employer, with a higher return on capital invested.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, in answer to the hon. member's question, as the automotive industry is predominantly situated in Ontario and exerts considerable influence on our economic welfare, we have felt it necessary in my department to follow, as closely as possible, every aspect of the automotive industry and we will continue to do so.

Mr. R. H. Knight (Port Arthur): Mr. Speaker, in reply to the hon. Minister's question, if it would be permissible, I would like to pose that question tomorrow. I did not expect to have the opportunity to do so today.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day and for the information of the leader of the Opposition, I have been informed that the Minister of Lands and Forests was the luncheon speaker at the Niagara escarpment conference on the weekend. I was not aware of this. The hon. member for Hamilton Mountain (Mr. J. R. Smith) was also a member of the afternoon panel, so I suppose this just demonstrates that we should not believe everything we read in the newspapers.

Mr. Nixon: It demonstrates the necessity of asking those who know, I suppose. I will

have more to say about it a little later this afternoon.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

THE FAMILY BENEFITS ACT, 1966

Hon. J. Yaremko (Minister of Social and Family Services) moves second reading of Bill 46, An Act to amend The Family Benefits Act, 1966.

Mr. L. A. Braithwaite (Etobicoke): Mr. Speaker, I assume the Minister is going to move second reading of Bills 46, 47 and 48 this afternoon. If so, I have a few comments I would like to make with reference to all three of the bills, since they are closely related.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: With your permission, Mr. Speaker, may we do that?

Mr. Speaker: The member—I am going to—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Well he can speak to all three bills.

Mr. Speaker: Would the member wish to speak to all three after the three have been moved?

Mr. Braithwaite: Oh yes, I understand.

THE GENERAL WELFARE ASSISTANCE ACT

Hon. Mr. Yaremko moves second reading of Bill 47, An Act to amend The General Welfare Assistance Act.

THE VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION SERVICES ACT, 1966

Hon. Mr. Yaremko moves second reading of Bill 48, an Act to amend The Vocational Rehabilitation Services Act, 1966.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Etobicoke.

Mr. Braithwaite: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when the hon. Minister introduced these bills into the House he mentioned that he was following the recommendations of the McRuer report and one wonders why, when he took the trouble to modify the bills in question, he did not follow all of the recommendations of the McRuer report, particularly with reference to The Family Benefits Act.

We feel, Mr. Speaker, that the bills would be stronger and they would be better if all of the recommendations of the hon. Mr. Justice McRuer had been followed.

I wish to make a few comments on these bills with reference to those recommendations, but I would like to state here, Mr. Speaker, that inasmuch as these bills are forward steps, and they make provision for a board of review, and appeal to the court of appeal, we think they are forward steps and we will support them.

The first recommendation of the McRuer report that is to be found on page 1156 of volume 3 is with reference to the words "allowances" and "benefits," as used in The Family Benefits Act and the hon.—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that on second reading of a bill the discussion is related to the principle as set out in the bill. Now I would think that what the hon. member is embarking upon could be perhaps a basis for discussion at some future time, in some other relevant portion of the debates. But I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that at this time the member should direct his remarks to the principle as set out in the bill, which consists of two portions, one relating to the delegation of power and second to the establishment of the board of review.

Mr. Braithwaite: Mr. Speaker, if I may speak to the point of order, the comments that I made in the begining were that we support the bills—all three of them. The Minister himself made reference to the McRuer report when he introduced the bills and it was my thinking that I might point out to the Minister and his staff two or three places where he might strengthen the bills. I do not see that this is something that the Minister could really seriously object to. We are talking about principles; we are talking about principles that the Minister himself brought into question when he introduced the bill. I feel that I am not off the point. I would appreciate guidance from Mr. Speaker, if he would care to advise me.

Mr. Speaker: I think this is one of those cases where the member finds it rather difficult to reach the principle of the bill without ancillary matters being brought in. I would ask that he bear in mind what the Minister has pointed out and which he himself has accepted, that this debate is on the principle of the bill as introduced into the House.

Mr. Braithwaite: Mr. Speaker, in that case, I will move then to the question of delegation of powers of the director—and with reference to this, Mr. Speaker, the director has certain discretions in cases of emergency. The McRuer report itself specifically sets out that if it were made clearer, in the bill, exactly when and how the director were to, or should, exercise this discretion, that is with reference to the payment of allowances or benefits in emergency cases, the Act would be better—I refer to The Family Benefits Act.

The submission I make, Mr. Speaker, is that the Minister might consider strengthening the bill in that regard by making it quite clear as to what is meant by "emergency". And further, when and how the director has the power to order an investigation and when and how emergency payments may be made.

In the same line, Mr. Speaker, the McRuer report specifically sets out that the director should not be given the power to order an investigation into the payment of ordinary benefits or allowances unless he has reasonable grounds for believing that there has been some dishonesty, are evident.

The bills before us make no such provision. We all know, or have heard of cases second hand where people have received welfare or payments and are supposed to be hoodwinking the welfare department or the Minister's department. Yet we feel that it would be an injustice if any one of the people to whom the director is able to delegate his power would be in a position to carry out a witch hunt or, in other words, make an investigation of benefits payable to anyone under any three of these Acts without a reasonable basis for believing that there is a need for same.

Now where an applicant is refused assistance, or where assistance is being cancelled or suspended, I strongly feel that the applicant should be given the full reasons for the director's decision. These reasons, Mr. Speaker, should not only be given orally, but the applicant should receive them in writing.

Further, the applicant should never have to make an application in the first place on his own. I understand that members of the Minister's staff are available to counsel people who make application for assistance under any one of the three Acts. However, we feel that there should be someone else available who is also a member of the Minister's staff. There should be sufficient numbers of these people so that they could be available throughout different areas in the province.

Individuals who make application, particularly to the director or anyone of the people to whom his powers have been delegated, should have these people available to counsel them and to speak for them. On many of the boards that we have here in Ontario, particularly the workmen's compensation board, Mr. Speaker, we find that individuals in the early stages of their application are turned down and are unsuccessful. Many times this is so because these individuals have language difficulties, they are unschooled, and they are untutored.

I should think, Mr. Speaker, that many of these same factors will apply to people who are making application for assistance, because they are needy. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that if individuals were available in the Minister's department, whose sole responsibility was to advise applicants, they would help many applicants to make a proper case at the application level before the director or his delegate.

When it come to the board of review, as set out in the Acts, it is felt that Bill 46 in particular, does not clearly set out how large this board will be or whether there should be regional boards of review. Now, inasmuch as a quorum will be three people, it is reasonable to assume that the board will have five or so members. In the McRuer report, it specifically states that, ideally, a single board of review hearing all appeals would be best. We would get a certain uniformity of decisions and, in the long run, it would be the best thing.

But the report also states, Mr. Speaker, that there are hundreds of applications weekly and I cannot imagine how the Minister expects to have this board of review take care of all of the applications of those who have been, for one reason or another, turned down on the preliminary stage. If speedy action is important, as no doubt it should be, inasmuch as we are discussing welfare and medical assistance, I am wondering if the Minister has any plans for regional boards of review.

The bill does not specifically set this out. Perhaps the Minister might have some comments on this point later. Other factors that might come up, Mr. Speaker, with reference to the board of review, include the fact that members should be chosen, in my estimation, from interested groups such as the social planning council, labour and various other groups where individuals can be found who are trained or experienced in this whole question of assistance. It is assumed that the

salary paid by the Minister's department will be sufficiently large as to guarantee a high calibre of individual.

But if the Minister does not plan to have regional boards, my contention, Mr. Speaker, is that there are going to be more blacklogs here in the operation of this board, than we had recently in Metropolitan Toronto magistrates' courts. The persons who will suffer will be those who need it most, who need to have an opportunity to have their case put forward to the board of review quickly.

Lastly, Mr. Speaker, Bill 46 makes reference to the right to appeal to the court of appeal on a point of law. The thought that comes to my mind, Mr. Speaker, is that many of the people who will be making application for assistance will not be business people. They will have no records, many of them will have a very low education and the possibility exists that there may be many questions come up which are mixed fact and law. It is my submission, Mr. Speaker, that the bill could have been strengthened if it made provision for cases such as this to be brought to the court of appeal for leave to make appeal.

In that regard, Mr. Speaker, I do feel that when an individual has been turned down on the preliminary stage, it should be made quite clear to him that legal aid could be secured. This becomes very important when you consider the court of appeal, and an application to same. This is a very complicated procedure and it must be done correctly. There is no way that individuals such as I have mentioned would know how to do same. Here, Mr. Speaker, I feel that the bills could have been strengthened if the Minister were to make some sort of provision for notification, in all cases, to applicants that they could secure legal aid in their quest for assistance.

These, Mr. Speaker, are some comments which we have on these three bills, and I am certain that if the Minister takes some of these into consideration, the bills will be improved.

Mrs. M. Renwick (Scarborough Centre): I have a few comments to make, Mr. Speaker, on Bill 46, and the remarks also apply to Bills 47 and 48, as the latter bills incorporate by reference to provisions of Bill 46.

I would like to draw firstly to the attention of this assembly Mr. Justice McRuer's opening paragraph in section 3, volume 3, on The Family Benefits Act:

> Our concern is with statutory rights and with the exercise of the power to determine the existence and extent of rights in individual cases.

The obvious point which arises under this amendment, Mr. Speaker, is the question which arose in the case of Mr. Kucyk and the workmen's compensation board, decided January last by Mr. Justice Hart in the high court and now on appeal to the court of appeal.

That case raised the question of whether a person appealing to the appeal tribunal of the workmen's compensation board or to the board itself was entitled to all his records in the hands of the board in order that he could adequately present his appeal. Mr. Justice Hart decided that the files of the workmen's compensation board should be available to the person making the appeal. I would like to read from CCH Canadian Limited:

> The application was granted. Once the board required that a hearing be conducted it would be destructive of the basic essentials of a hearing in the true sense if effect were given to its submission. Therefore having held out the fact of a hearing both to the workmen and to the public at large, the board had to conduct it on the well recognized principle that it be a fair and meaningful one. Toward this end production of the medical report had to be ordered. Kucyk v. workmen's compensation board, Ontario, high court of justice.

There is nothing in the amending Act, Mr. Speaker, which establishes the right of the person making this appeal to the board of review, that he is entitled to act as to the whole of his case history on file with the director of the family benefits branch in the case of this Act, or in the hands of the welfare administrator, in the case of the amendment to The General Welfare Assistance Act, or to the director of vocational rehabilitation services branch, in the amendment Act to The Vocational Rehabilitation Services Act.

I think it essential, Mr. Speaker, that this right be established. It is essential if the appeal is to be meaningful.

I note, Mr. Speaker, that if an appeal is taken from the decision of the board of review to the court of appeal that the appeal is limited to a question of law alone, and I would expect the Minister to advise the House whether a decision that a person

who is "a person in need" is a question of law, so far as The Family Benefit Act is concerned.

And similarly, a person of need under The General Welfare Assistance Act.

And "disabled persons" under The Vocational Rehabilitation Services Act is a question of law.

As it is quite likely that most appeals would turn on these questions, Mr. Speaker, and I am not a lawyer and quite likely there will be other questions, but whether these are questions of law or questions of fact I feel are the main questions.

I note, Mr. Speaker, that there is no provision in the Act for a person to be represented by a friend or another qualified person to present the appeal. And the next point that comes to my mind is that if the appeal is taken to the court of appeal, it is quite obvious that a lawyer will have to be retained and what arrangements are being made that any expense of the applicant, whether an appeal to the board of review, or an appeal to the court of appeal, will be absorbed by the department.

Mr. D. M. De Monte (Dovercourt): Mr. Speaker, in examining this particular Bill 46, we are setting down the procedure which will be followed in the further Acts, 47 and 48, but as the previous member has suggested, the question of an appeal to the court of appeal on a question of law is very laudatory in this Act. But after all, Mr. Speaker, is it not necessary that the question of fact, whether a person requires assistance or not, is the paramount fact in all this type of legislation?

Now there is a procedure laid down—Bill 46 lays the procedure down within the board itself and there certainly is not too much to go by in the Act. All it says is that you have to do this in order to appeal—for instance put it in writing—but it does not lay down any guidelines, Mr. Speaker, and I think it is incumbent upon the government to lay down certain guidelines and definitions as to what a family in need is. If it does not lay down these guidelines, the board established is going to be a board which makes arbitrary decisions as to who needs help and who does not need help.

If it does make an arbitrary decision, the person appealing before the board is not going to have any right under the Act to appeal on the basis of fact to a higher tribunal. Therefore it is my submission to this House, sir, that we are just establishing another board that is arbitrary, and Mr. McRuer sets that out quite clearly, that we must put an end to the arbitrary decisions that are being made by the multitudinous boards that we have in this province. I think that in examining this bill, we are just perpetuating something that many authorities have said, not only Justice McRuer, but many authorities have said is a denial of civil rights. When you look at section 11(b), in principle, all that can be brought before the court of appeal is a question of law and certainly, Mr. Speaker, it requires that a person who at the inception is asking for assistance must hire a solicitor, or a counsel to appear before the court of appeal to discuss a very highly technical aspect of the question of law.

I think that when we look at these Acts, and the government looks at these Acts, it should say to itself: "Are we infringing just a little more on the rights of the individual?" And for that reason, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that this side of the House does not support this Act.

Mr. Speaker: Does any other member wish to speak on this?

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Mr. Speaker, our party is reasonably sure that it will support the Act. We have not yet divided internally, perhaps we shall by the time that I finish speaking, but I am sure not. I suspect that we are firm in our resolve, although we are tempted to call for a standing division to see how the House might in fact divide.

I want to make a couple of observations on the three Acts in question. The first is the very obvious observation that it is most unfortunate that the principles of the Acts have to be dealt with separately at all. That the government persists for reasons beyond this party and the House, Mr. Speaker, in separating social allowance legislation, we have never understood. We cannot abide the proposition that The Family Benefits Act should be distinct from The General Welfare Assistance Act, and that the government should refuse to bring both in under The Canada Assistance Act for purposes of compensation.

The Minister will say—as the Minister inevitably does—that there is a separate federal-provincial process involved in The General Welfare Assistance Act, and that there are some modest differences in regulations, and that because of the different federal-provincial arrangement, the Act must be isolated. But

we would like to hear him stand in this House, and say Mr. Speaker, that the principle of separation violates the concept of need. That in the refusal of the government of Ontario to say to the federal government that we will combine the Acts lies the perpetuation of second-class citizenry in the province of Ontario.

The Minister well knows that when an applicant comes under The General Welfare Assistance Act—although the nature of his benefit now may be more or less comparable to that received under The Family Benefits Act, the general welfare recipient receives much the same as someone under mothers' allowance except for different methods of computing the allowance and for some ancillary benefits. Even though that be true, the distinction in the mind of the recipient and the distinction in the mind of the department is a pernicious distinction, because we again continue to categorize groups of welfare recipients. The whole purpose of The Canada Assistance Act legislation was to facilitate solidarity of recipients, and to remove all the invidious distinctions and categorical allowance that formerly prevailed, and which so mutilated the field.

Mr. Speaker, even in the principles of these Acts set out today, there is a continued violation. Nowhere in the principle has it been set out what is meant by an allowance, and what is meant by benefit. And why there should be discretion in one case, and why there should be a mandatory right in the other case, and why the director should be given the total discretion to decide. One worries about the inadvertent abuse of power —not that the director would in an intentional or malicious way discriminate against a recipient—but one worries about the extent of the discretion that the director is allowed to exercise in these Acts. It would surely be worth embodying that recommendation of the inquiry into civil rights allowing for some definition of the term "benefit."

The other thing that pertains directly to the establishment of the baord of review which worries one about the principle of the Act, is that the board of review, were it to operate effectively, should analyze every single allowance that has thus far been granted under any one of these Acts. The allowances could not possibly have corresponded to need, and have not corresponded to need, because the Acts are so replete with absurd and irrelevant regulations that no one applying for a social allowance can be appropriately appraised.

After all, as soon as you have a regulation in an Act which allows the Lieutenant-Governor in council to set maxima in terms of allowance, then you have immediately violated the principle of need—as the Minister knows.

There will be some families in the province —probably many families—who cannot be arbitrarily categorized within certain limits. Their dependencies, their requirements, will be such that the upper limit must be discarded and the allowance reapportioned accordingly. But again, in the amendments to the Acts and in the principles therein contained, there is no recognition of this fact. Yet this fact tends to abuse the intent of the legislation.

The legislation, I remind the House, Mr. Speaker—I need not do it excessively because I think that the House is well aware—was meant to abandon the "means test" principle and to substitute for it the "needs test" principle. In the process of constituting the needs test principle, it hedges needs around with the limitations that abuse that principle. It is absurd to bring in a bill which sets up a board of review for the purpose of reviewing decisions which are not based on valid social principles.

I will not bore the House with reading the regulations under The Family Benefits Act or The General Welfare Assistance Act. They may be the most up-to-date regulations in the world, but they were obsolete the day that they were printed, and they are an affront to the people to whom they apply. They are so particular in their detail that they cannot possibly apply, in any manner which is equitable, to the family who requires service. These are not guidelines, Mr. Speaker, these are straitjackets. If the board of review is to function in a reasonable way, I suggest to the Minister quite frankly that he should say to the board of review: Take a look at every single decision that has thus far been rendered, with the flexibility given to you as a board, and see if we cannot make some major alterations. Those of us in this party would be well pleased if that were possible.

The points made by my colleague from Scarborough Centre were truly valid, particularly the question of fact or law. Because in truth, if the board is to decide purely within what was described as the arid legal definition, then many families will continue to be discriminated against. The law, here more than anywhere else, requires a social interpretation which does not pay much homage

to particulars of law, but which takes all the facts of the family's situation into account.

How the Minister constitutes the board is, of course, up to him. But there is a tendency in government to appoint boards which represent those groups and areas in society who view people on social allowances as the uprooted and disinherited: not worthy of benefit anyway. If we establish that kind of board, little will come of it. It will be pleasing to us on this side of the House if the Minister indicated a board which would comprise every significant community grouping—not simply the professional grouping, but community groupings in the common sense definition of the word—so that the entire spectrum was represented on the board. We would like some real identification with the recipients, rather than a tendency to be condescending to those who have to depend on the state for a given period of time and for a given amount of social allowance.

Those are the basic comments we have, Mr. Speaker. It is perhaps inevitable that one would support the establishment of a board of review, because when you have a piece of legislation affecting so many dependents and you have no review procedure, the legislation is an affront to civil liberties.

So you establish a board of review. But to establish a board of review which perpetuates the violation of the statute, a violation directed against the recipient, then that very board of review has to be looked at very carefully, Mr. Speaker. It is our view that the separation between The Family Benefits Act and The General Welfare Assistance Act, however the Minister may wish to justify it; and the different lengths of time that govern both Acts; and the different methods of computing the allowances; and the second class relationship which that places the general welfare recipient in, and the pecularity of non-representative boards of review and the refusal—the refusal Mr. Speaker—to define benefits and allowances more particularly in the Act, so that the discretion of the director cannot be abused and the fundamental issue raised by my colleague of fact or law—all of these things are expressed by us as matters of strong reservation on second reading and principle and we hope the Minister will give them some heed.

Mr. Speaker: Is there any other member who would like to speak to this before the Minister replies and closes the debate?

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, just so far as to say that while we have the misgivings about the approach to this bill that have been expressed by my two colleagues, we on this side intend to support it in principle.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, I am going to try to cover as many of the issues that have been raised by the hon. members in approximately the sequence that they have been brought up. The reference by the member for Etobicoke—he touched on the recommendation that Mr. McRuer made respecting emergency payments. It is interesting to note that Mr. McRuer made that as a recommendation while not having enlarged upon it in the body of his report. This is a matter which will be given study by the department. It involves very broad principles. If you are going to give this power you must give it to some individual to exercise the discretionary power.

Now, if you give the director a discretion to make emergency grants because he feels that it should be done, then of course, we come on to the overall picture, I say to the Provincial Treasurer, of whether any particular official can be given a discretion to expend public money on his own judgment. Because in relation to the field of law we used to have a saying, and I think the member for Sudbury remembers this saying, that equity was as long as the chancellor's foot.

Well, this can also be the problem when you give the discretion to one person to decide on his own, without guidelines or without the necessity of carrying out procedures, to spend monies.

However, we are confronted with the facts of life and with theory so that this matter will be given study. This Act, The Family Benefits Act—which, Mr. Speaker, has been one of the outstanding pieces of legislation brought into being in this decade by this Legislature and all those on both sides of the House who had anything to do with its coming into being by promoting it, should be very proud of it. It is an Act which will be reconsidered and strengthened.

Because the underlying principle as established by this government, is that people who need help should get it. The Provincial Treasurer has provided funds in this regard and much as the members of both Opposition parties would like to stress that the Act is not achieving its result, this is not a fact of life as tens of thousands of people who benefit, who were transferred to benefits under this Act, will testify.

Now with respect to the matter of investigations, and the member for Etobicoke touched upon this and Mr. McRuer does enlarge on this. Here we have a very interesting field, Mr. McRuer indicated that so far as initial applications were concerned, the director should have full powers of investigation and then, when it comes to a secondary factor of whether there should be an investigation upon a reconsideration of the application, of whether the allowance should continue or be changed or cancelled or suspended or anything, he makes the point where perhaps there should be "conditions precedent" prior to the investigation.

However, the approach of the department has been in the past—and it is one that I am attracted to—is the fact that once we have established the person as being entitled to a maintenance grant or a benefit of some kind, that is not the be all and end all of the situation. If the true intent of a department of social service is to eventually make as many people self sufficient and independent as possible, there must be a system evolved where there is a continuous rapport, continuous confrontation if you will. That is a word which is used in an affirmative sense between the recipient and the person who is delivering the social service to see whether eventually the recipient can be changed from one who is a recipient to a completely independent person.

Now, Mr. Speaker, with respect to certain groups of disabled and old age assistance recipients, this may never be achieved. But with respect to other fields, with general welfare assistance with some of the family benefits cases this is an approach that we tend to follow, there should be a continuous contact between the recipient and the department. Indeed there are cases in which there are automatic, semi-automatic contacts, where if someone moves, we know from experience that a change of address will inevitably lead to a change in circumstances, one way or the other. Now recipients are reminded that they receive benefits under the terms of the Act and regulations and if they do receive benefits which exceed those as entitled under the laws they must make a refund, or some readjustment should be made. How much better it is if the person is prevented from getting into that position rather than having got himself into a position probably through a misunderstanding or not directing his mind to the fact that the change of circumstances might change his allowance. Then we have the difficult situation of an overpayment being made and then an attempt to make a readjustment at a time, perhaps, at the worst possible for the individual.

With respect to applications, I point out to the hon. member for Etobicoke that section 14 (1) of the regulations states that a field worker shall fill out and complete the application in the presence of the applicant and that the applicant shall sign the application in the presence of the field worker. So we do have that as part of our system.

With respect to the size and the make-up of the boards, Mr. McRuer, in examining what we had tentatively on the books, came to certain conclusions and pointed out certain difficulties that we would be confronted with were we to proceed under the old concept, and in these we agree that there is merit. We are, as I have used the expression, pioneering in this field. We are embarking upon providing a review for the whole of the province with a possible clientele in the tens of thousands and indeed in the total picture of hundreds, over hundreds of thousands. What will happen nobody really knows, except that we will attempt to take every precaution and the wording of the statute is such as to give us the utmost flexibility that the regulations—subject to the terms of the legislation—will enable us to move as our requirements are needed. Now we envisage at this time a fairly small board, larger than the three which exist under the old regulations. We envisage a larger number of board members in total. We envisage them sitting in groups of three, that is why we have a quorum of three, so that they would be able, independently of each other, because of geography, to service the whole of the province, and they are empowered to engage a staff that will bring this about. As to the make-up of the board, it will be as cross representative of the whole of the province as we can make it. Of necessity, and as Mr. McRuer points out, at times you need to have technical people. You need the so called experts, medical people, lawyers. It may be that those services may be engaged, but in a board of this size, there will be room for the experts for guidance wherever that is necessary and also good people, with good common sense, who can pass good judgment on a situation. With respect to the member for Scarborough Centre, to whom I suggest, with all respect, that if she wants a good legal counsel at any time, she might take advantage of the member for Riverdale at the breakfast table if at no other time—

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): He does not eat breakfast, that's the problem.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Well, late coffee might be even a better time. It is the type of "off-the-record" consultation that lawyers very often get and, I guess, also members of the medical profession at receptions, I suggest to the hon. Minister of Health.

I was not quite clear whether the member for Scarborough Centre was directing her mind to the powers of the board of review or the powers of the court of appeal. The powers of the board of review will be complete, that is, there will be what is elsewhere known as a *trial de Novo.* That is my way of thinking. The director and the department will have decided, and then the board of review will have full powers to completely review all aspects of the case, fact and law.

With all due respect to the member for Dovercourt and his use of the expression of "arbitrary", that this government was setting up an arbitrary board, for arbitrary decision, he is completely off on a tangent because exactly the opposite is true; in setting up the board of review, this government is doing away with arbitrary decisions, because—

Mr. Braithwaite: I want to wait until the Minister is finished; go ahead.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: —whereas up until now the decision has been a departmental one, and where it appeared that the matter was final and complete within the department, we are now setting up two stages, a complete review by the board of review, and then, of course, from there in accordance with the recommendation that was made by Mr. McRuer, an appeal to the court of appeal on a point of law.

Mr. Braithwaite: On that point, Mr. Speaker, if I might ask the Minister, perhaps he might take a few moments now to give us, on this side of the House, his views on this question of fact—fact and law in law—in view of the particular type of cases that will be coming before this board, which he says, will hear all sorts of cases, and dig into all areas of the cases.

Does it not seem strange that once the board of review has made its decision, then appeal must be on law only?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, there must be, as Mr. McRuer sets out in his report because when you read it, you must not just read The Family Benefits Act section, you have to turn towards the procedural sections, the appeal tribunals section in those parts, he goes into the question of whether there should be an appeal on points of fact and law.

The board of review will have a complete review, fact and law. We have adopted, for the present, the appeal to the court of appeal on a point of law. Whether the member for Scarborough Centre was concerned about whether, in an appeal to the court of appeal on a point of law, the point could be whether the individual was a person in need, I would think that that would not be a question of law.

However, there will always be the opportunity of a test case where somebody will take the matter to the court of appeal and they will decide whether that is, in fact, an appeal on a point of law. This is a decision which is continuously before the court of appeal that when a matter is brought before them, they have to decide whether the matter is properly before their jurisdiction, or not.

Mr. Braithwaite: Mr. Speaker, if I might ask the Minister, I cannot contemplate many situations where law alone may be involved, and I am wondering, perhaps, if the Minister might give his views on the applicant, or his solicitor, making an application to the court of appeal for leave to appeal on a mixed question of fact and law.

Because it would seem to me that most of the cases that are going to come up, most of the appeals that are going to come from this board, are going to be questions where there is a grey area as to fact and as to law, or a mixture of same. I would appreciate the Minister's views on this.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, as I say, we are interposing a board of review of three people to pass judgment on the whole picture of the individual applicant. We are carrying out Mr. McRuer's position in the appeal to the court of appeal, it must be remembered that in a court of appeal which we have adopted, there must be a quorum of three justices of appeal to sit on this factor.

I am not going to go into the question of appeal tribunals, this will be a question, I think, that the Attorney General will be discussing in the fullest, in the future.

Mr. Speaker, with respect to the discretion about which the member for Scarborough West, I think it was, talked about the discretion which resides in the director. We

have to make up our minds whether we want legislation and regulations that make square holes into which people must be fitted, or whether we give discretion. This is one of the great challenges of administering social service legislation.

It is interesting to know, and I bring this to the attention of the member for Scarborough West, that Mr. McRuer talked about the difficulties with which he has been confronted in understanding benefits and allowances, but it is interesting to know after several times of commenting upon that fact —that on page 1145 he arrives at the point, "this element of discretion has, however, largely been eliminated by the regulations." So that what appeared to be a discretion in the statute, is no longer such in the regulations.

Now, when the hon. member was talking, he took the regulations to task that they were not "guidelines." Now I want to bring to the attention of the member for Scarborough West that when you have guidelines, you put discretion into the hands of somebody. You either have a set of regulations which, as Mr. McRuer said, makes the director a judicial officer—that is he finds what the facts are, he compares them with the regulations and he makes a judicial decision on the facts. He has to fit his decision within the regulations. Otherwise, you would do away with the regulations completely, and just give the discretionary power either to the director or as the member for Scarborough West wants, you move the discretion one step further and give discretion to the board of review.

Mr. Lewis: Does the Minister consider the regulations to be guidelines?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: No, the regulations are the regulations. They are the law that is to be carried out.

Mr. Lewis: There is no discretion in the regulations.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Well, the member was complaining that there was too much discretion given to the directors.

Mr. Lewis: I am saying the directors are prohibited by regulations—what is the point of discussing this, the regulations—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The hon. member will have to make up his mind whether he wants to give discretionary powers to individuals or not. Now with the whole tenor, not only within this legislation but in most legislation, of what the Opposition has been saying is that there is too much discretion in the hands of the Minister or the director or this or that other body. I take this position after years of experience; that it is when you are asked to wield discretionary power; that is when you stay awake at nights. You do not stay awake at nights when you have punch holes in a card and put it through the machine. That is the kind of approach I do not really like then, the "holes in a card" type of thing. There has to be a judgment given to some. There has to be confidence relied in someone.

Now the implementation of The Family Benefits Act, has been good.

Mr. McRuer, having examined The Family Benefits Act, having pointed out weaknesses and flaws and compared them with the standards he has set out, time and time again does make statements along the line — no criticism of the department in carrying it out —it is commendable, I find no abuse—however, he does make the general principle that the law must be there and this is what we are attempting to do and will attempt to do.

One of the great points that Mr. McRuer makes out in the whole of his report is the fact that very often procedural items are the ones which either give or take away elemental justice from individuals.

Presently, under the regulations, we do have the power of setting up regulations for this procedural development.

It is our intent to develop administratively, procedures which will carry out the intent of the legislation and the will of this Legislature when this Act is passed, and then, having felt our way, in order, Mr. Speaker, to make sure that the recipient and applicants do get justice—and as I used the expression the other day "do get a fair shake"—we will, if it is the wise thing to do, transfer administrative practices into procedural regulations.

Of course, there you do not have the flexibility, but I have read the procedural guidelines, the procedural recommendations as set out by Mr. McRuer and they have—as they must have to any lawyer especially and as they must have to anybody who seeks that right be done—a great deal of appeal. A proper hearing, a proper record, a proper opportunity as in the Kucyk case mentioned by—

Mr. Lewis: The member for Scarborough Centre.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The member for Scarborough Centre—that is a case which the department will immediately use as a standard whereby we—

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Why does the Minister have to think about it?

Mr. Lewis: All he has to think about—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: You cannot always compare things one way and another because everything is not black and white. The hon. members must make up their minds whether they are going to embrace and adopt reports in their fullest, or whether they are going to pick and choose sections on a reasonable basis. I come to the member for Scarborough West who wants us to do away with The General Welfare Assistance Act. That is what he was advocating and is still advocating—that we do away with The General Welfare Assistance Act. This, of course, is counter to the recommendations of the Smith report.

Mr. Lewis: Another Conservative document.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The Smith report sees a great deal of merit in the continuance of The General Welfare Assistance Act, which I have adopted for the present, subject to the certain reservations which he has also made and which we will peruse.

Mr. Lewis: In other words the Minister will probably come around to it in four or five years' time.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Not necessarily. If there is merit and validity in it, as if there is merit and validity in the application of the Kucyk case to our stucture, I say we will adopt it. But I am not just going to say so just immediately. The member for Peel South (Mr. Kennedy) sent me a memorandum with respect to the setting up of a particular board that I had never heard of before, at the federal level, and he has brought to my attention the makeup of that board. I may say that I glanced at it very quickly and several sections of it appeal to me greatly, while several sections have no appeal whatsoever—so that I will pick and choose what is best, Mr. Speaker, what is best in the interests of the people who are to do the applying.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, may I ask a question?

In the interests of those who are applying, would the Minister think of appointing to his board of review recipients of social allowance? Would you put on your board of review someone on mothers' allowance, someone on old age security, a disabled person perhaps? Would you have the recipients themselves on a board of review to adjudge the worth of the case of other recipients, if that is what you are interested in?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, I say say this, that I trust that our salary wage which was touched upon by one of the other members, will be such as to immediately take anybody from that class off the roll that—

Mr. Lewis: The Minister is talking about hundreds of thousands, now I asked him a question. Would he allow recepients of social allowance to sit on the boards of review?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I do not follow the member's reasoning.

Mr. Lewis: The people who are in receipt of an allowance are often the best to judge the merits of others who wish to be in receipt of the allowance.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: That may or may not be the case.

Mr. Lewis: Why judge them by professionals alone?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I have some grave reservations about that—

Mr. Lewis: Right, exactly!

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: —as to who should receive and how much they should receive. I have some reservations about that.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. McRuer did touch on the question of "hundreds of appeals" that our department was having at the present time. I do not envisage that type of thing happening. As all hon. members of this House will know, no case is ever really closed in the department permanently. There is always review and review, and re-re-review within the department itself. We hope to develop a procedure administratively that when the applicant is dealt with, he will be given the fullest of opportunity at that level—of stating his case so that all the facts are known.

If prior to a final decision being made, an intimation is given to him, if he brings forward additional facts, additional circumstances, information which is not known to the director—the director will re-review it because there is no great advantage in having the board of review sit perfunctorily on the judgments of the director. It is my hope that

the director, by the time he achieves a decision, will do as he has in the past, make sure that every avenue has been explored and that the applicant is given every possible consideration—and, that having been exhausted, a decision will be made and then a review can be made.

That is the only way, I think, at the present, that we could possibly have a system work. We have hundreds of municipalities in the general welfare assistance field; we have thousands of people applying under The Family Benefits Act, under The Vocational Services Act. We must, in the interest of the tax dollar which has to be expended, re-review the case at the deparment level rather than have a host of appeals. The geography of the matter is going to be quite a problem to overcome. I think, Mr. Speaker, that—

Mr. Braithwaite: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Minister two questions?

Mr. J. H. White (London South): Not on second reading.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Braithwaite: How many weeks does the Minister envisage will elapse before an applicant would come before one of these boards of review? That would be the first question.

And the second question would be: The Minister did mention the number of individuals that he felt might be on this board of review but nowhere, at no time, did he give any approximate figure. I wonder, at this time, Mr. Speaker, if the Minister might give us some approximate figure of how many individuals he talking about that would make up this large board of review which would sit three people at a time at different parts of the province.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, what was the first question? I am sorry.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: As I said, I would not hazard a guess. All I can say is that where there is an application with regard to a person in need, speed is of the essence because if you do not get to the individual immediately, the longer you stay away from him and the longer that need is not satisfied the more difficulties are very often created. The sooner you come to grips with it, very often the better. So I would hope that we could possibly, subject to the tremendous challenging task, which is before us, move as quickly as possible in all these things.

With respect to the size of the board, I have been thinking in terms of nine, which gives three sets of three—the permutations and combinations of nine people.

Mr. Lewis: It is hard to get any other perms and comps out of nine people.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: We will not move in the total direction immediately, but presently this is what we have discussed with the Treasury board to provide us with the financial resources to carry out this type of an arrangement. Our whole goal is this. The legislation is on the books. Regulations and administrative practices will be passed to implement, not only the legislation, but what I interpret as the will of this Legislature. Having said that, I would turn to the member for Dovercourt and hope from my remarks and the very complete answers that I have given in the course of answering the questions of the others, as well as his, that perhaps he has a more full understanding, a better clarification, and that he would join all others in complete support of the bills.

Mr. Braithwaite: One more question, Mr. Speaker. No doubt the hon. Minister recalls the case of the solicitor who was disbarred by the law society and who fought the case all the way to the Supreme Court of Canada. If I recall correctly he was able to be reinstated because—

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Mehr.

Mr. Braithwaite: That is right, Mehr. The situation there was that certain members of the law society did not sit, if I recall correctly, at all hearings. I am wondering if there is any possibility of any of the decisions of this board of review being upset by the court of appeal for that reason?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I am advised by legislative counsel that the way we have set up the legislation enables us to have quorums of three sitting around the province. I do not anticipate that we will have that type of problem. The decisions of the board of review will be complete and proper. We have attempted to prevent the type of thing happening that Mr. McRuer was pointing out.

Mr. Braithwaite: Just one thing. Does the Minister have any particular salary in mind? I did mention it when I was speaking, but I do not think you gave any estimate or any figure.

Mr. Speaker: I would think that the member is now getting into matters which would

be better discussed in committee. If the Minister wishes to answer the last question and feels it is proper, I would allow it, otherwise we will put the motion.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I think your point is well taken, Mr. Speaker, but the salary will be commensurate to the task.

Mr. Lewis: To the elitest board.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: No, no. It will be commensurate to the getting of adequate representation and adequate ability on the board.

Mr. Speaker: We will now take these motions separately. First, Mr. Yaremko moves second reading of Bill 46. Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry?

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Yaremko moves second reading of Bill 47. Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry?

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Yaremko moves second reading of Bill 48. Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry?

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Clerk of the House: Private member's motion No. 18 by Mr. Meen.

NOTICE OF MOTION

Resolution:

That the public health regulations be amended to include apartment buildings' swimming pools within the definition of public pools.

Mr. A. K. Meen (York East): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the member for Quinte (Mr. Potter), the resolution standing in my name.

Mr. Speaker, the first comprehensive regulation governing swimming pools of any sort which I have been able to discover in reviewing this picture seems to have been passed by Ontario Regulation 197 in the year 1944. Prior to that time it would appear that there had been a number of regulations governing swimming pools, but this regulation 197 passed in the year 1944 appears to have been a consolidation of the prior regulations. It is interesting to look at the scope which was intended to be covered by the regulation and to do so, I think the best way is to look at the interpretation section of the regulation and I quote:

> In these regulations "pool" shall mean a swimming pool operated in connection with any school, hospital or educational institution, or any YMCA or YWCA, or any athletic association, and a swimming pool to which public patronage is invited, but shall not include a pool used only for therapeutic purposes.

That regulation clearly dealt with public pools and the regulation itself seems to be a forward step, inasmuch as it collected together the various prior regulations and updated them. Over the intervening period these regulations have been gradually refined and today appear as regulation 142 for the year 1965, as amended by a more recent regulation in the year 1967. The definition of a public swimming pool as it now appears is as follows, and I read from the most recent copy of the regulations, subsection (f) of section 1:

> Public swimming pool means an indoor or outdoor pool of water other than a bathing beach, a natural bathing area, or a wading area: (1) that is used for swimming and recreational bathing; (2) to which the public is invited whether or not a fee is charged.

There appears to be some doubt in the minds of certain of our people just what this section does mean. For example, what about the motel that advertises TV in every room and a heated swimming pool? Is that a public swimming pool, or is that a private swimming pool and therefore not covered by the regulations, or what is it? A joint board of Ontario travel associations known at BOTA for short —which includes the Ontario motel association, evidently was in some doubt about this matter and justifiably so. They appear to have asked for clarification, because they contacted The Department of Health last year and, as a result, the department issued a notice that it was their interpretation of the regulation that such swimming pools were public pools to which the public is invited.

BOTA was obviously somewhat disconcerted with this and I understand that they strenuously objected to this interpretation being placed on the regulation. There is perhaps, some good reason for this when one considers that someone renting a motel suite for an evening, he is considered in some eyes of the

law as having a private residence for that evening. If, consequently, a swimming pool goes along with that private residence, even if used in common with others, it might well be held that this was a private swimming pool and that the extension by the department of their interpretation of the regulation as it stands to include a swimming pool such as this may not necessarily be justifiable.

We come in particular to the matter of apartment house pools. I have a number of them in my riding and the question has come up about their use—indeed, about the design and the general safety measures that are applied, and sometimes not applied, in these swimming pools. Some of these apartment pools are used by non-tenants. Sometimes outsiders considerably outnumber the tenants who are using the pools.

In one of the boroughs of Metropolitan Toronto, I am advised, there are 10 pools serving some 11,000 tenants. One of them alone serves over 4,000 tenants and two others serve something of the order of 1,400 tenants each. There have been a number of instances in which youngsters living in other apartments and in homes near these apartment pools have been issued, perhaps gratuitously or perhaps for a small charge, passes which enable them to use the facilities of the pools, and to use them just the same way as the tenants would use them for that matter.

As I have indicated, there does not seem to be any regulation applicable today to this kind of pool, because they are treated as being private pools. Some of these pools, by the instructions of the management, have lifeguards, perhaps qualified, perhaps not, sir, but others of these pools do not have such guards.

Some require showers before entry to the pool, others, on the assumption perhaps, and probably rightly so, that the tenants would use their own showers in their own apartments, do not require a shower immediately before entering the pool. Some of them prohibit food on the pool apron, whereas others do not. Some have guard rails around spectator areas, others do not. There is no particular consistency.

There is a vast inconsistency, in fact, existing from pool to pool it would seem, and when you consider these pools are used, not for a couple of months of the year, or maybe three or four months of the year if they are heated outdoor pools as you see at motels, but rather are used 12 months of the year, I think it is time we recognized that some affirmative approach has to be taken to the problem of a form of regulation of these pools. There is a growing concern among our municipal leaders that unless something is done, this matter may get out of hand.

The municipalities have been looking at the powers presently accorded to them under The Municipal Act to see just what they might do within the present authority. In this regard, I know they have looked at section 379, (1) (23) which authorizes municipalities to pass bylaws. That section governs and refers to matters such as the erection of fences, gates and the types of locks to be placed on the gates, the height of the fences and the way in which obstructions may or may not be placed around pools. It is specifically limited to a home-owner type pool and could not apply to apartments. Furthermore, there does not appear to be any authority that the municipalities can put their finger on for controlling the issue of building permits. In other words, they can be forced to grant authority, or permit a pool to be constructed, even though its actual construction may be patently unsafe or unwise.

The municipalities, I might add, have taken a look at another section of The Municipal Act, section 243, which is a rather interesting section, and I will read from it in part. It authorizes a municipality to:

> —pass bylaws and to make such regulations for the health, safety, morality and welfare of the inhabitants of the municipality in matters not specifically provided for by this Act, as may be deemed expedient and are not contrary to law.

As you can see, that is a pretty general kind of section. One might argue, and argue successfully for that matter, that this section could be used as a last resort to give a municipality some kind of authority to regulate apartment house swimming pools, but I am advised that the cases decided under this section are anything but consistent. Indeed, there seems to be so much inconsistency among the cases, I am told that no municipality has tried to use this section for authority, and for background and support, in trying to regulate the use of swimming pools.

So we have come pretty much to the problem; that municipalities have no real control over apartment house pools at this time, either as to the nature of the construction in the first instance, or subsequently as to the way in which those pools are used. I

would qualify that by observing that, of course, if a medical officer of health attended and found actual evidence of disease, shall we say, at the pool site, he would, of course, under those circumstances, have authority to close the pool and keep it closed until the unhealthy situation had been remedied to his satisfaction.

In doing a little bit of research on this, Mr. Speaker, I came across a very interesting article written by Daniel P. Webster. Mr. Webster is chief for school and recreational safety at the injury control programme, national centre for urban and industrial health, of the public health service of the U.S. He has written this article called, "Pool Drownings and their Prevention" in the July 1967 issue of *Public Health Reports*, the monthly issue of the United States Department of Health. I found this article most illuminating and I do not propose to quote from it in large measure, but there are a few sections which I think would be helpful to the members this afternoon.

He talks about the number of fatalities and the areas of activity in which they occurred. In referring to ownership and type of pool he has this to say:

> Swimming and wading pools in homes or private residences, exclusive of fish or decorative pools, were the sites of 230, or 47 per cent, of the 1965 fatalities.

There were a total of 483 such fatalities in the United States in 1965, I might add in parenthesis, and he goes on:

> There were 86 drownings in public pools representing about 18 per cent of the total, hotels and motels, with 53 reported fatalities, and apartment houses with 52, accounting for slightly more than ten per cent of the total.

So we get from that, a general picture of the area in which fatalities can be expected.

In another part of this lengthy report he says, and I quote:

> In at least five of 51 instances in which the victims stepped or were swept into deep water, an abruptly changing slope in the bottom of the pool caused the victims to slide into depths with which they could not cope.

I might just stop and observe there that one of the things that the municipalities have been trying to get at is some control over the way in which the pools are built, such as the gradient of slope of the bottom, so that you could avoid having your feet go out from under you if it happened that the pool bottom became a little slimy or slippery, due to inadequate attention to the treatment of the water.

> Other unexpected hazards included electrocution and underwater entrapment. These hazards accounted for ten fatalities. The victims' failure to heed or obey instructions or warnings contributed to 16 deaths. Ironically, six fatalities occurred during swimming class instruction. Slipping or falling from a flotation device or raft, or the sinking of the device also resulted in six fatalities.

Now in dealing with the methods of, or the extent of, supervision at a pool, he has this to say:

> In over half of the 484 pool drownings, the victim was alone. At an additional 64 instances, the only other persons present were children. The drowning vicitims of 1965 were most often toddlers and pre-school children (223 to be precise), followed in frequency by students in elementary through graduate schools, 156.
>
> In residential pools—

And he groups everything together here, transient, multiple residences, apartments and homes:

> almost two thirds of the 335 drownings happened when only the victim was present. In only six instances were lifeguards present.

This points out to my mind the fact that there should be some enforcement of requirements for supervision for pools such as in apartment houses. He talks for a significant part of the report about matters of defects in equipment. He says:

> A variety of defects in equipment and pool facilities resulted in fatalities. Most frequent (and he comes back to this point that we have already touched on) were abruptly changing bottom slopes and slippery bottoms, particularly in pools where no surface float lines were provided. The use of rescue equipment such as poles, heaving lines and ring buoys were not mentioned in the accidents in the account of some accidents reported. This failure to mention such equipment may point to the lack of emergency equipment, or the failure to use it, because of panic or lack of knowledge. In the majority of instances, however, no one was present to use life-saving devices even if they had been available.

He goes on to say, and I guess that this was pretty well recognized without really saying it:

> No single action will prevent all pool fatalities or all injuries, yet, two measures, enforced by mandate, if necessary, could prevent as many as half of the drownings. Namely: adult supervision while the pool is in use, and adequate enclosure to prevent or discourage trespass when it is not.

He talks a little bit more about supervision. He suggests that:

> Competent adult supervision is essential to prevent accidents. Leaving children temporarily unattended contributes to more drownings than any other single cause.
>
> The mere presence of lifeguards will not provide adequate pool protection. The fact that 56 of the 86 drownings in public pools in 1965 occurred while a lifeguard was present, suggests a need for re-evaluation of what the permissible ratio of swimmers to lifeguards, and swimmers to pool size should be.

In his concluding remarks, Mr. Webster has this to say:

> The unusual toll that swimming takes of small children, particularly in home and other types of residential pools, points to the need for concerted action for local health departments and organizations concerned with water safety and drowning prevention.
>
> Convincing the guardians of children of the necessity for constant adult supervision when children are around water and persuading pool owners to provide better barriers against trespass and other physical safeguards, could possibly reduce the annual pool fatalities by half. Curbs on drinking before swimming and measures to avoid trespass and the avoidance of swimming or working alone at a pool, could reduce adult tragedies considerably. A combined legislation - educational - enforcement programme is needed.

That seems to suit our situation here pretty accurately. It also points out that our problem is not unique. I was interested to know, Mr. Speaker, just what the other provinces were doing in Canada in trying to resolve this ever-growing problem.

I was interested to see that the Maritimes have done nothing. I do not suppose that they all swim in the ocean, but it does sound as if they have not done much with this problem down there yet. Saskatchewan and Quebec do have regulations governing public pools, but they limit theirs to pools that are open to the public, or to which the public is invited. In other words, their regulations appear to be very much like our own. Neither of them refers specifically to, or has any regulations that apply to apartment pools.

British Columbia has a pool regulation not much different from ours, but it specifically exempts apartment pools. They do not, as far as I have been able to find out, have any other specific regulations that do apply to apartment house pools. However, there is a bit of silver lining in all of this, because when I came to look into the question of regulation in Alberta and Manitoba, I found that they do, indeed, have regulations governing apartment house pools.

Manitoba has a regulation which applies to apartment house, hotel, motel, and pools operated by clubs that are classed—and all cases are classed—as semi-public pools; so apartment, motel and hotel pools they have looked at, and they have said, "Okay, we are going to class these as semi-public."

I am using the term "semi-public," although I understand that they actually call their designation, or create the designation of "semi-private," although this, to me, has a sort of hospital connotation, so I stuck to the other term of "semi-public." I found that Alberta, likewise, has regulations governing apartment pools, and it calls them "semi-public." Now, what Alberta has done, has been to say, if the pool is, or has more than 2,000 square feet that would be a pool say 60 feet by 33 feet or more—they would class it as a public pool, and impose upon the owner-operator of the pool all the regulations that are imposed on any other public pool, whether it is a true public pool in the sense of being open to all personnel or not.

They then go on and say that pools under 2,000 square feet will be classed as semi-public, and in both these cases, where they classify, both Manitoba and Alberta, where they talk about their semi-public pools, impose considerably less rigorous controls over the use and operation of those pools.

Frankly, and despite the rather general wording of my resolution, in which I suggested that apartment house pools should be classed as public pools, I warm to this approach taken by Manitoba and by Alberta. I really feel that our regulations, instead of taking the rather barren approach of dragging apartment pools into the definition of

public, rather than that, our regulations should be extended to include a section that would cover apartment house pools in a special category, with such measures as lighting, filtration, supervision and so on, but the heavy onus that is cast on public pools in this area, should not be imposed on the apartment house pools.

The qualifications of lifeguards might not have to reach the same level or standard. Barriers between the spectator galleries and the pool might not be a strict necessity as they are under our regulation and definition of a public pool. I do not see why food or beverage should be precluded at the pool apron, and certainly we all know of many of these apartment pools at which you can and quite sensibly do, have facilities for refreshment at the pool-side.

The stringent requirements seem to me to be perfectly legitimate and justifiable for public pools, but hardly applicable to our apartment house pool. I suggest, in closing, that our Department of Health should take a good look at what Alberta and Manitoba have done, with a view to appropriate steps to amend our own regulations.

Mr. T. Reid (Scarborough East): Mr. Speaker, in discussing this resolution, that the public health regulations be amended to include apartment building swimming pools within the definition of public pools, I rise with my knees shaking, because I have not prepared adequately for this most important resolution.

First, I would like to raise a general question for your consideration, sir, in that while this is an important matter that young children, in particular, have drowned in apartment building pools due to lack of supervision, and perhaps faulty construction, it surely is not a matter that should be brought to this chamber. For this type of discussion, we have a competent, at times, Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond) in this province, and I would think that in matters like this, a private member might write the hon. Minister of Health a memorandum stating that he has these views, for example, that apartment building swimming pools should be included within the regulations. I am sure the hon. Minister would look into the matter—have his experts look into the matter—do the research, and change the regulations if he saw fit.

So I would suggest that instead of wasting our time even more by discussing such resolutions in this chamber, there might be some technique of co-ordination with the Ministers involved on these important, but fairly routine matters.

My understanding, too, Mr. Speaker, is that the Department of Health has already been able to alter the regulations or to put it another way, the Minister has already changed by order-in-council, existing regulations to enable pools in certain collegiates which did not qualify, or did not meet the requirements, to open as pools. And I refer the members to the Guelph *Mercury*, January 3, 1968, page 13 where the following news item was carried. It is headed: "The Minister of Health Explains Approval of Swimming Pool." Here is the statement from the *Mercury*.

> How the Ontario Minister of Health got around the legislation to permit the use of the swimming pool in Guelph's Centennial collegiate vocational institute is set out in the letter from the Hon. Dr. M. B. Dymond, Minister, that was read to the city council on Tuesday. "A pool, that has been classified as a non-conforming pool, may be approved by the Minister for use as a public swimming pool." The requirements are an undertaking in writing by the operator to provide not less than two lifeguards for each 75 bathers, or fraction thereof. Also that such alteration is made in the construction, management or operation of the pool, and such additional equipment or safety devices are provided, necessary to ensure health and safety, and provide adequately for the convenience in or about the pool. The regulations require that a notice be affixed adjacent to each entry, showing the ratio of lifeguards to bathers required in attendance, and additional equipment or safety devices that are required.
>
> In advising that the pool can be used immediately, as the lifeguard requirement is complied with, Dr. Dymond expressed in his letter to the city council "the hope that this pool provides the kind of service for your people, that you have envisaged for it."
>
> One alderman at the city council meeting, Alderman Ralph W. Smith, reported: "Everything is under control, the electric wiring is being checked to prevent serious developments such as claimed a life elsewhere recently, efforts are being made to clarify whether two lifeguards must be on duty if only one or two persons are using the pool."

Well that is the quotation from the *Mercury*, Mr. Speaker. The point in making this remark

is my understanding that the hon. Minister of Health was able, through an order-in-council, to include under existing regulations, or to widen them if you like, a number of pools that did not meet the standards required under existing regulations. Well, surely the Minister can act on his own in this regard as well. Surely if the Minister decides that apartment pools should be supervised either in terms of their construction or in terms of the supervision of the people in the pool, he could do so by taking separate action himself. I do not think it needs a resolution in this chamber for him to do so.

Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, just to be a bit catty, the only type of resolution the government back bencher can bring up, is this kind.

I would, though, like to say a few words on this subject. It seems to me that we are concerned with the question of the control of various types of pools. Pools that may be used by different people, for different purposes, at different times.

For example, we have the public pools in Ontario. We have the private pools, particularly the private ones adjacent to individual homes. We now have apartment pools. I would like to suggest that the type of regulation that is needed might not necessarily have to be uniform, as the member for York East has pointed out. I agree with him that perhaps we can have different types of regulations for various types of pools.

Having lived in an apartment, and coming from a riding in suburban Toronto, I think that perhaps the regulations and the control of apartment building pools could be somewhat different.

For example, if the swimming pools are within the apartment building, there are other ways of controlling the use of that pool. People can have keys—there might be some control system on the key itself. Children need not get in without adults. It can be closed at times. It seems to me that we do not necessarily have to have the type of standard regulation that are spelled out in the regulations in the Ontario *Gazette*.

I think the real question is who is going to pay for this supervision. Too often we have proposals by politicians saying that somethings should be done, but we never do a proper cost benefit study on it. It is very nice to stand up and say "we will do this and we will do that", but no one ever bothers to say: "Well that is going to cost someone another ten bucks a month, who is going to pay for it? Is it going to come from the profits of the apartment building owner? If we tighten up the construction regulations, who is going to pay for that? Are we going to grant tax relief?" What are we going to do, are we just going to sit back, and say: "Well let us go and have all apartment pools in the city of Toronto and out in Scarborough East, bring them under these regulations"? And then the landlord might go ahead and say to his tenants: "Well the government has forced us to supervise these pools. Now we either shut them down. Or we keep them open and your rent is up another ten bucks a month."

Well, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that before a proposal like this is either submitted to a Minister of the government privately or brought to this chamber for discussion, that there should be adequate research done on it.

I have not done my research—I do not think it is a worthwhile resolution to discuss here—and with that, sir, I will sit down.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Mr. Speaker, it is also with some trepidation that I rise to speak on the matter of these pools, being to no great extent informed in the matter. Nevertheless, there are a number of things that might be said. I think the New Democrats as a whole would be in favour in principle of such regulation of pools—both private and apartment house pools—that some supervision should be exercised over them by the public domain.

So far as these regulations under The Public Health Act are concerned, in the time that I have had to look at them, I would think that they would require a thorough revamping. As a matter of fact, I would think that they would not be feasible at all as they stand. The type of construction, the sort of supervision by the department over the pool, and the type of security surrounding the pool activities are so extensive and reach so deeply into the private lives of individuals as to be hardly consonant with the whole range of human rights, touching the ownership and the use of apartment facilities. These regulations have to do with public pools. I would suggest that a completely separate draft of regulations would be necessary in the circumstances.

If one looked at section 7 under "Construction," you will see articles (a) to (p) thereunder, with the rather elaborate panoply of equipment that must be utilized. I would hardly think that it would be necessary in the case of apartment pools—at least to the extent set forth therein. Then we get problems with

respect to the type of chlorine gas and other types of cleansing agents used in the pool. I would think that a public pool might be differentiated very easily in this regard, from either an apartment house pool or a private one. I would think that some measure of the size of the pool, as has been indicated in the Alberta legislation, would sound very reasonable and would be a determining factor as to what degree of supervision would be exercised by the local medical board, the medical officer of health, in his frequent trips to the pool itself and the business of the department approving the pool in the first instance. That may be the index or criteria that might be used in these regards. Apart from that, if one looks at section 16, it says that the operator shall post notices in conspicuous places in the pool notifying bathers in subclass B that all bathers shall take a shower using warm water and soap, and down below that no person shall engage in boisterous play in or about the swimming pool. Well, I would think that somewhat of a trespass upon the rights of apartment house owners.

Whether they take a shower to go into the pool or not, I do not think that that type of regulation is feasible. I think we easily could consider that whether or not somebody has BO—and even his best friend won't tell him—is a matter that would be made known within the apartment complex itself. No notice is given here or cognizance taken of the size of the apartment house, apart from the size of the pool. It could be a very small apartment house. For that matter it would bring the full weight of these regulations or such regulations upon the heads of tenants. It would not only make for exorbitant costs going one way, that is, in the construction of the pools, but would also have, probably the effect therefore of preventing much construction of pools; on the other side of the fence, it would be too onerous a liability to lay on the heads of the tenants themselves. Thank you.

Mr. G. Bukator (Niagara Falls): Mr. Speaker, I have been contacted by some of the people who are affected by the legislation or the regulation pertaining to safety about swimming pools and I think the government does have a problem to wrestle with. But let us look at the other side of the coin, and consider the small tourist operator, a man who has a motel with maybe 15, 20 or 30 units. To try to compete with the bigger establishments, they must put in a swimming pool. If these people whom I speak of—and we have many in the city of Niagara Falls—have to put a lifeguard on duty near that pool to guard it, and possibly to take care of the problem from 9 o'clock in the morning or till midnight, that would actually put that particular operator out of business.

They could not afford to hire that kind of help. While I realize it is needed, there should be some kind of precaution. I do believe that every swimming pool that is a public pool, where there are children, and where the tourists are around, ought to have fences up. If that is not part of the regulation, I think it should be. I think it is a measure of safety and I do believe that it would be good business to have that in the Act that if a person applies for a licence to build a tourist establishment he ought to have a fence about that swimming pool. I am fortunate to have a lived in a neighbourhood where just a few hundred feet from my home there is a quite a good pool at a tourist establishment.

The owner of that establishment said, "any time you want to use it by all means help yourself." Before they put their fence up, I watched children walk up to it, toddle about on the edges and the thought that they could tumble in unnoticed does scare one. Since that time they did put the fence up—although when that municipality did issue a licence to the individual to build his motel and allowed him to build his swimming pool, they did not compel him to put a fence around it. It is quite a substantial one, quite a size. But I cannot see where an operator who has a pool which may be quite small has to put a lifeguard on the job to protect the people who are using it, because under no circumstances could they afford to do that. I can find where management, through their staff, can keep their eye on the people who work there—who not only work there but use the pool. I can understand that being a part of common sense and good reason. But some of my people have already contacted the hon. Minister by letter, and I suppose he has got letters from throughout the province, to deal directly with this one that I have brought to you and I hope very forcibly, or quite forcibly. I do believe that for a small establishment which has a pool and cannot afford through the finances that they have to put up to hire a guard, that they can very well get along with management supervising. They talk about the buddy system and swimming and skin diving. Possibly the people who run the establishment could say, "I would not want you there alone—you should have someone with you just in case you get

into trouble." I might add to what I have already said I have been in the fortunate position to live near a very rapidly moving body of water—the source of supply of water to the hydro power plants—and recently they have taken more of the water out and have made that water much more treacherous for swimming.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Which does not pay taxes.

Mr. Bukator: Which does not pay taxes. I was hoping that someone would prompt me or help me with that one. But I might say that all of the children in that village—I doubt very much whether we would have a casualty in that particular river because the people know what they have to contend with —have learned to swim in that river and we have never had a local child drown in that particular body of water. I know by the same token of small swimming pools that has taken many lives, and I realize that there should be protection. But I would like the Minister to take a good look at the problem that these people have who run the small establishment—who just cannot afford it. They will just have to close their pools up. They cannot afford to hire a lifeguard because they are not that big in business. Having said that I would not want anyone to get the impression that I do not think there should be some protection there. I do believe that management and the people who work near them could supervise and guard against possible drowning in these small pools. But I hope the day never comes where the small business establishments have to put a lifeguard on, because it is just not possible financially.

Mr. Speaker: Are there any further speakers on this resolution?

Mr. J. W. Snow (Halton East): Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to speak on this resolution, but I do believe that I have a few comments which I would like to add to those that have already been brought up. I certainly do feel that there is room for some change in the regulations pertaining to the, shall we say, semi-private swimming pools—thinking of those for apartment houses and for motels and hotels. I certainly think that there should be legislation which would govern the construction details pertaining to average depths and the slope of the bottom of the pools—getting away from the drastic slope found in some pools. The bottom should be so constructed that it is not slippery. There should be adequate ladders and steps and railings to these pools as a safety measure. I believe the proper safety equipment should be required, such as long hook pole, safety lifesaving rings and a length of rope. The necessary equipment should be required at every pool, really, whether it be a private pool in your own backyard, or one of the semi-public pools.

Of course, proper fencing must be supplied. I believe most municipal building bylaws say that any pool, whether it be private or public, must be properly fenced so that when the pool is closed it is reasonably safe to the public, especially to the young toddlers who might wander into the pool.

I know that with these pools, even if you have a six foot chain link fence around them, you will find people swimming in them when the gate is locked, because it just does not stop them on a hot summer's evening. I do also think that proper chemical treatment equipment for the pool and the use of necessary chemicals and that at least daily, or twice-daily, testing of the water in the pools, to make sure that there is no health hazard, certainly should be a requirement.

To go further than this—to make these pools come under the regulations pertaining to public pools—I think would be a great injustice. People in apartment houses like to be able to go and sit around their pool, have a picnic around the pool, or food or beverage. They like to feel that this is the same as their private pool. After all, they are the tenants in the apartment building, and this is a private pool for themselves and possibly their guests.

To require lifeguards on a pool—to do this properly—I believe the average apartment house pool would be open approximately 12 hours a day, from say, ten o'clock in the morning until ten o'clock in the evening. This would require at least three lifeguards, to have two on duty at all times, allowing for lunch breaks and so on. Even using students, as would normally be used as lifeguards during the summer months, becomes difficult too. Your pool is open before the students are available for work in the spring and after they go back to school in the fall. Even based on students' salaries, it would probably cost at least $4,000 annually to supply the lifeguards for an apartment or a motel pool.

This might not be such a great deterrent to a very large apartment development, or a very large motel, but if a smaller building—such as the hon. member for Niagara Falls

mentioned—were to have to live up to this requirement, to supply the proper lifeguards for a small motel or a small apartment, it would, I believe, be imposing an unrealistic cost on the owner, and in turn on the tenants that are living in the building.

I think that every precaution should be taken by the owners of such establishments, by way of supplying the necessary equipment and the fencing, and some type of general rules for the use of the pool, such as no small children in a pool without an adult in accompaniment or rules of this type, but I certainly feel that to put further restrictions on would be unjust at this time.

Thank you.

Clerk of the House: Resuming the adjourned debate on the motion that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and that the House resolve itself into the committee on ways and means.

ON THE BUDGET

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, with 14 minutes remaining until you will be calling it 6:00 o'clock, I will endeavour to complete the section of my remarks that were begun last Friday, having to do with the development of the waterfront section of Toronto.

I was just about to call your attention, sir, to the need for a trade centre that would be part of our provincial capital. I feel that it would be as imaginative in concept as Montreal's Place Bonaventure, but it must be located close to the downtown area where it can share and contribute to the daily life of this city. This is necessary because the role of a trade centre is quite different from that of a public facility. It makes sense to me to connect the trade centre to the subway and transportation system, that it should be close to the present hotels and particularly the new hotel that the Canadian National Railways may have in their mind for development in this city.

As long as it is available for those people who would come from great distances to make use of it, and to take part in the trade fairs that it would house, it would certainly be of great use to this city.

In addition, Toronto's waterfront area could include—and, I believe, should include—a large pedestrian square at the bottom of University Avenue, built over the existing roads; the relocation of Lakeshore Road to increase the amount of waterfront parkland; a public marina near the Humber River; and large apartments near the downtown core built by Ontario housing corporation, if it is the wisdom of the Toronto housing authority to give over their responsibilities and jurisdictions to OHC, as I believe in the long run would be in their best interests.

These apartment developments are the type that have been frequently announced by the government but very little has been done in order to build them. I well remember in the days immediately before the election of October 17, when the Minister responsible for housing announced one of these developments in his own constituency. There has been some movement since that time, but we are a long way from moving the families into the apartment complex that he was talking about.

Surely the answer for the city of Toronto, the large downtown area, is the high rise sort of development that can be used, if it is properly designed, for families that perhaps are not interested in single family dwellings or perhaps are not economically prepared to accept that sort of responsibility. With careful planning we should surely have the commercial facilities right in the apartment, and certainly the school facilities right there.

Too often it is thought that it is necessary to set aside large tracts of land for the schools, particularly the elementary schools. Recent studies indicate that these new apartment designs can include the schools within them, with the land that is normally available and must be made available if these high rise apartments are going to have the surrounding recreation amenities that would go with the numbers of people living in the apartment itself. Here is a practical approach, which surely the Minister responsible for housing should consider and move and act on.

It is astonishing to think that we have so few good plans for housing medium to large urban families in apartment complexes that would include all of those facilities. It seems that the only apartment blocks that can presently rise downtown are places like the Village Green or Sutton Place that are well beyond the reach of needy families, or in fact beyond the reach of all but the higher echelon—the members of the Legislature, Mr. Treasurer.

With housing starts down and rents rising so fast, it is impossible to keep track of these changes. The solution to the Metropolitan urban crisis requires the immediate and complete co-operation of the three levels of

government, but with Queen's Park clearly showing leadership, which it has failed to do in years gone by. It is here that a massive programme of low cost housing should begin.

We should be co-operating more fully with Ottawa in this matter now. Ottawa will, in any event, be bearing 75 per cent of the cost. This province brought back $360 million from the last federal-provincial housing conference, yet dubbed the meeting a failure. The failure, I suggest, was not a federal failure but a provincial one. They went down there, I suppose with empty pockets, but in many ways, empty minds, certainly without any imaginative proposals. It was up to the federal government to lay down, as they did, their long-range approach over the next four to seven years for the part that they expect to play in the development of our communities, particularly those large urban centres, such as Metropolitan Toronto.

The Minister knows that a practical approach, rather than a vote catcher like HOME, can evoke and will evoke a response at the federal level that we can all be proud of.

Mr. Speaker, I have just a few remarks to make about a subject that is of great importance, continuing importance. I would say that no urban renewal scheme can succeed without at least the powers of expropriation behind it, but the present system is as incapable of producing the desired results as it is so often inhumane in its effects on the families and individuals affected by change. Too often, in my view, the urban renewal directors simply file a plan of expropriation on the lands considered without attempting in any way to acquire title to the property in the normal bid and ask—or in the normal negotiations that would precede the purchase of a property normally.

I would say there are many improvements that we must enact at this session to the expropriation procedures statute. Too often the complaint at the municipal level is that our procedures and enactments do not provide the municipalities with sufficient freedom of action to accommodate the home for a home policy that many enlightened politicians, Liberals included, feel should be a part of this sort of negotiation.

We have to have one central expropriation authority—or at least we have to centralize this to a much more important degree than we have done in years gone by—with every right to appeal, and every right to approve the decisions of the expropriation committee when they simply indicate that they have need for the land. I do not underestimate the practical and legal technicalities this approach entails, but the formula must be found that balances civil liberties and the common good and that brings the whole expropriation process out into the open, so that justice can be seen to be done.

Too often the individual whose land is being expropriated does not have access even to the information that is available to the government board or commission that is the expropriating power. We have often seen, particularly in cases involving expropriation for conservation authorities, that the evaluation that is purchased by the government board is not made available to the person whose land is being taken. He is put to the additional expense and difficulty—often beyond his powers—to get a countering evaluation, so that when these matters come before the board or whatever it may be, he is poorly armed and his monetary involvement is very great indeed.

We have to have a home for a home as the basis for expropriation. How else can justice prevail? You know the history and the cases in court and the jurisprudence in this, but the plain fact is that the elementary humanity that a home for a home is the fair and proper thing to do. When there are buyers that are willing to pay $30,000 for the kind of house that would fulfill this moral obligation in our large urban centres, so that they can turn it into a town house, the temptation to neglect our social responsibilities in this regard is often very great.

We do so at our peril, because if justice does not begin here, then what hope have we of carrying justice into wider fields? We must start to do the decent thing right here in Toronto, where the slums are within walking distance of this building. The urban renewal programmes must be a continuing effort on behalf of the municipalities.

The important matter is that public confidence be strengthened in many areas reinstated in our programmes of expropriation. It has improved, certainly, with respect to expropriation procedures of The Department of Highways when these procedures are compared with what they were in days gone by. But these surely must be strengthened. There is the general response with most people that when the government officials come and call on you, you must, of course, refuse the first offer, because the officials will be back to negotiate. They will be back to compare your response with the response of your neighbours. There is a general peculiarity that has grown up about the expropriation procedures

of this government that is something less than arms' length. It is something objective and certainly it is far less than fair.

The procedure that really has been an earmark of this government's policy is that in an effort to conserve public monies it is their desire to expropriate lands for the lowest possible figure. I believe that this figure must be replaced by a far better one. It must be the aim of the government to see that justice and fairness prevails, and that this surely must be the earmark of our expropriation procedure. I am against urban renewal upheaval, and I am against populating the city with one special kind of people, rather than with a balanced community. I think that most planners will agree with me in this. I can think of nothing worse than a Toronto that is so unlike the rest of Ontario and Canada that it attracts only the high income, the childless, the young and the so-called smart types at the expense of the general run of citizens, those people that I have already named, plus the elderly, the week, the fumbling, and I suppose the average.

Yet this is the metropolis that the urban policies of this government are forcing into being. These are not cosmic forces over which we have no control. These are trends that can be changed overnight, sir, by bold and imaginative policy decisions that will get at the root of the urban dilemma.

What are we going to do then to create these balanced communities? I say that we do it by enabling people to get a roof over their heads, and in 99 per cent of the cases that is all we have to do. This is a great challenge indeed. We know that the average citizens are excellent risks in housing finance. Once they have surmounted the now impossible hurdles of those enormous initial payments, then come hell or high water, they will meet the monthly payments on their homes with clock work regularity, and the Minister knows that this is true. So to get them started, we have to offer provincial second mortgages at reasonable rates and I would have put this to you on previous occasions.

But I believe that beyond this, we must plan for provincial first mortgages to stabilize the sky-rocketing interest rates. At least the ratification of this proposal merits the fullest exploration with the federal government. By the end of the century, the migration to our cities will have changed our world. That is the extent of the urban crisis, we have to face up to it now. This Budget does not do so. Housing is discussed as "top priority" in the Provincial Treasurer's (Mr. MacNaughton) words. He announces with fanfare, a $400 million provincial programme, and the facts are that, in a Budget of $2.8 billion, we find only $60 million for housing from provincial sources, and this is an increase of a paltry $15 million over last year.

This is a weak reaction indeed to a programme that supposedly has this government's top priority. It is cynically pulling the wool over the eyes of our citizens who are trapped in the urban jungles that Conservative management has allowed to grow.

It being 6 of the clock p.m., the House took recess.

ERRATA

Tuesday, March 12, 1968

Page	*Column*	*Line*	*Correction*
665	2	44	Change to read: will be adjusted nominally to $5.90, $11.80

Wednesday, March 13, 1968

731	1	28	Change to read: Kitchener, representing the Consumers' Association of Canada. Mr. Malcolm David-

Friday, March 15, 1968

Contents		4	Change to read: Questions to Mr. Stewart re the Canada and Dominion Sugar Company, Mr. MacDonald, 838.



Legislature of Ontario Debates

No. 36

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

First Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Monday, March 25, 1968

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1968

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Monday, March 25, 1968

Resumption of the debate on the Budget, Mr. Nixon, Mr. MacDonald 1185

Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. MacDonald, agreed to 1215

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to 1215

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

MONDAY, MARCH 25, 1968

The House resumed at 8.00 o'clock p.m.

ON THE BUDGET

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, with the Premier (Mr. Robarts) back in his seat tonight, I thought that we might continue, at least for a few moments, the discussions that arose in the question period earlier this afternoon when I asked the Premier just what the involvement of the government was in the purchase of lands for recreation and parks purpose, related to the $200 million purchase plan that he announced, I believe, just before the election of 1963.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): It was just before. What a coincidence.

Mr. Nixon: It was before the election of 1963. He was quick to tell me, Mr. Speaker, that we should not believe what we read in the newspaper, and I thought that, so he would know what he was condemning, I would read a very short excerpt from an article in the Hamilton *Spectator* of Friday, March 22, with the heading "Government Group Boycotts Escarpment Conference". I will read about four paragraphs. I quote from the article:

> A one day conference called to discuss the future of the Niagara escarpment was boycotted today by senior civil servants conducting a government study on the escarpment. The conference was sponsored jointly by the Ontario federation of naturalists and the Niagara escarpment committee, a group of planners, geographers, naturalists, and stone quarry owners asked by the government a year ago to form the committee. James Woodford, executive director of the Ontario federation of naturalists, said today the absence of senior government officials was more than conspicuous. Invitations were sent to members of the government Niagara escarpment study group over three months ago, he said. All refused to attend.

Mr. Singer: Well, well!

Mr. Nixon: The Premier was quick to point out that his Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Brunelle) spoke at the event but, of course, we know what it is like when these Ministers, who are very busy, are rushed into the conference just in time to have a bite to eat and to rise and give their views and then leave. But I would like to read on with a further excerpt from this article:

> Mr. Woodford said he fears the government report is being strangled in a web of bureaucracy. Premier John Robarts announced on March 10 last year that the cabinet committee on regional development would conduct a study of the escarpment with a view of turning it into a 450-mile recreation and conservation area that would include Manitoulin Island.
>
> The matter was referred to the interdepartmental advisory committee which in turn set up a subcommittee to deal exclusively with the Niagara escarpment. Subcommittee members include Dr. Thoman, chairman, and representatives of the Premier's office and The Departments of Municipal Affairs, Agriculture and Food, Highways, Energy and Resources Management, Tourism, and Treasury.
>
> Six weeks ago, the government announced the Cabinet committee on regional development had been replaced by a Cabinet committee on policy development. While these committees supposedly work, vacant land along the escarpment is being snapped up by speculators, many of them Americans, Mr. Woodford said. Some evidence of the government's intention to get on with the job is needed, he added.

I would add, Mr. Speaker, "hear, hear" because there has been no evidence of the government's position on this, other than the appointment of a committee and then a subcommittee more than a year ago. Surely this is an inadequate—

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Nixon: Why, certainly.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, I find it difficult to understand if we are talking about the same conference? I mean, are you

still saying that the Minister was not there and that it was boycotted?

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I would say that the government's official committee charged with research into the future of the escarpment, was not represented by anyone, and that the government is shirking its responsibilities in this regard.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, I really want to sort out whether we were really speaking about the same meeting. This man that you are quoting, I do not know what his qualifications are, I can only—

Mr. Nixon: He is executive director of the Ontario federation of naturalists.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: He was quite wrong in what he said because we did have representatives there and we have an active programme. So I must simply say, without knowing the gentleman, I have never met him, but I can only say he is wrong.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): How many Liberals were there?

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I think the matter is a very important one that we—

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): If there were ten people, there were six Liberals.

Mr. Nixon: —that we as Liberals have been calling for the conservation of the escarpment.

Mr. MacDonald: Was the Liberal Party invited?

Mr. Nixon: There have been the inroads of the quarrying industry that we brought to the attention of the House and the select committee on conservation and this was reacted to by the Premier, I thought most effectively, a year ago, when he set up this committee.

But their first report is evidently not due until well into the summer and I would say to you that since the matter was responded to rather forcefully by the Premier in asserting their interest in this matter, I would say that if their interest does not grow, we are going to lose the opportunity to develop this as one of the most important provincial resources.

The reflection in the Budget itself leaves much to be desired as far as the purchase of these lands for recreation close to the large centres is concerned. And, I would say to you, sir, that this lack of faith in Ontario's prospects is not supported by the evidence before us.

The Minister of Mines (Mr. A. F. Lawrence) reported a billion dollar year in that industry in his report just a few weeks ago. We are witnessing renewed interest in the Elliot Lake area, accelerated sales of uranium in the international market and even the prospects of diamonds in Moosonee to gladden the heart of our friend, George Wardrope, whose dream this was.

As a matter of fact it was, I believe, just a few weeks before Christmas that there was some public discussion as to the development and use of uranium for atomic power in the province of Ontario. It was my responsibility, I felt, to point out publicly the shortcomings in the programme that the government has been supporting in conjunction with the atomic energy of Canada Limited over the past few years. This is hardly the time to go over that information again.

I think that there will be circumstances when the vice-chairman is making his report to the Legislature, and when Ontario Hydro is before the committee on commissions, when some of these details might be put before the members. But we have been sadly disappointed by the efforts that this government has taken in order to promote the sale and the development of atomic energy, based on the natural fuel that is found in the province of Ontario, in the Elliott Lake area.

We are hoping for better things in the future because certainly when I predict the expanding economy of the province at a much faster rate than the government economists are prepared to do, it is based on the world need for energy and our tremendous position in this province as one of the chief world sources of uranium. If we only had a vehicle in which we could adequately sell it.

I think that the heavy water reactor that has been developed by atomic energy of Canada, in conjunction with Ontario Hydro may very well, in the future, fill the bill. But so far, it has been a disappointment indeed. We are just now, I understand, negotiating for certain international sales and all of us hope that these will be successful. But our mineral resources must be extracted, purified, smelted, refined and manufactured into secondary goods within our borders wherever possible.

These mining developments are bound to be accompanied by the expansion of our

forest resources and the development of the northern community in general. It is in this connection that I would like to put forward, for your consideration, sir, and the consideration of my colleagues in the House a proposal for a northern development fund which I have mentioned before and which I think is of great interest to the Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Randall).

The capital requirements for this development are the barrier that this Budget does not deal with. The savings of Canadians, particularly those in Ontario, remain in mattresses, bank accounts or directed toward American investments, if they follow the advice from the NDP. But, too many of our citizens were personally stung, or warned off local investment, by the procession of financial fiascos resulting from the inadequate policies of this government.

The financial failure list includes British Mortgage, Atlantic Acceptance, Fame and Prudential, each one of which swallowed the savings of misled investors and eroded world confidence in Ontario investment.

Still, firms like International Nickel expect to borrow $150 million on the New York market this year. It is a great thing that such a corporation can command the confidence of the international market, but this confidence is based not only on their management and profit position, but also on the world need for nickel, one of our greatest provincial resources.

Ontario, in our view, must expand the Ontario development corporation to permit the utilization of private funds in guaranteed investment in northern resources. The northern growth fund can use the stability of the province to reassure Canadian investors, allowing them to put their own Canadian funds to work, developing Ontario.

I ask the Premier, and the Minister, to consider this as a real possibility, that there are all sorts of people in public life who are calling for increased investment of Canadian savings in Canadian development. And I would say that this government has a very real role to play, not only in restoring confidence in investment in this province, but to direct these investments through a government organization such as ODC so that they would become a very significant factor in northern development.

This is obviously the way to strengthen Canadian participation in our own industry, and to see to it that further growth involves Canadian funds and strengthens Canadian control and management. All this is the due of the north. It will give to this neglected region of Ontario, the economic strength it so badly needs to realize its potential, and that is why I say that we, in Ontario, should at this time, be budgeting and gearing for an acceleration of the rate of expansion of the north, and indeed of all of Ontario, with new initiatives and new programmes.

I believe that southern Ontario will support a rate of growth of our gross provincial product, in real terms, considerably higher than we have experienced in recent years and, in particular, in the last year. To accomplish this, we must not allow piece-meal development to cause some areas to stagnate while adjoining communities are projected into the new kind of urban industrial world.

I mentioned earlier in my remarks, on Friday, the shortcomings of the equality of industrial opportunity programme, EIO. It is under the direction of the Minister of Economics and Development, and in looking over the report in *Hansard* that I was called upon to correct, and, of course, it is a great pleasure to read that a second time, I noticed there the implication that I left with the House was that the town of Waterford had not been so designated.

To set that matter straight, and for the benefit of the Minister who might undertake to look that up, I would say that the designation was delayed, but Waterford has now fortunately joined the list of communities that have this advantage. But it still leaves places like Peterborough—that I called to your attention a few days ago, Mr. Speaker—which does not enjoy designation while it is ringed by communities which, by the statistics that evidently direct the decisions in the Minister's office, had indicated an even greater rate of growth.

But the development of the community of southern Ontario in a broad and modern sense shows a promise unexcelled in other growth areas of North America. No other region of such potential can claim so many natural and man made advantages. Now, by the southern loop, natural gas from the west will reach southern Ontario by a second route. We have discussed this in the House before, but the decision evidently having been made, and the pipeline being under construction, we know that the special advantages that accrue whenever a major new facility of this magnitude is made generally available to industry, will now emerge in this region as they should have emerged in northern Ontario if the second line had gone there.

Already the growth spurt is under way. The

establishment of major plants in the Talbotville area is the forerunner of the kind of development we are going to see from Windsor right through to the Golden Horseshoe as this area grows at a rate unparalleled in our history.

The option on a tract the size of Oshawa, on Lake Erie's north shore, adjoining the Nanticoke power plant by Stelco of Hamilton, means a new Ontario urban centre, and a new Great Lakes port.

I believe, it is going to change the life of southern Ontario and its people. The ownership of this option was kept secret for some time but the tract of land, Mr. Speaker, is 15 square miles in size; three miles, I understand, along the waterfront of Lake Erie, and extending five miles inland into Haldimand county, the stamping ground of the former Provincial Treasurer.

And he knows as well as I, that in years gone by, the forces of development have somehow by-passed Haldimand county. It has remained one of the rural outposts in Ontario, even though it is within fairly easy commuting distance of some of the major centres, like Brantford. We know that this particular establishment is going to make tremendous changes and I would predict that this new Stelco development—

Mr. J. N. Allan (Haldimand-Norfolk): We are going to reverse the trend.

Mr. Nixon: Well that may be. It may very well be the new Stelco development will provide employment for a good many people in the area, even beyond Haldimand county. We are going to see the development of a new town there, a new Great Lakes port. The result will be rapid urbanization of a great part of Haldimand county around the industrial nucleus centred on the lake and it should develop into one of Ontario's new age communities. This is the kind of challenge that the Budget should be reflecting.

How can we be expected to look dour today, and tomorrow be asked to plan the community facilities, the public transportation for regional government that will make this an attractive and exciting new community in the Great Lakes basin?

Mr. Speaker, as we look to these avenues of promise, to the dormant natural resources and the untapped energies of our young people left without opportunities in the backwaters of Ontario, to all the factors that make Ontario such an exciting place to be part of at this time, we realize that we have to have a budget in keeping with our potential. The 1968 Budget should not be restrictive and full of retrenchment. It should contain the initiatives and ideas that will take Ontario forward, defining its growth pattern and channelling the energies of the eager people of this province towards clearly marked goals.

The next 30 years will see changes in our way of life, much more extensive than those that have affected us so far in this century. I believe that progressive government, acting on expansionist policy, can achieve a standard of living in Ontario that by the year 2000 will see us leading the world.

Mr. Speaker, you will have read the Canadian welfare council has started a new study on the effects of young children being cared for by people other than their working parents. It is clear that facilities in this area are inadequate to meet the increased demand. This study arose from one statistic, that one worker in six is now a mother whose responsibilities in that role are still very much with her.

In fact, while 1.7 per cent of the growth rate for the male labour force, the female labour force is growing at three times that rate. This rate of growth is something unprecedented in our society, but it is only one facet of a world that is changing all around us.

Changing family and community needs make everchanging calls on government. We must be continually alert in revising the list of services of a family and community nature, and indeed the whole range of government services, so that changing social reality is answered by appropriate government programmes.

This is also a cogent reason for pressing forward with a study of the possibilities of a guaranteed minimum income plan that is at once efficient and flexible, that will be easy to administer, and that will take the stigma out of welfare and cut its costs, so that the money finds its way to the recipients automatically, rather than going toward the upkeep of the housekeeping machinery of the welfare establishment.

The welfare workers ought to be working with people and re-orienting them towards new prospects and possibilities. Too many are merely engaged in administration of complex formulae for a hodge-podge of handouts under a score of headings. I would say to you, sir, that there would surely not be a private member in this House who has not had to deal with these welfare workers, well

motivated though they may be, and with the regulations that control their decisions.

We discussed this matter briefly this afternoon under another heading, but it certainly has broad, general and very important applications. A guaranteed minimum income would save much of this money and would give welfare workers a more dignified and professional role in the new society. It ought to be considered a high calling, indeed, to graduate in social science and become what our French-speaking friends call an *animateur*. There is evidence from the United States of many studies and projects now under way, some of them out of necessity, relating to a guaranteed minimum income.

The centre for the study of democratic institutions has men of the stature of Robert Hutchins, former president of the University of Chicago, working on these proposals. Michael Harrington, who wrote *The Other America*, the book that triggered the Kennedy war on poverty and Sargent Shriver, who has been much in the news in recent days. People of this calibre are now being attracted to and becoming actively engaged in government approaches to the concept of the guaranteed minimum income.

We, therefore, propose that a federal-provincial study group be appointed to look into this concept. The federal government must be involved in this because they pay, in large part, the costs of the programmes that are directed by the provincial government, and I believe that the federal government should also be involved in order to broaden the scope of the approach. Not only practical reality, but soon, I am convinced, sheer economic necessity will dictate that this be done.

Further in my remarks—and there are not that many of them remaining, Mr. Speaker, you will be glad to know—I will comment on the fiscal relationships between this government and the government in Ottawa. This is a matter that is associated not only with money but with philosophy, in which the two levels of government must co-operate. The increase of taxes that we are to suffer are all regressive, in that they hit unfairly at the lower middle income groups.

Mr. Sopha: The wrong people.

Mr. Nixon: For example, the increase in truck fuel tax will be reflected in increased freight charges for the freight carried, and at every stage of the distribution, a penny will be added here and there to the cost of a whole range of essentials from butter to bacon, baby clothes—from hardware to nylon. As a matter of fact, the announcement made by two of the dairies in the last few days of an increase of two cents on the price of a quart of milk, is associated directly, in the words of the dairies, with the new provincial taxes that they will be required to pay in order to provide services to the people.

Whether or not this is justified it is a reflection of the regressive type of taxation that the Provincial Treasurer has resorted to in the Budget that we are discussing.

Now, the least regressive tax is the income tax, because it is related to the ability of the individual to pay. This is a tax which the federal government collects on our behalf. The hold-over of this wartime innovation seems to have become a continuing part of our constitution, the unwritten part of it. But times are changing and my view in this regard is strongly influenced by wholly provincial considerations.

So I say that when before the next provincial Budget, the Premier of Ontario and his chief advisors make their pilgrimage to Ottawa to negotiate a fiscal agreement with the federal government that may hold for a period of years, that they should not go as supplicants, or as beggars with cap in hand.

The income tax is as much a provincial as a federal source of income. It, of course, is quickest to reflect economical change and most influential in moderating these changes. It is a progressive tax, directly associated with the ability to pay, while users of public programmes must be related to the cost; everyone accepts the primacy of the income tax in a progressive field. Ontario must exert initiative in these negotiations by convening a conference of Premiers and the Prime Minister of Canada and their associated Ministers.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: It has already been held.

Mr. Nixon: Yes, and I am even proposing this without any fancy public relations name. I am even proposing that the Prime Minister of Canada be invited, so do not say it has already been held. The three particular men who have the responsibility for an emerging constitution on fiscal lines, as well as other responsibilities—

Mr. J. H. White (London South): What happened to your policy of one year ago?

Mr. Nixon: —that these people lay the issues on the table before non-negotiable stands are taken by any one.

Last year, our conferences excluded fiscal matters and the Premier made this clear from beginning to end, but this year, we cannot afford to have conferences which exclude these matters. There should not be any question this year, of the second most important government being prepared to settle this matter after a brief conference, at which the federal government presents a statement of settlement on a take-it-or-leave-it basis. There must be no question of this government coming back to Toronto as it did from the last confrontation whining and whimpering and surely the Premier remembers that.

Mr. White: Incredible assertions.

Mr. Nixon: Our future demands that the Premier shall not withdraw to the provincial capital stating his dissatisfaction in the terms that we recall from two years ago—

Mr. White: Unbelievable hypocrisy.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: "An exercise in futility" was how I described it.

Mr. Nixon: —muttering about the inability of the federal government to realize the primacy of provincial needs. As citizens of this great province, we now demand that the Premier take some initiatives himself. It is only in this way that a full discussion and meeting of minds can take place before either side announces the non-negotiable position that got us into so much trouble last time. We do not want face saving, we want cash in the bank and a co-operative plan to finance our responsibilities for the next 30 years.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: The fastest flip we have seen in some time.

Mr. MacDonald: The image is being corrected from that of being the water boy for Ottawa.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I am glad these two gentlemen are paying so much attention to my remarks and if they will simply take them to heart I can see that the province of Ontario will benefit.

We have talked about constitutional theory and will continue to do so but we must also talk money and I would urge that in this new endeavour, all matters other than fiscal problems be excluded from the agenda to make that distinction plain. Now with that proviso, I believe that preliminary consultation with federal provincial discussions at the staff level are all in order and quite germane and these have been brought into line.

The aim will be to go to Ottawa in the fall with the determination and the resolve that was hitherto lacking, and backed up by the kind of facts, figures and documentation that of all provinces really only Quebec has undertaken up until now. The programme lies before us for the next year. There is a possibility I believe—a strong need—that this House would be convened in the autumn of 1968 in order that the government might finally put before us some legislation that would, in fact, reform the provincial municipal tax system that would take into account the fiscal difficulties that have been presented to us by the Smith report that we are surely going to encounter in the next few years.

At the same time, there is no doubt at all that the Premier, before he goes to Ottawa, might very well take the initiative that I have described and convene the kind of conference which would mean that the final confrontation around the bargaining table at Ottawa would be a much more fruitful and useful one than the conference that set the programme that runs out at the end of 1968.

There must be a regular schedule of high level meetings, probably on a quarterly basis even while the agreement is in force. In the past, these have lasted for five years but we have somehow run out of luck in that regard having to renew them on probably a two-year basis. But these meetings should be held regularly, so that subsequent agreement can always be tailored to changing conditions and can be negotiated with the background having been prepared by a staff which makes this new field its specialty. After all, the rewards of successful negotiation can justify the kind of professionalism that must now be applied to it.

We must never forget the constitution which assigns to the provinces certain responsibilities, and gives to the provinces the right to tax, to meet these obligations to their people. While we are prepared to negotiate for the abatement of more and more percentage points from the whole income tax pie, we, that is the province of Ontario, do have the power to increase the size of that unilaterally to meet our own requirements. We can meet our obligations if necessary in exactly the same way that the federal government has done, by means of a surtax on income.

For practical purposes, we must retain the same tax base, even though we have the right to change even that. Since we want Ottawa to continue in the role of tax collector to avoid duplication of collection machinery

and its expense, then we must go along with the same tax base simply to avoid impossible complications; convenience and efficiency demand it.

However, since we are all going to be using the same base, we must have something to say about that base. We must not accept—I believe we cannot accept—a unilateral determination of that base by Ottawa alone. We have the right to state our views, not only on how much we need but also on how the assessment should be made.

It is in the interests of this province as much as it is in the federal interest, to develop a more comprehensive base for personal income tax—one that would be fair for all concerned and one, Mr. Speaker, that might very well follow the Carter proposals as they have been put before the Parliament of Canada and as we understand them here. I have often felt that Mr. Carter did somewhat of a disservice to all politicians and citizens when he indicated—

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Is he running for the leadership?

Mr. Nixon: —that his proposals had to be adopted *in toto* rather than in part, or by stage. Surely the federal government in their announcements have indicated that they are prepared to undertake a far reaching overhaul of our tax system by stages. It is in this particular responsibility that the government of Ontario must be involved.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, my friends to the left are concerned about who I am supporting for leadership, but I can tell you they can be assured that whoever wins there will be a continuation of Liberal government and it is in the best interests of Ontario.

The very basis of democracy has always seemed to me to lie in the rule which says, the jurisdication that pays out the money for services should have the responsibility to raise that money on taxes. Governments initiate plans and they must, therefore, raise the funds to implement and establish these plans.

It is only governments like this one, that sits docile and planless without initiative, that abdicate this authority. Today we must never build up the impenetrable barriers of fiscal responsibility. That is why we go to Ottawa every few years to renegotiate these agreements in accordance with the changing nature of our society. I know all of us here believe in a strong central government or have protested that we must accept federal intiatives in certain areas. Those areas involve programmes that, in the judgment of the federal government and the Parliament of Canada, think back to medicare; the Parliament of Canada, are in the best interests of national unity and of the right of Canadians as a whole to enjoy equality of opportunity, Mr. Speaker.

I do not know whether this Legislature can be the judge of the efficacy, virtue and rightness of these programmes. Someone has a broader view than we have, and I would say to you, sir, that when it comes to equality of opportunity across Canada, it is the Parliament of our nation. Sometimes we in Ontario, in the light of our narrower interest, may frown on particular measures, but surely it is better to accept federal leadership expressed through Parliament than to partake in the balkanization of our nation as a consequence of our too rigid insistence on the separation of powers and the separation of taxes.

An example of Ontario's failure to appreciate the nature of the new approach was the recent housing conference. The Ontario government came back saying that it had been unsuccessful. I do not think that this was the case since the federal government advanced $360 million for housing. But I think that Ontario had not learned the lesson of a previous fiscal encounter, and that once again the cap-in-hand approach caused the beggar to come away, as usual, disappointed and dissatisfied.

Our negotiations with the federal authority must centre on our prime responsibility to raise taxes within the province to pay for the responsibilities that are ours by constitution. We should go to Ottawa accepting our role as a major contributor to equalization funds. We should go believing in the propiety of federal initiatives in those programmes that relate to Canadian equality and unity, and which must include Ontario to be effective.

We should go recognizing that these benefits imply the continuation of what will now become an evolving panel of shared cost programmes, based in the main on federal initiatives. By "evolving panel", I mean that these programmes are established and accepted and, as they are accepted and stabilized like hospitalization, they will be transferred from joint finance and become wholly provincial in nature.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Do you really agree with this?

Mr. Nixon: Yes, I believe it is so. As such programmes cease to be a federal concern, new programmes will appear in their place on the federal-provincial shared cost panel, which will, in a sense, mirror our changing society. The truth is there for the Premier to see and for the member for Forest Hill, too.

Since confederation there has always been a group of shared cost programmes. These programmes change as the needs of society change as the initiative of the federal government is exerted to unify our nation and bring about equality of opportunity. That is the way it has happened for 100 years and if the Premier thinks that we are going to get away from that programme, I would submit to you, sir, that he is mistaken.

An hon. member: Again!

Mr. Nixon: I do not think there is any doubt that medicare, over a five year period, will gain the universal acceptance that hospitalization now has.

Mr. MacDonald: No doubt about it at all.

Mr. Nixon: Now at that time, the federal initiative would no longer be needed and the medicare programme could pass from the area of joint support to being financed by changing allotment of shared tax resources. Its place will then be taken by education support, in my view—certainly in those areas of educational technology and specialized training needs that will be in such demand in our new society.

For example, the provision in Ontario of the technology for educational television for our province from a national communications satellite, would speed educational television at lower cost than any obsolescent ground base method, and is a logical, federal contribution to a matter which is concerning all the provinces, and particularly Ontario, at this time.

We might have access to a national data bank, as the science secretariat has recenty suggested, or to a shared geophysical survey satellite that would sound out the wealth of the Canadian shield. All of these are possibilities. They suggest themselves in relation to a new approach to federal-provincial relations and the joint design of a more comprehensive tax base.

Mr. Speaker, the Premier has in the past been quick to criticize the government of Canada for lack of consultation and planning in these important matters involving finance. Surely the mayors and reeves of our municipalities can look to the leader of this government with the same criticism. The philosophy of the Premier's office seems to be that municipal politicians and officials are a lesser breed, not able to contribute anything to the final disposition of these important matters that are somehow of minor importance in the democratic stream of responsibility.

Increased aid to municipalities is a case in point. The NDP has undertaken to propose and support a foundation programme for financing municipal expenses. This is patterned after two sources: the one that is operating in Nova Scotia, and the one that is the basis of our educational tax formula in this province. Certainly our experience in Ontario with a foundation programme, based on the complex formula, is completely unsatisfactory and appeals only to the bureaucratic mind of "make-work" politicians.

Mr. Sopha: Hear, hear. Like the member for York South.

Mr. Singer: Yes, and the Premier.

Mr. Nixon: The yearly revisions and tinkering with weights and advantages change and do not satisfactorily fulfil the needs of the municipalities as they are presently set up. Nor will it work when they are rationalized, as they must be, under a system of regional government.

The government, on the other hand, is attempting to implement the recommendation of the Smith report with a basic shelter exemption grant, and it is experiencing impossible difficulties and finds itself, even now, trying to extract from expert opinion, the way by which the $50 gratuity can be put right in the hand of the taxpayer, and need I say, elector.

The fantastic cost of individual cheques, so that the savings will accrue to the home owner and the tenant, would almost preclude the possibility of such a system unless it were modelled directly on the Bennett, BC homeowner grant which has been made to work reasonably well under circumstances prevailing in that province.

There is also another aspect to the basic shelter exemption grant which should be mentioned at this point. In my reply to the Speech from the Throne, I spoke of preelection promises and post-election penalties exacted by the government. The basic shelter

exemption grant was such a promise. The raise in OMSIP and OHSC premiums is the corresponding penalty. Once more, the government will take back more than it gives—and from the people who can least afford it. In one pocket and out the other.

The Liberal position clearly stated in the recent election—and I should say here the Premier accuses us of saying what we have said before, and in this case he is absolutely right—is that we believe that over a four-year period, the government should take over an average of 80 per cent of the cost of education at the municipal level.

We are more than ever convinced that this is the right way to go about aiding municipalities. It is far simpler and fairer to administer than the NDP proposal—they used to support us in this but they seem to have taken a new tack again—and it does not contain the great difficulties of the basic shelter exemption grant.

Even if the grant does reach the tenants, many landlords will raise rents by more than the amount of the benefit. We talk about regressive taxes. This grant would be a regressive bonus. I am convinced that even with the grant operating in whatever form it may finally take, thoughtful people will come back to the common sense ground of the Liberal proposal for an average 80 per cent, achieved over the next four years towards the cost of education.

May I say, sir, that the introduction of the amendments to consolidate school areas in no way weakens the soundness of our 80 per cent proposal. In fact, this development, regardless of its other merits or defects, by insisting upon separate billing for education at a different time of the year by the municipalities, clearly cancels our one objection, namely that the municipalities would fill the tax vacuum by some other local use of the property tax revenue. Even that objection will disappear when separate billing becomes law.

The need for far-reaching reform of municipal grant system is recognized by all. Even in the Budget itself, there is an indication that the proposals are merely stop-gap and we must continue to wait for the reforms that province needs and has needed for ten years. The Provincial Treasurer has indicated we must wait for a Smith report study. Stop-gap measures have been taken once again.

The fall session, as I mentioned a moment ago, of the Legislature is the latest opportunity that we can let this matter run on. The government has been ineffective and procrastinating in this matter to the detriment of municipal taxpayers, as new rates are being announced even now.

The House has a heavy responsibility to direct and approve the expenditure of $2.8 billion dollars in public funds. This debate will continue for many days, mived in with other business, but for our part, we believe the government programme to be inadequate for the challenges to be met in the coming year.

Mr. Speaker, for the reasons that I have set out at length, I move for the consideration of the House, seconded by Mr. Singer, that the motion "that Mr. Speaker do now leave the chair and the House resolve itself into the committee on ways and means" be amended by adding thereto the following words:

This House regrets:

1. The government's dependence on regressive tax and revenue increases which impose harsh new burdens on lower and middle income citizens and employers, particularly in the financing of health services;

2. The paltry commitment in dollars and initiative towards alleviating the worsening housing difficulties;

3. The lack of initiative in maintaining the Ontario sugar beet industry which will add new financial hardships to the agricultural economy;

4. The absence of a wage price review board that should be operating in areas of provincial jurisdiction to assist in easing the cost of living and to act against inflation;

5. The lack of an overall reform of the grant policy to assist municipalities in reducing local taxes, particularly as they are related to school costs;

6. That no effective programme for the industrial and economic growth of northern Ontario has been proposed which would channel private and public funds into the development of our natural resource areas.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, the Budget debate affords one the opportunity to roam as far as one wishes, and I want to exercise that privilege to a small degree to deal with two or three unrelated issues that have emerged very recently.

The first is a reference to a story that appeared in this afternoon's *Telegram*. It is under the title of "Quackery to Teach

French" and it is date-lined Guelph and it reads as follows, in part:

> Teaching French in Ontario is about as relevant as teaching Swahili, the Assistant Deputy Minister of University Affairs, A. P. Gordon said here today. Mr. Gordon, one of five men at a Guelph University Teach-in rapped his own government for going bi-lingual.
>
> "The government is introducing French because it is the thing to do," he said. "They are not thinking whether it has any relevance. Everyone is jumping on this bandwagon, because it is the thing to do, and the universities are not doing anything to expose this quackery."

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Well, I hope tomorrow he is reading The Unemployment Insurance Act.

We would ask the Minister of Education (Mr. Davis), if he was ever here.

Mr. Macdonald: In the Budget debate, the member from Sudbury will have the opportunity to make his speech later, instead of trying to dub it in on my track. What I wanted to say, Mr. Speaker, is that the Bi- and Bi- report has provided an encouraging degree of consensus in this nation on this very vexing problem which is at the heart of Canadian Confederation and the tensions that are plaguing it.

It has not only provided a consensus, it has provided a programme for action and I commend this government for moving it in the direction of its fulfilment. But I find it a little strange that right in the government, at the top levels in The Department of Education, we should have people presumptuous enough to dismiss this consensus, and with remarkable impropriety as to publicly challenge the government's position.

I do not want to say, as suggested by my friend from Sudbury that the man should be unemployed, but I would say to the Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) that a fatherly chat to the gentleman would not be out of place. Indeed, we will leave other statements for later consideration, but in the same story, Mr. Speaker, there are two quotes which are fascinating. When, out of the heights of education, we get these comments today, I look forward to the estimates for those departments. One quote is: "He said 'research should be removed from universities and attached to a particular branch of industry'." Now, to put it mildly, that is a little controversial.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Maybe the chat should be more than fatherly.

Mr. MacDonald: The second one, Mr. Speaker, and this is a direct quote—

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Yes, I must admit I read this with some surprise myself.

Mr. MacDonald: Yes—I am sure you did. The second quote reads as follows: "We are well on our way to committing all errors at once in developing community colleges," Mr. Gordon said.

Mr. Sopha: Is he for anything at all?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I do not really know him.

Mr. Sopha: You know the fellow.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: No, I do not.

Mr. MacDonald: Are you going to know the fellow? Do you intend to get to know the fellow?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Perhaps not personally.

Mr MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister satisfies me for a moment, if he will just have that fatherly chat, because there are a few things to be clarified for Mr. Gordon, not only in the educational field, but in the appropriate role of a civil servant.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Perhaps the hon. member would continue that quote. I liked the bit, too, about the number of people who were at the teach-in as compared to the group from which they were chosen.

Mr. MacDonald: I am glad to oblige the Prime Minister. As a matter of fact, if this is what was being preached, it was a good thing that so few were there. But the final paragraph does say that "the two-day teach-in was attended by about 80 students, a fraction of the university's total enrolment of 4,000".

Hon. Mr. Robarts: So I gather he did not have a very big audience.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: Pursuing the category of odds and sods that I wanted to deal with in exercising the freedom of the Budget debate, Mr. Speaker, I almost developed a little sympathy for the government in face

of the massive onslaught that the Liberals were directing towards them a moment or so ago.

For example, I found the government a little bit vulnerable, to put it mildly, in not having sent anybody from their study committee to this Niagara escarpment conference. If they have a committee which is studying this question, when any group of people, particularly the people who are most interested, have taken the trouble to come together, I would think that the government researchers would be there. So I think the government is vulnerable. But the interesting thing, Mr. Speaker, is that all parties were invited to go there—

Mr. Sopha: Were you there?

Mr. MacDonald: —including the Liberals. And the Liberals had nobody there, so they had to quote from the newspapers in criticism of the government.

The answer to the question from the hon. member for Sudbury is that our caucus was invited and we had an official delegate in the hon. member for Yorkview (Mr. Young), who was there.

The other point that I viewed with both interest and compassion so far as the government was concerned, was this mighty onslaught on the government for not standing up and being tough with Ottawa in terms of getting money.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Not even talking to them.

Mr. MacDonald: We have an interregnum in Ottawa at the present time and I suppose an interregnum in Ottawa leaves the Liberal leader in the province of Ontario able to play a free role, an uncharacteristically free role. For about a generation, the Liberal leader in Ontario has either been a captive of, or ignored by, the Liberal Party at Ottawa. We do not know who the leader will be, but if it is any consolation to the Prime Minister, before he has to go to Ottawa to negotiate, there will be a new leader in Ottawa, and you will have the Liberals from this side of the House, as we have had for 25 years, making excuses to defend Ottawa from your terrible onslaught. When that happens, I will be on your side pressing for more money, even though the Liberal leader defends Ottawa once again.

Mr. Sopha: The newspapers will tell you who the leader is.

Mr. MacDonald: Before considering the Budget itself, Mr. Speaker, there is a general comment which I would like to make on the pattern of debate which has emerged so far during this first session of our new Legislature.

It is generally agreed that this year's Throne debate was the best in years. It was, I submit, because for the first time in my experience in this Legislature, it was just that—a debate, instead of a succession of speeches which tended to ignore what had gone on before. Not only were issues dealt with, but the underlying political philosophy was expounded and out of it all emerged something of a consensus.

Now Mr. Speaker, a consensus does not necessarily mean agreement, in all instances. A consensus within a democratic society also involves the clarification and acceptance of areas of disagreement with which we are willing to live. Indeed, those areas of disagreement, stemming from different political philosophies, represent the strength and vitality of a democracy. Areas of disagreement provide the choice which is offered to the electorate so that, when and if the voters so desire, they have an opportunity to make a change in government and not just a change in administration.

In threshing out these areas of disagreement, it is inevitable that personalities should become involved, though I would agree that the issues, rather than the personalities which embody them, should remain paramount. It is also inevitable that sharp exchanges, even bitter words should enter the debate. Within limits, this is not to be deplored. It is part of the cut and thrust which elevates parliamentary debate from the routine to the memorable. Some of the greatest debates down through the centuries in the mother of Parliaments contain passages that have scorched their place in the pages of history. Let us not reduce the tone of debate in this House to a milk-toast panty-waist level whose outstanding characteristic happens to be banality.

The differences, I submit, Mr. Speaker, should be expressed within a framework which we all accept. That is the framework of a democratic society, and agreement that those differences will be worked out through the democratic process. Now, when the point is reached, as it has been reached by some hon. members on the other side of the House of characterising those who hold these democratic socialists as "insidious forces" which threaten our way of life, then unwittingly,

Mr. Speaker, those who take this position are themselves threatening our way of life. Because it is an undisputable fact that the democratic socialist parties and their views have become an integral part of all western democracy—indeed, of democratic states all over the world. The examples of this kind of attitude are becoming legion; that is why I raise it.

Speaking, for example, to the Oxford County Insurance Underwriters in Woodstock last fall, the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs (Mr. Rowntree) declared that "the great mistake that the voters made" had nothing to do with defeating a Tory and electing a Liberal, rather it was the growing support that they gave the NDP. He called upon his audience to forget their differences as Liberals and Conservatives—"not to divide the forces of decency," to know "the common enemy," and to make sure that "subversive elements" do not upset the Ontario economy.

Innuendo of this kind, Mr. Speaker, contains an imputation of motives that is not only false, but when and if advanced in this House, is in violation of the rules.

The Provincial Treasurer (Mr. MacNaughton) matches it, Mr. Speaker. Unfortunately he is not here tonight. He matches it both inside and outside this Legislature. He told a picnic gathering in Huron county, as we reminded him a year ago in the session, that "it is my opinon that the forces of socialism —and I may be charitable when I continue to call it socialism—are actively at work in their own particularly destructive manner." In the House, the Minister has often repeated the same kind of accusation, and when the same Minister lashes verbally across the floor of the House: "I hate your bloody guts," then the common fabric in which differences of opinion must be woven, is being violently torn on that side of the House.

And furthermore, Mr. Speaker, when the Minister of Agriculture and Food, (Mr. Stewart) or the Provincial Treasurer, or the Minister of Reform Institutions, attempt to characterize and dismiss the views of the New Democratic Party as Marxist, then they are stooping to levels unworthy of them—

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): Your own member agreed with that as your philosophy.

Mr. MacDonald: —or of any member of this House. Indeed, such reactions represent an attempt to dismiss through innuendo, rather than deal with, differences when they are presented. When you look at it another way—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I just asked him, Mr. Speaker, if he would like some cut and thrust. I did not interrupt him.

Mr. MacDonald: Please ask the hon. Minister to sit down because I will not accept a question from him.

Does the hon. Minister want to sit down when the Speaker has asked him to sit down or does he rule the House like he rules his department and everything else?

Let me make the point another way, Mr. Speaker, there are some members of the governing party on the other side of the House who are very conservative in their views. This is their right and their privilege.

Theirs is a legitimate position within the spectrum of a democratic society. I disagree with those conservative, often extremely right wing views. That is why I am in the New Democratic Party. But if I were to dismiss those views, or to characterize them as being Fascist, I would be being unfair.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: You have done it.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I have never, and the hon. gentleman is trying to protect his guilty conscience because of what he has indulged in.

By the same token, those who hold those views, Mr. Speaker, have no right to characterize my views, or those of my colleagues, as being "insidious forces" which threaten our way of life; as representing an attack on the "forces of decency", or as being Marxist with the imputation which it always carries—particularly with some members, lke the Reform Institutions Minister—that we are less fervent upholders of the democratic process through parliamentary government than themselves.

The position of the democratic right and the democratic left has been put forward with vigour, so far in this session. All this is good. There has been no hesitancy on either side to relate issues to basic political philosophy. That is not only good; that is progress. It means that the clash of opinions, honestly and sincerely held, has deepened and broadened, and in such a confrontation the people of Ontario can only stand to benefit. If hon. members opposite, and to my right, when they sometimes join in this type of argument, persist in imputing sinister motives to us, or indulging in shrill name calling, that is up to them.

For our part, we prefer that the confrontation in this Legislation shall take place on

the genuine issues of our time. On our approach to these issues, the solutions and views that we put forward, we are prepared to have the people judge us. We are ready to take up that challenge because that is what we are here for. I am satisfied that the people of Ontario have the discrimination and the judgment to tell the difference between sound and substance.

Mr. G. A. Kerr (Halton West): That is why you are over there.

Mr. MacDonald: To all of us in this Legislature, Ontario looks for leadership and substance. They have had enough of sound. Beyond the Budget debate which is now launched, we shall get down to the infinite range of problems faced by our people, and set forth in the estimate for next year's spending. That is the task that will occupy us from now, I suggest, until well into summer, and let us get on with the job.

Mr. Speaker, let me begin with a background note to the Budget, and this is partly continuing in the same theme. For the past few years, the Canadian people have been subjected to massive brain washing. The propaganda has poured out daily from all branches of the establishment – financial, industrial and governmental. The message was clear: We are earning more than we produce, we are living beyond our means. The underlying theme is that our difficulties have been created, or at least compounded, by unwarranted intervention by the government in our lives, and by too much government spending.

The result is inflationary pressures which are eating away the value of our dollar, and are always threatening to get completely out of hand.

Now, in this cacophony of fearful warnings, our Provincial Treasurer has been blowing his own little trumpet quite regularly. But when you analyze carefully what he has said, there are contradictions which make most interesting reading in the light of the Budget which he has just presented to this House.

For example, last November, the Ministers of finance met in Ottawa, in an atmosphere of grim resolve, about the austerity budget which the Finance Minister was about to bring down. The public had been well conditioned to the acceptance of tax increases. All the little people of the nation had been told that they must accept their share of the burden in order to restore the confidence among the fat cats of the financial and industrial world, both domestic and international. Without their confidence, we are in trouble. In this atmosphere, our Provincial Treasurer struck a jarring note. This is what he said:

> There is a possibility that tax increases might result in a decrease in the level of disposable income, and create demands for wages and increases. To that extent, the inflation might actually be exacerbated rather than abated.

Imagine, Mr. Speaker—higher taxes would reduce disposable income and lead inevitably to further wage demands and therefore increase, rather than decrease, inflationary measures! What a supremely intelligent statement, though a somewhat puzzling one, in the light of the Budget of the Provincial Treasurer, because the Ontario government has done precisely what it suggested to the federal government that it should not do. I will come back to that in a moment.

The Provincial Treasurer went on:

> In our present situation, the matter of government expenditure becomes critical. We should be considering the alternative expenditures in the gross national product of reducing the proportion of government rather than increasing taxes and the relative size of the government sector.

That is a more familiar stance for a Tory. The Provincial Treasurer was back swallowing the hue and cry for the proportion of government spending, and that is the conventional wisdom of the day. We must restore the balance of the private sector in our economy if our problems are to be resolved. But, wait, Mr. Speaker, our Provincial Treasurer is a very complex fellow, his very next words were these, and I quote:

> However, in this process, a blind and slashing attack on government expenditures would be unsophisticated and unwarranted.

So where does the Provincial Treasurer stand? Like the practised politician that he is, he stands on both sides of the question at the same time. Cut down government expenditures in order to restore the balance between the public and private sector of the economy, he says, but let us not be so unsophisticated as to cut them down unduly.

Mr. Speaker, someone once quipped that any attempt to pin Mitch Hepburn down was like trying to pin jelly to the wall. Let me put it bluntly—pardon?

Mr. Nixon: That was his question.

Mr. MacDonald: Was that his question? With regard to whom?

Mr. Nixon: George Henry.

Mr. MacDonald: With regard to George Henry. Mr. Speaker, let me put it bluntly, trying to nail this Huronian blob of jelly to the wall is a pretty futile task.

Mr. Lewis: And he should be here to be nailed.

Mr. MacDonald: Right. Perhaps, for the moment we should accept his preaching, and I have given you a lot of text from his rather varied bible. Perhaps, we should accept his preaching, balanced as it is—so balanced as to be on both sides of the question at the same time—and examine his budget practice in light of that preaching over the past few months.

First, said he, we should cut government expenditures to cope with the problems such as we now face. That is what the Provincial Treasurer preaches. Now, let us look at what he practises.

This year's Budget represents an increase of $489 million, the largest single increase of any budget in Ontario's history. This year's increase, the increase alone, is four times the total of the first budget brought in by the Tories, when they took over power in 1943, because that budget incidentally was $123 million.

Mr. W. Newman (Ontario South): How much was your increase?

Mr. MacDonald: You just listen and you might find out. What of all the advice, Mr. Speaker, about cutting government expenditures? Since your practice belies your preaching so completely, do you not think it is about time that you Tories cut out all this propaganda about the menace of growing government expenditures? To put it bluntly, either shut up, or practise what you preach. Is that not fair advice?

Mr. W. Newman: We are good managers, we do a job.

Mr. MacDonald: Now, let me digress from the Budget itself for a moment. I raise this issue because, quite frankly, I am getting a little weary of the hypocritical drivel which emerges from the Tory benches.

I hate to see the innocent back-benchers on the government side being misled by the Treasury benches who do not practise what they preach.

Let me give you an example of what I mean. I do not cite this case with any intention of picking on the hon. member himself, except that he seemed to be even more willing than others to swallow and regurgitate the propaganda from the front benches.

On February 29, the hon. member for Quinte (Mr. Potter), delivered his maiden speech in this House. To give the hon. member credit, it was a most vigorous expression of the almost pathological fear of the growing government role in modern society.

Mr. Lewis: Right.

Mr. MacDonald: And I quote:

> In Canada today, as in every other country, there is a group of people, ever increasing in size, who unwittingly, perhaps, and without sinister intent, are determined to destroy all individuality and to establish a state-controlled society.

He went on:

> More and more, we see government being influenced by this group to offer us increasingly socialistic policies. By socialistic policies, I refer to services rendered by the state to everyone. We are merely paying the government by means of our taxes, to provide these services to us, and thereby allowing our freedom to pass from our hands to those of our government.

The hon. member then bolstered his case by a warning expressed by the Prime Minister —quoted from the Prime Minister as a matter of fact. The Prime Minister was quoted as saying:

> Each time the state assumes a function and makes a decision for the individual, he must lose some of his freedom which he can never recover.

Mr. R. T. Potter (Quinte): It is true.

Mr. MacDonald: An interesting and debatable point.

The hon. member then attempted to draw an analogy with the fight for freedom in the world wars, and I quote again:

> In Canada, few of us can appreciate what it means to lose our freedom. During the war, the occupied countries—Holland, Belgium, France and others learned the real meaning. We have new Canadians who left their homes and countries because of that loss of freedom and came to Canada.
>
> These people saw many of their friends and families killed, and many Canadians gave their lives to help them win back their freedom and defend it for us. Must we sit idly by and watch it being eroded without doing anything to stop it? We do not want this to happen unless we make ourselves heard much louder than the minority whose plan it is to steal our freedom from us.

The hon. member then reached his peroration:

> We, as individuals, must strive as never before to defend our birthright against these insidious forces which are seeking to destroy our individuality, as well as our freedom.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: You make it sound better.

Mr. R. M. Johnston (St. Catharines): Sounds good.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, all I want to say to the hon. gentleman, through you, on the other side of the House, is that it is time he resigned from the Tory party, because the Tory party has just done in spades, more than any other government has ever done, what he deplores. So if he does not agree with it, I think in all intellectual honesty, he should get out.

Mr. Speaker, just let us, for a moment, after having heard out all this drivel, take a look at it for a moment, because the government has done what he deplores, the biggest single increase in the budget in Ontario's history, shipping into the freedom of people—the freedom, once lost, they will never get back. This government did it. The Tory government.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: So reflect on that instead of so much noise.

Mr. Speaker, for one moment, let us strip away the propaganda façade and deal with the reality—the reality not the propaganda.

All governments today are spending more money.

Mr. R. M. Johnston: I have been waiting for five weeks.

Mr. MacDonald: All governments, whatever their professed ideology, will continue to spend more money. They will do so because they are responding to the democratic pressures of an electorate which is demanding that they should provide services which the private sector cannot, or will not, provide; or for which the private sector has priced itself out of the market.

Mr. Speaker, it is idle for the hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, so often joined by Liberals, to indulge in this weary complaint about growing government expenditures. Their lamentations are as futile as King Canute's effort to sweep back the tide.

Government should not, and cannot, any longer be, as it has in the past, the instrument used mainly by the powerful and the privileged to serve only their interests. In a day when every man and woman has a vote, the problems of all the people have been added to the agenda of Parliament.

It is inevitable that government should be used by all the people to meet their needs. That means more and more services, and higher and higher expenditures. Such a development is not a denial of the democratic process—I say to the hon. member for Quinte—it is a fulfilment of the democratic process.

Mr. Speaker, because this trend is an indisputable fact today, and even my Tory friends on the other side of the House cannot dispute it, my colleagues were right when they said that today, thank heaven, we are all socialists. The Tories are creeping socialists, the Liberals are crawling socialists and the New Democratics are marching socialists. We would prefer to live in the real world of today, rather than some make-believe world of yesterday which you will get back to and which you can never reclaim. As socialists, we have no desire to creep or crawl, but stand up and march because we have a profound conviction that socialism is the fulfilment of democracy in any society that is determined to remain free.

Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House are genuinely disturbed by the government, by big government, by the threat of growing and insensitive government bureaucracy, I invite them to read the McRuer report.

This is the important thing. This study, may I remind you, was instituted by a Tory government which was so insensitive to the rights of the individual, that it bumbled its way into the so-called police state bill. A Tory government did that—not a socialist government.

The McRuer report documents massive invasion of the civil rights of the individuals throughout so many of our statutes, throughout so much of the proliferation of irresponsible boards and commissions, through a growing government bureaucracy which can victimize the indivdual, and too often offers him no means of redress through the normal political process.

The McRuer report, and this is again for my friend from Quinte and some of his colleagues who seem to share his views so completely, the McRuer report dismisses as unjustified—that is his word—the uninformed criticism—that is his word—that public servants, who constitute that faithless threatening bureaucracy we hear so much about, in some way act independently in carrying out their duties, without regard to the public interest, and not subject to the control of the Minister.

The underlying principle of Ministerial responsibility, the report stresses, is that every sector of the public service should be under the direction and control of the Minister who can be called to account by, and in, the Legislature.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: You just criticized a Minister—for too much control of his department.

Mr. MacDonald: I was trying to call him to account, this afternoon, and we will get back to that, because of the strange things the Minister does on occasion.

Time and again, Mr. Speaker, the report documents that this is not the case, and, therefore, the rights of the individual have been encroached upon. All this is part and parcel of the proud record of 25 years of Tory rule which we heard about so much in the election campaign, and which the Prime Minister took time out to extol once again in his Throne Speech.

If the hon. gentlemen who mouthed these hollow slogans about free enterprise, and mount their white chargers to ride off into political battle at the mere word, mere mention of Socialism, if they really believe in freedom, if they really wish to restore and strengthen the rights of the individual, then do not waste their time chasing political ghosts. Look to their own record during 25 years of Tory rule. That is the message of the McRuer report—because the Tory government is financially rooted in the economically-privileged of the nation, and because its instinctive disposition is to protect the rights of the socially-privileged. A Tory party, because of its very philosophy is a far greater threat to the rights of the great majority of individuals than any democratic socialist party. Moreover, Mr. Speaker, in your heart of hearts, some of you know it to be true—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: You and Goldwater.

Mr. MacDonald: And if enough of you do not, then even more than you realize, you are living on borrowed political time.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: Now, Mr. Speaker, with that note by way of background, let me get back to the Budget itself, and the Budget papers accompanying it, and examine some of the verbal ambivalence of the Provincial Treasurer. Summing up all these factors, he said, "The Ontario economy should perform somewhat better than last year," end quote. What are the cold facts, Mr. Speaker? Last year the gross provincial product rose by 7.8 per cent; this year, the Budget papers predict it will rise 7 per cent. In short, the economy may well perform worse, not better, on the basis of his figures.

In 1966, unemployment in Ontario stood at 2.5 per cent; last year it averaged 3.1 per cent; in 1968, the Budget papers predict, it could well rise to perhaps 4 per cent. That will be 1.5 per cent more of our working force idle and unproductive than in 1966. Now what does that mean? The Canadian economic council tells us that each percentage point of unemployed means a loss in the growth national product of $2 billion. Just let me pause and repeat that, Mr. Speaker, because it is rather a basic and interesting figure. Each percentage point of unemployed means a loss in production of $2 billion. Therefore, if our unemployment is going to be 1.5 per cent more than it was in 1966, that will mean a loss throughout the whole nation of $3 billion. Since Ontario's share of the GNP is approximately 40 per cent, that means a loss in the province of Ontario of $1.2 billion in production.

Let us not dismiss it, Mr. Speaker, but let me translate it into something that will be of more interest to the Provincial Treasurer. If you examine the Budget statistics, you will find that close to 10 per cent of our gross provincial product in Ontario returns to the provincial government in revenues. That simply means that the collective failures of government—federal as well as provincial, I agree with the hon. member for Halton West —resulting in a loss of $1.2 billion in our gross provincial product means a loss in revenues of $120 million, and that would wipe out about half your deficit.

Now, I turn to another aspect of the government's whole approach. In conformity with the convention or wisdom of the establishment, the Provincial Treasurer is striving publicly to reduce the public sector in order to establish a better ratio with the private sector of the economy. I have already pointed out that an unprecedented Budget increase of $489 million over last year makes something of a mockery of that whole stance. But let me remind the House of another pathetic gesture in which the Provincial Treasurer has indulged. Some weeks ago, on February 8, the Provincial Treasurer blew his little trumpet over the announced postponement of five major building projects scheduled to start this year and amounting to some $39 million, as well as 20 other smaller projects,

representing departmental facilities in various locations across the province, for a total of some $43 million.

The announcement pointed out that working drawings for the five major projects were completed or are in an advanced stage, and the expenditure in the coming fiscal year would have been only $12 million of the $39 million involved in outside projects. Now with respect, Mr. Speaker, this kind of action by the government is just playing games to bolster a public image—which the greatly increased Budget itself completely repudiates —namely of retrenchment.

If our economy is overheated, and inflationary pressures must be checked by cutbacks, then I protest this simplistic approach which assumes that all of these cutbacks must come in the public sector. There may well be hundreds of millions of dollars of much less urgent construction going on in the private sector of the economy and it is just plain stupid that we should postpone a much needed public project such as the Penetanguishene mental hospital without any effort to cut out low priority construction in the private sector.

The proposition that the market place shall decide the order of social priorities when we must ration our limited construction resources is not in the public interest, and that is what the Provincial Treasurer says he is doing it for. We have too little construction resources so he is backing out to leave it for the others. There are other forms of rationing if rationing is necessary. Only a Tory government, Mr. Speaker, which worships at the shrine of free enterprise, would operate on that basis.

But it is when we examine the government's tax bite, that the government's twisted and anti-social sense of priorities is most flagrantly revealed. As the press has so well detailed, so that I will not take the time to read it here tonight, the new taxes hit the average family to the extent of about $125 a year. This includes increased OHSC and OMSIP premiums of some $81, higher gasoline tax and car licence fees, a 200 per cent increase in cigarette tax, brand new fishing licences for residents, higher provincial parks entrance fees, steeply increased hunting licences, and a host of hikes in minor fees. Now with that in mind, let us listen once again to the Provincial Treasurer's sage advice to the finance Ministers in Ottawa last November, I quote:

> There is also a possibility that tax increase might result in a decrease in the level of disposable income and create further demands for wage increases. To that extent, the inflation might actually be exacerbated rather than abated.

Mr. Speaker, that is rather highfalutin language, but translated into the vernacular, the Minister is saying that his own Budget may well make a bad situation worse, on the family budgetting front, on the labour-management front, and on the inflation front, and that is supposed to be good budgetting. But the Provincial Treasurer protests, "We have got to have more money." Well, quite true. Nobody denies it. But is it not about time, Mr. Speaker, that we started to raise money on an equitable basis, instead of just paying lip-service to that objective?

I invite the hon. members to examine a graph on page C8 of the Budget papers. It reveals the most interesting fact that ten years ago, corporate income in this province was carrying almost 25 per cent of the tax burden. Today that percentage has dropped to 13—in ten years. More and more, Mr. Speaker, the individual taxpayer—yes, I use the term despite its offensiveness to some; my friend from Sudbury—the little man and his family is being forced to shoulder the burden of provincial expansion and corporations are not carrying their share of the burden.

It is interesting to note that this year revenues from the gasoline tax alone, Mr. Speaker, for the first time in our history exceed the revenues received from the corporations tax. Not only has the government procrastinated for years in widening the provincial tax base, but it has remaind silent while that other group of Tories, in the Liberal Cabinet in Ottawa, refuse to act on the Carter Commission report.

As the *Globe and Mail* put it in an editorial headed "Salvage the Carter Virtues", and I quote:

> There is undoubted merit in some extension of the tax base which would shift some of the burden from the wage earner to the investor and the gambler.

We have tolerated an utterly preposterous situation for years where financial institutions such as insurance companies have enjoyed virtually a free tax ride at the expense of the ordinary taxpayer.

As the Toronto *Daily Star* pointed out, and I quote:

> The Carter report simply proposed that life insurance companies be taxed in the same way as other taxpayers.

It noted that Canadian life insurance companies in 1964 paid only $2 million in income taxes. It indicated that insurance companies would have had to pay $75 million if they had been taxed in the same way as other businesses.

Mr. Speaker, what makes the situation so preposterous, is that Canadian insurance companies with only 30 per cent of their business placed abroad, paid $13 million in taxes to the foreign governments under whose jurisdiction they were operating, while on the $70 million of their business back home, they paid only $2 million in taxes. And those Tories by the name of Sharp, Winters, et al will not do anything about it; they want to study it for five years before we get around to action.

New Democratic spokesmen, Mr. Speaker, reviewed these alternative tax sources federally and provincially many times, so I am going to let the matter rest there for the moment.

On the revenue side, old-party governments at Ottawa and Queen's Park have procrastinated in broadening the tax base. They are still procrastinating and meanwhile, in this Budget, for example, they pile the old inequitable tax structure higher and higher. On the expenditure side, the government has come up with a bizarre set of priorities. Consider housing: Faced with an unprecedented housing crisis, the government bandies around figures of hundreds of millions, represented by mortgage money available from Ottawa, but significantly our provincial Budget—whose expenditures were increased by $489 million, plus a further $79 million increase in loans and advances—housing's share of this expansion is $15 million, or a mere 2.6 per cent.

Once again, an analysis of the government's dazzling statistics on housing makes a mockery of their propaganda claims that our supersalesman, the Minister in charge of housing, indulges in all the time. The number of units planned still falls at least 50 per cent short of the need, which is becoming greater with every twist in the interest rate screw. This is a warped priority which can only make a bad situation worse, not solve it.

Or consider health, Mr. Speaker. The average Ontario family will pay another $81 a year for hospital and health insurance coverage under OHSC and OMSIP. That makes a total bill of $309 a year. For those with private coverage, it will be still higher. This gigantic hike is forcing many of our citizens who can no longer afford it, to abandon the coverage they now enjoy.

While hospital premiums have risen 69 per cent—not 65 as the hon. leader of the Opposition said—and that applies to everybody, the provincial subsidy to the plan is down from $90 million to $78 million, and now represents only 12.4 per cent of the total estimated cost of the plan for this year, a total cost of $628 million.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is a far cry from the proud boast of Leslie Frost when he introduced OHSC—that the costs would be split one-third from the federal, one-third from the provincial and one-third from premiums. Even if we add mental and tuberculosis hospitalization, the provincial share will be much below one-third. Meanwhile the government has imposed premium increases which are in effect a flat rate tax increase, adding to the inequities of our revenue raising. We are getting further and further away from a hospital plan based on ability to pay.

For all their phony arguments about costs and higher taxes in the health field, the Tories could have taken the people of this province into medicare on July 1 this year and received the benefit of some $160 million in federal grants. A public medicare plan is bound to be cheaper. The Saskatchewan 1967 figures have become available since I detailed this issue during the Throne debate. The figures reveal—and for those who exaggerate it, note this—the figures reveal only a five per cent increase in the overall cost of the plan. Despite the highest doctors' incomes anywhere in Canada, the per capita cost of medicare went up from $25.78 in 1966 to about $26.73 in 1967. PSI and other plans in Ontario are running much higher—we are told in the range of $40—and our Provincial Treasurer says we cannot have it in Ontario for less than $48.

The government's refusal to move on medicare, Mr. Speaker, is a monument to its shortsightedness and its twisted priorities. And if I might just digress for one moment here, I thought at the beginning of this session that we were going to be able to mount a solid united front in the opposition in favour of public medicare—to charge against the government in the hope that they at least would be persuaded to move July 1 next year. How solid the offensive is in view of the confusion of the Liberal Party with regard to what is public medicare—since it includes private insurance—

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Nonsense.

Mr. MacDonald: —and now, in some fashion, it includes PSI and Co-op coverage—

how confusing it can be has been beautifully illustrated in 48 hours last week. One day Mr. Sharp said, "If I become Prime Minister I shall review the plan."

Mr. Nixon: Only to bring it in more effectively.

Mr. MacDonald: Reviewing the plan, Mr. Speaker, is a euphemism in view of what Mr. Sharp's past views, which have been made very clear to the public, for scuttling the plan, yet within 48 hours the leader of the Liberal Party becomes a supporter of Mr. Sharp.

Mr. R. M. Johnston: Let us talk about Ontario.

Mr. MacDonald: This happens to be Ontario, for better or for worse.

Mr. Sopha: The leader can support anyone he wants, do you object to that?

Mr. MacDonald: No, but if the leader believes in public medicare and he supports the man who is traditionally opposed to it and about to scuttle it, one has to review what he really means.

An hon. member: You know how to hurt him.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, for scrambled priorities, there are even more flagrant examples.

Mr. Sopha: He is talking about the Liberal leadership.

Mr. MacDonald: While preaching cuts and practising an unprecedented increase in budgetary expenditures, the Minister of Social and Family Services (Mr. Yaremko) has given elaborate explanations as to why the emergency need of the big brother movement for $30,000 cannot be met this year. Yet the government comes out with a 500 per cent increase in expenditures for the horse racing industry, up to $1.8 million. I do not know, Mr. Speaker, how many horses there are in the Ontario racing game, but I can say with assurance that $1.8 million works out to be a lot of money per horse.

Mr. C. G. Pilkey (Oshawa): A lot of hay.

Mr. MacDonald: In the past, the horse breeders' subsidy has been dispensed by paying each winning horse an extra amount equal to five per cent of its winning stakes. The other horses do not get anything. Mr. Speaker, you have got to give the Tories credit for at least being consistent in the application of their philosophy—whether it be to horses or humans: Those that have, get; and those that have not, do not. By the way, Mr. Speaker, when it comes to the big brother movement, or any other worthy cause, it is a horse of a different colour.

Last year, out of the $87,651 distributed to thoroughbred subsidies, some $23,251 or 26 per cent went to one tycoon, by the name of E. P. Taylor. Now how much of this new allotment will go to this impoverished gentleman, we do not know, since the government has given no indication how the $1.8 million is going to be divided. Is the government going to give the racing commission a free hand in handing out this kind of welfare payment?

Mr. Speaker, whatever may be—

Mr. R. G. Hodgson (Victoria-Haliburton): Mr. Speaker, can I ask the hon. member a question?

Mr. MacDonald: Yes.

Mr. R. G. Hodgson: In this grant, how much does it cost the taxpayers?

Mr. MacDonald: May I answer your question when I have proceeded about two minutes more, and I think, in what I have to say, will be the answer to your question.

Whatever may be the appropriate long-term policy for subsidizing the horse racing industry, because of its revenue producing potential, I suggest that it must be on some basis other than public money going so extensively to underwrite rich men's hobbies.

At the present time—and here is the answer to your question—granted, our financial problems and the Provincial Treasurer's professed objective of cutting out unnecessary expenditures, such an increase for horse racing, is not only indefensible, it is scandalous. The fact that $2.5 million more was raised from the bettor is not the point. How many millions have they raised from the gasoline users? How many have they raised from the tobacco smoker? Why should it be given back to the person immediately involved in the industry?

Mr. R. G. Hodgson: Do you not support industry?

Mr. MacDonald: I repeat, at the moment the expenditure of that kind of thing, in view, for example, of the refusal to give $13,000 to

such a worthy cause as big brothers, is a scandalous set of priorities.

Mr. R. G. Hodgson: Do you not believe in supporting industry?

Mr. MacDonald: Little wonder that even the *Globe and Mail* concluded in its editorial comment on the Budget as follows:

> When almost everybody in the province is being hit for a tax increase—and many of them from several directions—it is wholly wrong that the government should decide to multiply by six its subsidy to a sport.

That I think is an appropriate comment at the present time.

Mr. R. G. Hodgson: It is a subsidy to an industry.

Mr. MacDonald: It is a sport.

Mr. R. G. Hodgson: You try and tell that to the farmers and the horse racers, and the owners and operators. It supports thousands in this province.

Mr. MacDonald: I suggest that the hon. member is personally interested in this and should not press the point too much.

Mr. R. G. Hodgson: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I have no interest beyond any other member of this House in the horse racing industry, and I wish him to withdraw those remarks.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentleman has no interest in horse racing beyond this House, I know other members of his family who have been proud of being involved in it, and I am not criticizing them.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: I am not criticizing them. If I had spare time and a little money, I might engage in the game too, but I suggest that when we have to raise $489 million and we raise $2.5 million from this one area, you do not hand most of it back to the same people, when it is a sport, and leave the poor big brothers, for example, looking for money. Your priorities are a Tory set of priorities that leave human need at the bottom—

Mr. R. G. Hodgson: Progressive Conservative.

Mr. MacDonald: —and put the influence of that whip-cracking E. P. Taylor at the top.

An hon. member: E. P. Taylor by right.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The member will proceed, please.

Mr. MacDonald: Fine, Mr. Speaker, I feel quite content, secure in my little one square foot here.

Hon. S. J. Randall (Minister of Economics and Development): You hate anyone who is successful.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): He missed the point.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, having dealt with the details of the Budget itself, I propose in the concluding part of my remarks—and they will not be finished immediately, lest anybody should be misled by that suggestion—I propose in the concluding part of my remarks to deal with three broad areas that are background to the Budget.

When we get into the Provincial Treasurer's estimates, or when we get into each of the departmental estimates, we will then be in a position to deal with specific aspects of many programmes. I think now is the appropriate time to deal with broad issues in relation to the Budget.

And the first one that I want to deal with is in reference to economic development and expansion in this province. Two recent events have drawn our attention once again to the problem of foreign ownership and control of Canadian resources and industry. One is the publication of the report of the Watkins task force on foreign ownership and the structure of Canadian industry, and the other is the resignation from the federal government of the president of the Privy Council, the hon. Walter Gordon.

I think these two events are tied together. I think it is not going to far to say that Mr. Gordon resigned out of despair and disillusion that his government would ever take decisive steps to head off the problem so carefully documented in the Watkins report.

On this point, I want to draw to your attention the extraordinary disclaimer which the Cabinet at Ottawa insisted should be printed on the front cover of the report:

> Although this study is published under the auspices of the Privy Council office, any opinions expressed are those of the authors themselves and should not be attributed to the government of Canada.

If there was any doubt about it, Mr. Gordon's resignation has confirmed that, notwithstanding the expert analysis of the task force—and Mr. Speaker, just let me interject here, lest anybody should conclude that this task force was a politically packed group; I understand that the names were solicited from whatever committee discussed this in the first instance at Ottawa and people from all political persuasions were appointed, including Conservatives, on the Watkins task force—the federal Liberals neither admit the problem of foreign ownership and control, nor do they intend to deal with it.

On the contrary, most of the likely successors to Mr. Pearson seem, on the basis of their record so far, likely to move in the opposite direction, that of continentalism. Messrs. Winters, Sharp, Trudeau, Turner and Martin are all in varying degrees, continentalists.

All the more reason why, as I shall elaborate in a few moments, the Legislature of Ontario must itself move now to grapple with the problem insofar as it affects our own economy, and, as well, give some much needed leadership in developing a co-ordinated national policy to redirect the present trend.

The Watkins report documents that, in 1964, foreigners owned $33 billion of assets in Canada—mines, land, machinery, stocks and bonds. A great deal of these assets are right here in Ontario. When we talk about foreign ownership, we are in a large measure talking about American ownership and control. The Watkins figures indicate that 80 per cent of our non-resident ownership is based in the United States.

The foreign ownership is heavily concentrated in manufacturing, petroleum, natural gas, mining and smelting. By 1963, foreign ownership of our manufacturing industries had risen to 54 per cent—60 per cent were under effective foreign control.

In 1963, non-residents owned 62 per cent of our mining and smelting. Of our petroleum and natural gas industry, 64 per cent was foreign owned, and 74 per cent foreign controlled. In fact, at the end of 1963, just over one third of the entire Canadian economy, excepting agriculture and the service industries was foreign owned. The Watkins task force estimates that of the 743 largest Canadian corporations, 380 are foreign controlled, and 363, less than half are controlled by Canadians.

The bulk of foreign investment is in the form of direct investment, that is shares of companies' stock that enable the investor to earn dividends and normally assume control. As the report puts it:

> The extent of foreign control is unique among the industrialized nations of the world. It goes on to say: the overall level of foreign control in Canada is significantly developed country, and higher than for most of the underdeveloped countries.

Let us not waste any further time arguing against facts which are fully and objectively documented by the most exhaustive and expert study ever undertaken in this area. The evidence is before us that the Canadian economy is increasingly becoming owned and controlled by foreign interests, chiefly multinational operations whose home offices are in the United States.

Now, to what extent does this economic fact constitute a threat to the freedom of Canadian economic or political decision making? An argument can be made that any kind of situation like this constitutes an *"a priori"* threat creating a permanently unsettling economic climate for Canada. After all, when someone else has most of your marbles, it is pretty hard to argue that you are in control of the game. The Watkins report goes further. Let me quote one of the major conclusions:

> The most serious cost to Canada of foreign ownership and control results from the tendency of the United States government to regard American-owned subsidiaries as subject to American law and policy, with respect to American laws on freedom to export, United States anti-trust laws and policy, and United States balance of payment policy. The intrustion of American law and policy into Canada by the medium of the Canadian subsidiary erodes Canadian sovereignty and diminishes Canadian independence. It implies that the American-based multi-national corporation is not multi-national, but American. It creates political cost for Canada from American direct investment that seriously undermines the economic benefit.

In another chapter, the report further notes that:

> Private decision-making by large corporations clearly affects the capacity to implement public policies even in the closed economy. Where a part of the decision-making is made outside the country as it is in the case of foreign direct investment, there is a special significance attached.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, decisions which we take in this Legislature may well one day

be neutralized by the private decisions of corporations whose interests are fundamentally those of another country. Some of those may be able to view that kind of situation with equanimity; I cannot nor can the New Democratic Party. To us it spells not only the loss of economic power and diminished freedom of political initiative, but also the loss of dignity as elected representatives, as Ontarians, and as Canadians.

The policy of the Conservative government in Ontario has helped to bring about the situation which currently gives us so much concern. This is for special consideration of the hon. Minister involved. The Watkins report notes that:

> The desire of each province to get as much job-creating investment, including foreign direct investment, as it can, has created a tendency towards minimal constraints on and maximum encouragement of foreign investment.

Moreover, as the report points out, "The extent of American investment in Canada tends to implant or reinforce the American industrial system in Canada." In our province, foreign investment is creating a branch plant economy. It has resulted in a growing concentration of subsidiaries along our southern and western perimeters. We are in danger of becoming an industrial suburbia for New York, Boston, Detroit, and Chicago. In fact, no part of Canada is more completely integrated into the United States, economically and culturally, than the southwestern portion of Ontario.

We have not enjoyed efficiencies of operation which might have been expected to accompany these American subsidiaries. The Watkins task force found that whereas there was little difference in efficiency between Canadian owned companies and the United States branch plants, both were "typically inferior" to their American counterparts from the standpoint of efficiency.

Branch plants lead to inefficiency. We have seen the setting up of large numbers of relatively small units of production in some sectors, more than a country our size would warrant. We have a limited domestic market, and therefore our branch plants tend to be high cost. Indeed, in some instances the Canadian subsidiary is barred from exploiting the international market because of divisions of that market by the parent company.

Thus, a predominantly branch plant economy does not provide us with the basis for developing the strong competitive capacity that we are going to need to survive and expand. The only way Canada can survive economically in the long run is to specialize and achieve pre-eminence in the world market in a more limited series of lines and products. This cannot be done in a branch plant set up. Indeed, this was the point that was being made by the Minister of Labour as quoted by my hon. friend for Oshawa the other day, and in strange contradiction to what we so often hear from the Minister for Economics and Development.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Would you suggest General Motors' branch plant in Oshawa should pack up and go home?

Mr. Pilkey: Do not worry, we are going to get the money there. We got it closed down for a little while. We are going to have the money, and it will not be $3,000 a year.

Mr. Speaker: The member for York South has the floor.

Mr. MacDonald: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A related disadvantage of the branch plant extension is that basic research, design, and product innovation tend to take place at the parent level, rather than at the subsidiary level. In fact, the Watkins report points out that the Canadian spending on basic research and development is always lower than it should be, and lower than in comparable countries. It does not follow, therefore, that encouragement of branch plants and foreign subsidiaries will upgrade the technological capacity of Canadian management.

Far from having augmented genuine economic competition, the growth of United States subsidiaries has diminished it. The Watkins report points out that many United States firms in Canada are what the economists refer to as oligopolies. These firms are not actively engaged in price competition, nor are they fully subject to the discipline of the market. They are firms with a more than ordinary degree of economic power, and they constitute a further diminution of decision making in Canada.

Reliance on branch plant growth, combined with the absence of vigorous government leadership, is perverting and distorting overall regional development in this province. It is, as I have pointed out, concentrating economic growth in southern Ontario. If the government were simultaneously moving to balance this growth by promoting new

development in other regions, the problem could be contained within manageable proportions.

But today, there is little or no help from Queen's Park. That is one major reason why northern Ontario feels so keenly, and so rightly, that economic development in that vast and resource laden hinterland suffers at the expense of the new expansion in the south. That is why eastern Ontario continues, with a few highly localized exceptions, to be an area of economic deprivation.

Last year, during the debate on the estimates of The Department of Economics and Development, I read into the records the findings of Dr. Michael Ray, of Spartan Air Services, with regard to the prevailing economic situation in eastern Ontario. He compared three pairs of cities; Ottawa-Hamilton, in the east, and in the west, Kingston-Sarnia, and Cornwall-Guelph.

Hamilton, he noted, had 89 United States subsidiaries; Ottawa only had 14, Sarnia had eight subsidiaries and Kingston only three. Guelph had 18, and Cornwall only eight. In total, Dr. Ray reported, eastern Ontario had 52 American subsidiaries, while southwestern Ontario had 434.

I do not, of course, begrudge southern Ontario the economic growth it has achieved, to answer the rather touchy interjections of the hon. member for Halton West.

But I think these sets of comparisons amply illustrate how an optimum regional development programme can, in the absence of government leadership, be rendered a shambles by the unplanned encouragement of United States branch plants in Ontario. The task of equalizing economic opportunity in our province is made all the more difficult.

In delineating the broad outlines of a solution to the problem created by foreign ownership and control, the Watkins report task force has called for a tough, intrusive role by the Canadian government. Now that may shock the hon. member for Quinte, but there it is, a tough intrusive role by Canadian government. As the report puts it, Mr. Speaker:

> The inference for Canadian national policy is that a strong government presence is needed to countervail both foreign private economic power and foreign government power.

On behalf of the New Democratic Party, I endorse that approach wholeheartedly, and if you do not endorse it then you are talking double talk when you engage in a programme of equalized economic development across the province of Ontario.

Mr. R. M. Johnston: I thought you were getting jobs for those people.

Mr. MacDonald: I endorse that approach wholeheartedly. First, it is obvious that the problem is so pervasive in our economy that only a major offensive against it, co-ordinated by government, will be effective. Second, we are dealing with multi-national enterprises, and with laws and policies of foreign governments; only at the level of our government can we effectively make the Canadian case strong enough to get the results. And third, because there is a real opportunity here to build a stronger and richer public sector in Canada.

I am encouraged to see that the report's concept of how its major instrument, the Canada development corporation, would work, differs substantially from the earlier suggestions by Walter Gordon. It is necessary to move away from the "Buy Canada Back" orientation with which Mr. Gordon was so preoccupied. As envisaged by the Watkins task force, and consistent with our party's policy in this area, the Canada development corporation would play a creative building role, mobilizing Canadian savings and capital to develop new resources and industries. Rather than squander hard-to-come-by equity funds on buying into existing American subsidiaries—to 25 per cent for example—the Canada development corporation should open up new fields for domestic investment. Much of the new investment would, I infer from the report, be undertaken in the public sector; a good deal would still be private, or joint public and private.

In the process, we would accomplish two things. We would generate new economic activity across Canada. We would also, by enlarging the amount of new Canadian development, reduce the overall proportion of foreign ownership and control in the Canadian economy.

But, as in so many other cases in today's complex society, it is not enough to lean back and say it is Ottawa's job. The Ontario government has a responsibility and an opportunity to grapple with the problem as it affects our own economy and the pattern of our own provincial development.

Just a quick look at the distribution of foreign ownership and control indicates that Ontario's share of the problem is a large one. We have over 50 per cent of Canada's total

manufacturing capabilities right here in our province—most of the rubber industry, most of the chemical industry, most of the auto industry, a good portion of the mining and smelting industry.

Canada's problem is Ontario's problem. The threat to Canada is the threat to Ontario. We have got to get Ontario moving on this problem now.

The Watkins task force suggests a line of action, "There are key sectors of the economy," it says, "where the dominance of foreign firms must be countered by deliberate attempts to build up domestic competition."

One place the Ontario government could start is the mining and smelting industry of northern Ontario. I have already, in this House, suggested the establishment of a public corporation to undertake exploration of new mineral bodies and, if private industry will not then move, to develop these bodies as well.

I will go further and suggest that the Ontario government must insist on the location of the Texas Gulf sulphur smelter in the Porcupine area, and must acquire, on behalf of Ontario citizens, some equity interest in this vast enterprise. We have heard only the other day from the member for Cochrane South (Mr. Ferrier) what can happen to a community when a private corporation decides it has had enough of an area and just moves out. And the future endangered by a lazy, hands-off, wilful attitude on the part of the government at this time.

These are just one or two examples of how enterprising government initiative in the north could offset the trend toward United States' control, and at the same time, greatly stimulate the economic development of that region.

There is a further vast potential for the Ontario development corporation, beyond merely propping up failing industries and operating on the periphery of the problem. It must become itself a mobilizer and channeler of capital, and guide Ontario investment into those areas which the provincial economic priorities determine to be the most important at this time.

There is no reason why the ODC, the Ontario development corporation, cannot be developed into an instrument to give Ontario people a piece of the action in the development of our natural resources and new industries. Instead of merely handing out public funds to industries as the present EIO programme is doing, the government should be obtaining an equity interest in the firms it assists, in some fair proportion to the amount of that assistance.

I am always surprised, Mr. Speaker, at the frequency with which one hears from the government side of the House, grave deploring of welfare hand-outs. But there is no objection at all, if the government hands out up to half a million dollars at one time to an industry. Why should we not have an equity in that industry to match the half million dollars that we are providing? In doing that, the people of Ontario will then share in the future earnings of these companies as they grow. Additional funds would be provided for further investment and we would insure that Ontario and Canadian interests are considered in the future decisions of the company.

Another thing that can and should be done: We must expand the Sheridan Park research project, placing a higher priority on the development of adequate management skills and technology for Canadian companies. The Watkins report laid particular stress on our shortcomings in this area. In the research field, too, if public funds are provided to assist companies in developing new processes, there is a strong argument for the government receiving a royalty on the earnings from the new process, or an equity share in new industries, which may be developed as a result of the new process.

There is a role for this government in joint partnership with private capital—even foreign capital—to develop new industrial complexes. In this way we can continue to make use of necessary foreign capital without, at the same time, losing control of our own decision-making ability. This sort of policy has been carried out successfully in Mexico, in Japan, in Sweden, and many other countries. We can learn from them.

There is a role for this government in encouraging rationalization and specialization of Ontario's domestic industry in augmenting the efficiency of Canadian firms; in eliminating some of the built-in inefficiencies of the branch plant economy. There is also a very big role, Mr. Speaker, for this government to tear aside the curtain of secrecy which hides the operations of many of our province's largest industries.

The Watkins task force felt very strongly that we could not meet the threat to our economic independence without fuller knowledge about the operations of foreign subsidiaries in this country. We need to know the extent of their sales, research, export, and so

on. The report places great stress on the need for much stronger disclosure laws, particularly with reference to companies which have no public shareholders. With over 90,000 companies registered in Ontario we can give a lead in writing disclosure laws that will provide us with the information we need to rationalize our industry. Without that knowledge the Minister simply cannot even consider the proposition. We can see to it that the policies of industries operating in this province conform to the interests of Ontario and Canada.

I do not see the Ontario role being undertaken in isolation from the necessary federal government role or at cross purposes with it. The two must go together—complementing one another, and with the Ontario government maintaining the primacy of the province's priorities. On the other hand, I cannot see Ottawa handling the job by itself. There is too much to be done and too much of the problem is right here in Ontario.

It may profit me little to repeat once again my conviction that many of our difficulties stem from the short-sighted continentalist policies of the Ontario Conservatives, but it is worth saying again if only to emphasize that a radical change in the direction of our economic policies is required and that the time to start is now.

Mr. Speaker, I want to turn to a new and very basic issue in this session of the Ontario Legislature—I should say another and very basic issue in this session of the Ontario Legislature—namely the Smith committee and what I would describe as more effective alternatives to what it has to provide. I propose to take some time discussing the implications of the Smith report because the Budget debate appears to be the most suitable opportunity for an overall look at our tax system in this province. I did touch on some aspects of the report when I outlined our foundation plan for general municipal services in the Throne debate.

At this time I want to deal with the totality of the committee's findings and its proposals for reforming our tax structure. The Smith committee, like the Carter committee, found that the overall tax system in Canada was far from progressive. It was very regressive for the lower income groups and not much better than proportional for those with income from $3,000 to $10,000. Beyond that it was slightly progressive. The Smith committee also found that the Ontario provincial and municipal tax system was considerably less progressive than the federal tax system and it labelled our municipal tax system decidely regressive.

Its figures showed that in 1961 the revenue collectors in this province took almost 14 per cent of the income of those in the under $2,000 class; about 9 per cent of the income of those in the next bracket from $2,000 to $3,000; and then the take was almost uniform—a uniform 11 per cent for those from $3,000 to $10,000. Above that level it went up to 13 per cent, but still below the 14 per cent rate of the lowest income group.

Now we all know that taxes have gone up substantially since 1961 and if the same pattern of distribution prevails, the excess burden of the lower and middle income groups is an even heavier burden to bear. I would suggest that the distribution pattern has altered for the worse in the intervening period as property taxes have climbed and more flat rate taxes have been imposed.

Mr. Speaker, at this point we have to examine an important technicality in the Smith committee approach. This technicality vitally influences the committee's conclusions and we must be fully aware of it in assessing the validity of the committee's conclusions. In the first place, the Smith committee views the concept of "income" which is somewhat different from "money income." That in itself does not invalidate its findings as to where the burden of taxation falls. But they also introduced another concept which made it possible for them to conclude that our tax system is not as unfair as it would appear from the figures that I just quoted a moment ago.

The committee suggested that not only the burden of taxes on each income class should be studied, but also what each income class gets back from the government. It therefore attempted to allocate all government expenditures to the various income groups. The committee then deducted the total taxes paid by each income group from its share of the total government expenditures and it came up with the net benefit figure which is described as the "net fiscal incidence."

The Carter commisison also attempted this exercise. Both the Smith and the Carter committees concluded that the lower income groups got the bulk of government expenditures mainly because they received the majority of welfare payments and had the largest number of children attending school. As a result they come up with a net gain for the lower income groups that therefore conclude that our tax system is not so intolerably regressive.

In fact, one of the Smith committee studies comes up with the startling conclusion, Mr. Speaker, that any Ontario resident earning $7,000 or less gets more from the government in services than he pays in taxes. In other words you have to go beyond $7,000 before you are not having a net gain. It is significant that both Smith and Carter warned that these results are open to challenge because of the formidable array of assumptions required in this somewhat academic exercise of allocating expenditures to income groups.

For example, education expenditures are assigned according to the number of children in each income group, which automatically puts most of these outlays in the lower income brackets where most of the children are. This approach ignores completely the benefit which comes to childless couples as to society as a whole from operating in a milieu of literacy and technical and profesisonal skills. It also ignores variations in the quality of education provided for the different income groups.

A moment's reflection will indicate that it is even more difficult to allocate other government expenditures such as defense or police protection. Most incidence studies end up assigning these outlays either on a per capita basis or in proportion to income, neither of which is satisfactory. The per capita basis puts the bulk of the benefits in the lower income brackets where the majority of people are found. Assigning them in proportion to income results in a circular argument since distribution by income is then being used to indicate whether or not benefits are distributed in proportion to income.

The Smith committee uses a mixture for allocating general government expenditures based on population, families, income and investment earnings in an effort to get the best of all possible worlds or to avoid making a choice of methods. I am not sure which.

Now there are many other serious criticisms of the "net fiscal incidence" theory. One of the major ones is that the results relate to averages only. Even if reliable figures could be obtained to show that the lowest income groups get back from government far more than it pays out in taxes on the average, this does not mean that every individual in that group receives the average benefits. Most of the benefits may be for welfare payments and some people in that income group do not qualify for welfare payments at all. As the Carter commission said, "The system should be fair to every man and not only to the average man." (Vol. 2, page 260.)

It can also be argued that some of the so-called benefits received by the lower income groups are either compensation for a position of weakness in the market place, or old age payments which they partly paid for during their working years.

To use these payments as a reason for contending that they are not being unfairly treated by a tax system, which takes some of their all-too-inadequate income, is, in my opinion, the height of absurdity.

In short, Mr. Speaker, there is plenty of evidence to suggest that the "net fiscal incidence" theory should not be taken as proof that we have anything approaching a fair tax system. The Smith committee itself virtually admits this when it says that:

> Dollar transfers cannot be assumed to provide a quantitive measure of underlying welfare.

Also, that the dollar tax burden:

> will involve significantly different real burdens, depending on whom it falls . . . both as among income groups and within each income group. (Vol. 1, page 142).

The committee also concedes, Mr. Speaker, that the "net fiscal incidence" calculation is even more hazardous when confined to what happens within one province because of the statistical problems involved and the lack of data. It concludes its observations on the whole exercise by recommending more research, indicating that we are not yet in a position to place such reliance on the figures produced in this field.

Mr. Speaker, so much for an analysis of the weaknesses of the "net fiscal incidence" theory. The incredible proposition is that, in spite of all its own doubts, as well as those of other experts in the field with regard to this theory, the Smith committee accepted it as a fundamental which critically shaped its conclusions. For that reason, one is on sound ground in challenging the conclusions of the Smith committee.

The Smith committee's acceptance of this highly questionable theory erroneously led it to its major conclusions: that wholesale revision of the provincial and municipal tax set up is unwarranted and unneeded. Thus, the overall result of the Smith committee's recommendation was a mere tinkering with the *status quo*.

Mr. Sopha: And you are right.

Mr. MacDonald: A source close to the committee has been publicly quoted—and this is

most significant, most illuminating, it is a source close to the committee—as saying:

> If the – Johnson net fiscal incidence – study had shown that the net effect of government fiscal policy was regressive, the committee's report would have been quite different.

In other words, this report is based on the assumption that the tax structure was not regressive. It will be seen that the Smith committee's acceptance of this questionable theory led directly to what I described in the Throne debate as the "essential bankruptcy of the Smith committee report."

It did not provide any long-term fundamental solution to the crisis on the municipal front. It did not outline any basic alternative to our present chaotic grant structure to relieve the inequities of the municipal tax load and assure greater equality of municipal tax services all across the province. It failed to propose a reshaping of our tax structure which would make it a fair share system.

I am not prepared to concede that we have a progressive tax and spending system in this province, and I do not think that either the Smith or the Carter incidence studies have proved otherwise.

The question then remains: what is the government going to do about it?

I recall that on the final day of the last session, the Prime Minister said:

> We will, when the Smith report is available, address ourselves to the task of rationalizing our tax system.

It is six months since the Smith committee report was released. Yet the Budget provides no convincing evidence that this government is respecting even the spirit of commitment while it waits for public submissions to the Smith report.

For nearly five years, our demands for a reform of the unfair and outmoded tax structure in this province met with the excuse: "We must wait for the Smith report."

By 1967, that excuse was wearing pretty thin to the hard-pressed property taxpayer and the lower and middle income groups who were carrying an ever-increasing share of the load.

Instead of facing up to the tax reform long ago, the government dozed, blissfully dreaming that the Smith committee would provide it with a blueprint that would relieve the overburdened taxpayer and solve its revenue problems at the same time. The Smith committee has completely failed to do this.

While I will concede that the committee's report contains a lot of useful information about our tax system, and proposes the removal of some cobwebs from the edifice, it is a most disappointing and muddled document in the field of tax philosophy. It inclines towards the benefit theory of taxation—you pay for what you get—but admits that the benefit theory can only be applied to a very narrow range of taxes, like motor vehicle taxes because of the difficulty in determining benefits.

It also gives lip service to the ability to pay principal, which is in direct conflict with the benefit theory, but it departs from the principle of ability to pay in many of its recommendations. It fails to support the Carter commission's call for a fundamental reform of the personal and corporation income tax which is an integral part of developing a tax system, based on ability to pay.

The Smith committee's greatest shortcoming is, as I have just said, its failure to solve the municipal tax crisis. That crisis was documented by some DBS figures on family spending which are more recent than the 1961 figures used by the Smith committee. They show that, in 1964, the homeowners in Toronto with incomes under $2,500 spent 16.8 per cent of their income on property taxes, while those from $3,000 to $3,500 spent 12.6 per cent and those over $10,000 only 3.1 per cent on property taxes. I suspect that these percentages have gone up since 1964, with the sharp rises in municipal and educational needs in recent years.

I dealt with our solutions to the municipal tax crisis in my Throne debate. The government's solution, consisting of the basic shelter exemption grant and the taking over of the costs of justice administration, looks like an attempt to cure acute appendicitis with an aspirin. The difficulties it is reported to be having in drafting the rules for basic shelter exemption grant, indicate that it was brought out as an election gimmick without any prior research on methods of implementing it.

Its most serious shortcoming is in the treatment of tenants. The grant will apparently be paid to landlords, who are right now riding a sellers' market due to the government's abysmal failure in the housing field. The Smith committee naively assumed that:

> The forces of competition will, in due course, lead landlords to pass on the tax savings to tenants.

Now even the government apparently is having some difficulty swallowing that proposition. The Minister of Municipal Affairs

(Mr. McKeough) was quoted in the Toronto *Star* on February 8 as saying:

> One way or another, the tenant will benefit the same way as the homeowner.

While we have not yet seen the legislation, the government has so far rejected any suggestions, including a strong one from the bureau of municipal research, that the grant be paid directly to tenants. In our opinion, it should be feasible to work out a system of rebates for which tenants could apply, instead of giving the grant to the apartment owner.

Such a system is already in effect in Wisconsin and Oregon. While the basic shelter exemption grant does slightly reduce the regressivity of the property for home owners, it will be eaten up by the continuing rise in municipal costs, resulting from the growing urbanization of our society and climbing educational needs in this technological age. It is not a solution to the municipal crisis. It is a palliative, nothing more. Moreover, the delay in producing the rules for the grant—six months have gone by since it was announced—have left the municipalities in a difficult position in preparing their tax bills for 1968.

The second recommendation of the Smith committee which the government picked up —the assumption of justice costs—is another example of a hasty election promise by a government which was running scared. The number of difficulties which have occurred in the implementation of this promise, indicates the lack of planning behind the promise and puts this government up close to the Liberals at Ottawa in the accident-prone league.

First, there was the failure to consult the trade unions involved, and arrange for any orderly transfer of employees and the honouring of established patterns of collective bargaining. As a result, we had the strike of the Don jail employees. Then there was the questionable legal device of using orders-in-council to effect a transfer of jurisdiction, instead of bringing amendments to the relevant legislation right here to the Legislature. It took until February 16 before the allocation of the revenue from fines was announced, and the much bigger question of the financial arrangements relating to the takeover of the court houses, jails, and other assets of local governments connected with the administration of justice, has not yet been resolved. As a result, some plans for the replacement of 150-year-old jails have been shelved, and the municipalities are left in the dark as to when they will be reimbursed for costs incurred since the beginning of the year for accommodation of justice activities.

In addition to having to suffer the consequences of this lack of planning, the municipalities are losing some grants which they previously received under The Fire Departments Act and The Police Act. Thus, the net benefit to them from the provincial takeover of justice administration is estimated at a total of only $18.5 million spread over 900 municipalities. That is not going to provide much relief to the property taxpayer.

Another place where the Smith committee appears to have failed the government is in providing an answer to the serious problems of mining municipalities. The committee's proposed formula for compensating mining municipalities for not being allowed to levy municipal taxes on mining properties would result in a drop in total payments over the next five years. The committee estimates the drop at 30 per cent, but on the calculations made by the association of mining municipalities, it will be 60 per cent.

Mr. Sopha: They did not understand the problem and they did not take the trouble to find out the answer. It is quite apparent. It reminds one of Spengler's "Decline of the West."

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, regardless of whether the figure is a 30 or 60 per cent drop, it is completely unrealistic to contemplate a formula which would result in any reduction at a time when all municipal costs are rising.

Mr. Sopha: So far as I know they were never north of the French River to find out either.

Mr. MacDonald: The Smith committee's formula, based on impairment of commercial and industrial assessment, is a poor substitute for a formula based on some measure of the real needs of the mining municipalities and the principle that those needs could be met without the municipalities having to resort to above average levels of taxation. The Smith committee did offer some significant relief to the municipal taxpayer by its proposal that the provincial government take over an additional 15 per cent of education costs; increase unconditional grants and pay more grants in lieu of taxes on exempt public properties, including hospitals and universities. But, Mr. Speaker, the government's reaction to these recommendations is typical. The Provincial

Treasurer in his speech on February 28 to the Ontario good roads association said in reference to these proposals:

> Let me express caution here; these additional measures cannot be contemplated to any degree near their entirety until we have adequate intergovernmental co-ordination and resolution on public spending and taxation requirements.

So we must await the millennium before we can expect any action on these additional proposals of the Smith committee.

The course chartered by the Smith committee for meeting revenue needs in the period between now and 1975 reveals their tax philosophy most clearly. For financing the basic shelter exemption, the takeover of justice, the additional 15 per cent of education costs, more grants in lieu of taxes and other municipal grant changes, the committee proposes in the first year an extension of the sales tax to services. An increase in sales tax, gasoline tax and personal income tax. It does not propose any increase in the corporation tax until the second year, and then only a 1 per cent increase. And no increase in the insurance premiums or succession duties until 1971, or in the mines profits until 1974.

During the same period it suggests a surcharge be added to personal income tax starting at 8 per cent and rising to 12 per cent by 1974, but it makes no recommendations for broadening the personal income tax base along the lines proposed by the Carter commission as an alternative to the increased rates. This set of priorities indicates that the committee is not committed to a policy which would reshape the Ontario tax structure into a more progressive system. Increased reliance on sales tax, gasoline tax, tobacco tax, and in unreformed income tax, would add to its regressivity. The government has already started along this path with tax increases in this present Budget, in spite of the unimaginative approach of the Smith committee.

It is interesting to recall the Provincial Treasurer, in speaking to the Finance Ministers' meeting in Ottawa on January 10 of this year, maintained the pretence that the Smith committee offered a blueprint for remedial action. I wonder if he has read it yet? I quote:

> Restoring and broadening the tax base was one of the basic principles of the recommendations of both the Carter and the Smith commissions.

After nearly a year of silence and many vain efforts by the Opposition to solicit this government's reaction to the Carter commission report, the Provincial Treasurer did give some inkling—I suppose we should be grateful for this final glimpse, Mr. Speaker. The Provincial Treasurer said this, and I quote:

> It is obvious from the reaction to the Carter commission and the subsequent statement of the federal Minister of Finance in his budget of November 30, that the Carter approach to the tax base involved a concept which is impractical to implement in the extreme form in which Carter presented it. Nevertheless we believe that some broadening of the tax base is necessary.

So we are not much wiser except that it is clear that the Ontario government has accepted the protest of those who have enjoyed tax favouritism for years. To what extent, is a matter of guess work. The Treasurer said:

> We hope that the federal government will, in its white paper, propose a number of steps towards modernizing our tax laws. We shall certainly have a full commentary and suggestions following the white paper.

No representations for shaping the white paper at Ottawa—after the white paper has come down they will speak.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in our view the Provincial Treasurer and this government should speak up now. This government has an obligation to take the Legislature into its confidence by indicating more precisely what its views are on the Carter proposals. A year's silence is already a gross neglect of its responsibility to give leadership to public discussion on this vital issue.

It is significant to note, Mr. Speaker, that while the Ontario government is silent on where the federal treasury should raise its money more equitably, it is not bashful in reasserting its demand for a larger share of the federal tax dollar through more generous fiscal agreements with Ottawa. The Provincial Treasurer told the finance Ministers in January that until the tax base has been broadened, federally as well as provincially, the Ontario government favours another two-year extension of the current two-year agreement on of course, a more generous basis.

I draw that to the attention of the leader of the Opposition. It is not necessarily a two-year pattern regularly. The Minister has asked for a repeat of the two-year pattern, while the federal government and the provincial government make up their minds on what tax reforms they are going to have. But beyond that, the Provincial Treasurer is more specific

in his long term demands. In his Budget last week, the Provincial Treasurer restated Ontario's case:

> As this government stated to the tax structure committee in October, 1966, we believe that the federal government can well abate up to 60 per cent of the personal income tax and 33 per cent of the corporation income tax while still retaining adequate leverage for fiscal control.

Mr. Speaker, to put it mildly, that is a matter of some little controversy. Those demands are far beyond anything the federal government has indicated its willingness to countenance and they go far to matching what are considered by some to be the exorbitant demands of Quebec. This is the heart of the impasse between the federal and provincial governments in the whole process of re-confederation.

Beyond any shadow of doubt, the provincial governments must have more money if they are going to be able to meet their obligations under the present constitutional division of responsibilities. I would agree that an abatement of 33 per cent, or even more, of corporate income tax is a defensible demand. But whether the federal government can retain adequate leverage for fiscal control, and translate that into other terms and remain a strong central government, with an abatement of 60 per cent of personal income tax, is more debatable.

However, that argument can be left to the meetings of the continuing constitutional conference and its range of committees. For the moment, it is of some interest to consider what further revenues Ontario would have if these demands were met. In other words, let us take a look at the Provincial Treasurer's own planning as he looks ahead.

Ontario now receives approximately 30 per cent of the total corporate income tax collected from this province, jointly by the provincial and federal governments. Incidentally, I have excluded the old age security corporate tax and the new federal surtax from these calculations, as the former is an earmarked tax and the latter has only two years' life.

Each percentage point of corporate tax currently yields $10.5 million revenue, for a total of $315 million in the 1968-69 Budget. If the share were increased to 33 per cent, that would provide a further revenue yield for the province of Ontario of only $31.5 million. It is rather significant how little more the government is asking of corporate income tax.

Turning to the personal income tax, Ontario's share is now 28 per cent. Each percentage point currently yields $23,214,285, according to the Budget estimate. If Ontario's share were boosted to 60 per cent, as the Provincial Treasurer is suggesting, there would be an increased yield of 32 percentage points, or $742.9 million.

If Ontario's demands were met, the total increase from both corporate and personal income tax would mean an added revenue of $774.4 million. Mr. Speaker, in light of that figure, I would like to remind the House how realistic—we got other kinds of retorts from the Provincial Treasurer and the Prime Minister when I originally made these proposals—but how realistic are the proposals in the three-point programme which I presented to this Legislature during the Throne debate, on February 26, for meeting the growing municipal crisis. Briefly my proposals were, and since the leader of the Opposition has not grasped them, I will solicit his attention.

Mr. Nixon: I am listening.

Mr. MacDonald: First, the establishment of a municipal foundation plan for general municipal purposes to replace the present chaotic system of grants. Even if the foundation plan in its initial stages were only to raise the total provincial contribution to local government by three percentage points, from the present 22 to about 25, that could be done by an increased expenditure by the provincial government, in the first year, of $32 million. The extra money would go out on a fiscal need basis as a start towards equalizing municipal services and the burden which they represent to the local taxpayer.

Second, the phased additional takeover of education costs by the provincial government, from 45 per cent to 80 per cent, in a five year period and an annual increase in provincial grants of some $70 million, plus normal growth cost. In short, Mr. Speaker, we have not forgotten that, as the leader of the Opposition thought.

Third, a complete takeover by the province of health and welfare costs at a further expenditure by the provincial government of $48 million.

In summary, this three-point programme, which represents hope for a fundamental solution to the municipal crisis, not just patching on it, would cost the provincial government $150 million in its first year.

The Provincial Treasurer, when I first made

this outline in the House, dismissed it—where are you going to get the money? Where? Mr. Speaker, with the provincial government requesting new revenues from fiscal agreements with Ottawa amounting to $774.5 million, our proposal is obviously financially manageable.

But I have a further proposal for the Provincial Treasurer's consideration. It had been our suggestion that the government should move on such a three-point programme, including a municipal foundation plan, in a fall session this year, to be operative in the year 1969—but the government has decided otherwise. Its actions this year have been restricted to two piecemeal items of relief, through the takeover of justice administration costs and the basic shelter exemption. It is significant that this represents an added cost to the provincial Treasury of $168.5 million, approximately $150 million for shelter exemption and $18.5 million for the administration of justice.

I would urge that the provincial government plan to move from this piecemeal start to the three-point programme which we have proposed, a year hence, if not earlier. It would offer hope for some real solution to the crisis on the municipal front, and the cost of $150 million a year in the first year, is entirely realistic in a budget which jumped this year by close to a half billion dollars, quite apart from the greater revenues which Ontario hopes to get from Ottawa.

I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, as the government receives representations on the Smith report, and moves to the presentation of its own white paper as the basis for new policies, we shall continue to press these proposals. They provide an alternative to the bankruptcy of the Smith report, which offers nothing more than palliatives for the municipal programme.

Mr. Speaker, I have one more section, plus some comments on the amendment which has been made by the leader of the Opposition. Can I prevail upon the Prime Minister for adjournment, or does he insist that I proceed?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, if you are going to go beyond the next ten minutes, I would suggest—

Mr. MacDonald: Unfortunately, I shall.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Would you adjourn the debate, please?

Mr. MacDonald moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, tomorrow—when we reach the order paper—we will complete the hon. member's contribution to this debate.

I would then like to go to the order paper to deal in committee of the whole House with those bills standing in the names of the Attorney General and the Minister of Social and Family Services. After that, we will proceed with the estimates of The Department of Highways.

Before I move the adjournment of the House, I would say that I have been asked what we might do at the Easter recess. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that we rise on Thursday at 6 o'clock, that would be April 11, the Thursday before Good Friday, and resume a week from Easter Monday, which will be April 22. That would be Monday. We will resume at the usual hour of 2:30 p.m.

To show our complete ecumenical spirit, the official Opposition, who are all, of course, delegates to that fracas taking place in Ottawa a week from next weekend, we might rise on Thursday, April 4 at 6 p.m., and not sit Friday morning, and we would resume then on Monday afternoon.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 10.55 o'clock p.m.

ERRATA

Tuesday, March 19, 1968

939	1	49	Change to read: full-time staff members, Mrs. E. Boal and
939	2	14	Change to read: a charter member of the National Association of Social Work; a member of the American Group Psychotherapy Association; and a member of that plumbers' union known as the Royal Society of Health. I want to say on



Legislature of Ontario Debates

No. 37



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

First Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Tuesday, March 26, 1968

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1968

5

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Tuesday, March 26, 1968

Reports, commissioners of estates bills 1219

Presenting reports, Mr. Welch 1221

Motion that provincial auditor be authorized to pay salaries to the civil service and make other necessary payments, Mr. Robarts, agreed to 1221

Questions to Mr. Davis re Mr. A. P. Gordon, Mr. Nixon, Mr. MacDonald 1222

Question to Mr. Robarts re aid to school boards, Mr. Deans 1223

Question to Mr. Randall re Ontario housing corporation, Mr. Burr 1224

Questions to Mr. Rowntree re mutual funds, Mr. Deacon 1224

Questions to Mr. Randall re Ontario housing corporation, Mr. Knight 1224

Question to Mr. Robarts re the McRuer report, Mr. Lawlor 1225

Questions to Mr. Davis re school property, Mr. Lawlor 1225

Question to Mr. Davis re teacher shortages, Mr. Pitman 1226

Questions to Mr. Davis re history courses, Mr. Pitman 1226

Question to Mr. Wishart re pedestrians, Mr. T. Reid 1227

Question to Mr. Welch re liquor laws, Mr. De Monte 1227

Question to Mr. Rowntree re the Ontario securities commission, Mr. Shulman 1228

Question to Mr. Yaremko re comfort allowances, Mr. Shulman 1228

Questions to Mr. Stewart re milk prices, Mr. Shulman 1228

Questions to Mr. Brunelle re fish depletion, Mr. Martel 1229

Question to Mr. Brunelle re resident angling licences, Mr. R. S. Smith 1229

Question to Mr. Davis re school boards, Mr. T. P. Reid 1230

Questions to Mr. Wishart re Viola and George MacMillan, Mr. Stokes 1230

Questions to Mr. Grossman re parole, Mr. Sargent 1230

Questions to Mr. Stewart re the beef improvement association, Mr. Sargent 1231

Questions to Mr. Robarts re wire tapping, Mr. Sargent 1232

Question to Mr. Davis re history courses, Mr. Knight 1233

Question to Mr. Davis re the OSSTF, Mr. Knight 1234

Question to Mr. Davis re education of Indian children, Mr. Stokes 1234

Question to Mr. Davis re standing committee on education, Mr. Bullbrook 1234

Question to Mr. Davis re universities, Mr. Good 1235

Statement re the workmen's compensation board, Mr. Bales 1235

Question to Mr. Stewart re threatened milk strike, Mr. Martel 1238

Resumption of the debate on the Budget, Mr. MacDonald 1240

Perpetuities Act, 1966, bill to amend, reported 1249

County Judges Act, bill to amend, reported 1249

Wages Act, bill to amend, reported 1250

Religious Institutions Act, bill to amend, reported 1256

Pre-Arranged Funeral Services Act, 1961-1962, bill to amend, reported 1256

Recess, 6 o'clock 1256

Erratum 1256

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

TUESDAY, MARCH 26, 1968

The House met at 2:30 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are pleased again this afternoon to have visitors to the Legislature and we welcome students from the following schools: in the east gallery, Gladstone senior public school, Toronto; and in the west gallery, Edgewood public school, Scarborough; and in both galleries, pupils from Ryerson senior public school, Toronto.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

I have the honour to inform the House that the Clerk has received from the commissioners of estates bills, the reports on two bills.

Clerk of the House: Mr. Speaker, may I present the following:

RODERICK LEWIS ESQ. Q.C.,
CLERK OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY,
PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS,
TORONTO 2, ONTARIO.

Dear Sir:

Re Private Bill Pr1—An Act respecting
The United Church-Evangelical United
Brethren Church

The undersigned as commissioners of estate bills as provided by The Legislative Assembly Act R.S.O. 1960, chap. 208, sec. 57, having had the above noted bill referred to us as commissioners, now beg to report thereon.

Your commissioners appointed the 20th day of March, at 10 a.m. to consider the said petition and bill and gave notice thereof to the applicant.

We were attended by Dr. E. Hallman, Superintendent of The Canada Conference Evangelical United Brethren Church; Dr. J. B. Dahms, Chairman of the Board, Evangelical United Brethren Church, F. L. Dreger, Q.C., Solicitor for the Applicants; Dr. Harold Arnup, Secretary of the Board of Finance, United Church of Canada, and H. D. Langdon, Q.C., representing certain dissident congregations of the Canada Conference, The Evangelical United Brethren Church.

We have been informed, but have not of ourselves sought to verify, that:

1. By virtue of c. 112 of the statutes of Ontario, 1930, the applicant corporation was incorporated under the name The Canada Conference Evangelical Church, (subsequently changed to The Canada Conference The Evangelical United Brethren Church), for the purpose of administering in Ontario the property, business and other temporal affairs of The Canada Conference Evangelical Church;

2. By that Act of incorporation:

a. Certain property was vested in the corporation "to be held, used and administered by the corporation or disposed of as may be provided by any by-law, rule or regulation made from time to time by the corporation";

b. Other property at the date of the incorporation "belonging to or held by or in trust for, or to the use of any congregation of the Canada Conference Evangelical Church was not specifically vested in the corporation but was declared thereafter "to be held, used and administered for the same congregation as a part of the corporation in the manner and upon the trusts and subsequent terms and provisions set forth in Schedule A."

3. That the ecclesiastical body known successively as Canada Conference Evangelical Association, Canada Conference Evangelical Church, The Canada Conference The Evangelical United Brethren Church as distinct from the corporate body incorporated by said c. 112, as of the 1st of January, 1968, by virtue of a plan referred to in the recitals to Bill Pr1 (the contents of which was not before us) became a part of The United Church of Canada.

4. The avowed principal purpose of Bill Pr1 is to accomplish the vesting in The United Church of Canada of property, real and personal, within Ontario held by the said corporation, or in which it has any beneficial interest, including property held in trust for individual congregations, without the necessity of the execution by the corporation or any trustee thereof of any deed or other form of transfer and without any consent, approval or direction from any individual congregation for which the corporation holds such property.

5. The United Church of Canada is agreeable to accepting the property or interests in property sought to be vested in it and to hold the same pursuant to the provisions of Bill Pr1;

6. That corporate action by the corporation authorizing the presentation of the petition praying the passing of Bill Pr1 has been taken without any attempt to seek the consent, approval or direction of any individual congregation.

Bill Pr1 as drafted fails to respect the rights of persons and congregations in trust for whom the applicant corporation or trustees hold property: there is absent from it such provision for the preservation of the rights of non-concurring congregations as were included with such meticulous care by the Legislature in enacting The United Church of Canada Act, Statutes of Ontario, 1925, c. 125 particularly sec. 8 thereof.

The bill, if enacted as drafted, would have the effect of denying to members of a non-concurring congregation the right of access to the courts for the determination of their rights, if any, in or to property held in trust for the congregation. In this respect the bill as drafted may well prejudice rights which exist under The Act of Incorporation of 1930.

The bill as drafted, fails adequately to protect the rights of creditors who may have claims against the corporation at the date the bill will receive the Royal assent. The provisions of the bill as drafted would at that time denude the corporation of all its assets and make it impossible for any creditor to enforce payment of its claim against the corporation. We are satisfied that it was not the intention of

the applicants to bring about this result; quite understandably an attempt was being made to avoid interfering to the prejudice of other congregations of the United Churches of Canada with the obligation of any particular congregation to discharge a debt or obligation incurred in respect of property held in trust for such congregation by a revision of clause 9 of the bill which would leave unqualified the liability of The United Church of Canada to the creditors of the corporation but would leave unaffected the obligation of any particular congregation to save harmless or reimburse The United Church of Canada for any debt with respect to the property held for that congregation, which The United Church of Canada might be called upon to pay. The legitimate objects of the applicant could be achieved without doing violence to the rights of third parties.

On account of the abrogation or extinguishment of the rights to property of the members of non-concurring congregations and the failure adequately to protect the rights of creditors, we recommend that the bill in the form submitted not pass into law.

If the applicants are prepared to accept in a form satisfactory to the legislative counsel, revisions which would

a. assure the preservation of the rights to property of any non-concurring congregation as was done in The United Church of Canada Act, 1925 (c. 125 sec. 8);

b. preserve the rights of creditors to be satisfied out of the property of the corporation notwithstanding the vesting thereof in The United Church of Canada, our major objections to the passing of the bill would be met. In such event there would remain three other features of comparatively minor items which we would mention.

1. The inclusion in paragraph 2 after the words "other body" of the words "other than a congregation". 2. The revision of the recitals to distinguish between the incorporated corporation and the unincorporated ecclesiastical association. 3. The revision of the recitals to include a statement that The United Church of Canada had agreed to accept the transfer of property upon the terms and conditions set out in the bill and is prepared to observe such terms and conditions.

Although we feel compelled to recommend that the bill as presented should not pass into law, if the two major features to which we have made reference are met by appropriate revisions, we are of the opinion that the terms of the bill as so revised would be proper for carrying into effect its purposes and that it is reasonable that the said bill should pass into law.

We are returning herewith the petition and the bill duly signed by the commissioners endorsed with a note of our recommendations and four copies of the transcript of the hearing before the commissioners on the 20th day of March, 1968.

Yours truly,
(Signed)
COMMISSIONERS OF ESTATE BILLS
F. G. MACKAY, J.A.
ARTHUR KELLY, J.A.

Since preparing the foregoing report, the solicitor for the applicants has laid before us a copy of Bill Pr1 in which he has caused to be inserted certain suggested amendments designed to meet some but not all of the matters referred to in the foregoing report.

The inclusion in the bill of such suggested amendments would meet the features upon which we have commented save that with respect to the rights to property of non-concurring congregations. No attempt has been made by the applicants to suggest any amendment which would meet this objection—on the contrary it would appear to us that the applicants are not prepared to suggest or to agree to any amendment with respect to that objection we have taken to the bill as submitted, that is, that it is capable of prejudiciously affecting the rights of non-concurring congregations or the members thereof to property and of denying access to the courts for the determination of such rights.

In addition to the documents above mentioned, we are attaching to this report the copy of Bill Pr1 with the amendments submitted by the solicitor for the applicant, the same being identified by our signatures. To remove any doubt with respect to our views we would again recommend against the passing of this bill even if there be incorporated in it all of the suggested amendments submitted by the applicants and incorporated in the copy of the bill last above referred to.

Yours truly,
(Signed)
COMMISSIONERS OF ESTATE BILLS
F. G. MACKAY, J.A.
ARTHUR KELLY, J.A.

Bill Pr44, An Act respecting the Toronto city mission.

RODERICK LEWIS ESQ. Q.C.,
CLERK OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY,
PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS,
TORONTO 2, ONTARIO.

Dear Sir:

Re Private Bill Pr14—An Act respecting the Toronto city mission

The undersigned as commissioners of estate bills as provided by The Legislative Assembly Act RSO 1960, chap. 208, sec. 57, having had the above noted bill referred to us as commissioners, now beg to report thereon.

Your commissioners appointed the 12th day of March, 1968 at 9.30 a.m. to consider the petition and bill and gave notice thereof to the applicant. On the hearing, Mr. M. N. Ellis appeared for the petitioner and submitted the petition of Gordon V. Crofoot and others.

In addition to the facts recited in the petition, the commissioners were informed that prior to the incorporation of the corporation by letters patent dated 3rd day of December, 1910, an unincorporated body known as the Toronto city mission had for a very considerable number of years, carried on the same charitable activities as were carried on by the corporation after incorporation that after the 2nd day of January, 1956, when the corporation was dissolved by reason of its failure to file returns under The Corporations Information Act, members of the dissolved corporation carried on and still carry on the identical charitable work, as an unincorporated association under the name of the Toronto city mission.

Your commissioners are satisfied that despite the dissolution of the corporation no rights to the property vested in the corporation at the date of its dissolution have been acquired by any person, persons or corporation other than the said unincorporated association and that no rights which would be adversely affected by the enactment of this bill were at any time nor are now vested in any person, persons or corporation.

We recommend that the bill, if it is to pass into law, should be redrafted in the following form:

Bill Pr44, An Act respecting the Toronto city mission

Whereas Gordon V. Crofoot, Edward S. Fish, J. A. Northey, Harold D. Poole, Lawrence M. Stark, Ivy

M. Bunt and Marjorie E. Finch by their petition have represented that the Toronto city mission, hereinafter called "the corporation", was incorporated by letter patent, dated the 3rd day of December, 1910, as a corporation without share capital having religious, philosophical and charitable objects; that the honourable, the Provincial Secretary by order, dated the 28th day of November, 1955, made under the authority of subsection 2 of section 326 of The Corporations Act, 1953, cancelled the letters patent of the corporation and declared it to be dissolved on the 2nd day of January, 1956; that both before its incorporation and after its dissolution the Toronto city mission carried on its religious, philosophical and charitable undertakings as an unincorporated association, in the name of "the Toronto city mission" which name and style has been used continuously by the petitioners or their predecessors since A.D. 1890; that the petitioners were all the directors of the corporation at the time of its dissolution and since its dissoluion have carried on the corporation's religious, philosophical and charitable undertakings as an unincorporated association named "the Toronto city mission"; that the notice of default in filing annual returns required by the said subsection 2 of section 326 of The Corporations Act was not received by any of them and none of them was aware of the dissolution of the corporation until more than ten years after the date thereof; and the corporation at the time of its dissolution was actively carrying on its affairs and was the owner of real and personal property in the province of Ontario; and whereas the petitioners have prayed for special legislation reviving the corporation and altering the quorum of its board of directors; and whereas it is expedient to grant the prayer of the petition;

Therefore Her Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the legislative assembly of the province of Ontario, enacts as follows:

1. (1) The Toronto city mission incorporated by letters patent dated the 3rd day of December, 1910, is hereby revived and is declared to be a subsisting corporation and shall be deemed to have been a subsisting corporation since its incorporation in the same manner and to the same extent as if it had not been dissolved.

(2) All property both real and personal vested in the said corporation the Toronto city mission at the date of its dissolution which has not since been disposed of by the unincorporated association known as the Toronto city mission and all property both real and personal now vested in the incorporated association known as the Toronto city mission is hereby vested in the said corporation.

(3) The corporation is exempt from the requirements of section 3 of The Corporations Information Act or any predecessor thereof, in respect of annual returns required to be filed for the years 1911 to 1965, both inclusive.

2. Two-fifths of the members of the board of directors of the corporation constitute a quorum of the board.

3. This Act comes into force on the day it receives Royal assent.

4. This Act may be cited as The Toronto City Mission Act, 1968.

We are of the opinion that the intent of the bill in the form so amended is reasonable and that the terms of it are proper for carrying into effect its purposes and that it is reasonable that the said bill should pass into law.

The bill in the form as amended by us duly signed by us as commissioners and a copy of the petition for the same together with the document referred to herein, are accordingly returned herewith.

Yours truly,
(Signed)
COMMISSIONERS OF ESTATE BILLS
F. G. MACKAY, J.A.
ARTHUR KELLY, J.A.

Ordered, that the bills together with the reports of the commissioners of estate bills thereon, be referred to the standing committee on private bills.

Hon. R. S. Welch (Provincial Secretary and Minister of Citizenship): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present to the House the following reports:

1. The annual report of the St. Lawrence parks commission, for the year ending December 31, 1967;

2. The 21st annual report of the liquor licence board of Ontario, March 31, 1967.

Mr. G. R. Carton from the standing committee on private bills, presented the committee's ninth report which was read as follows and adopted:

Your committee begs to report the following bill with certain amendments:

Bill Pr46, An Act to incorporate Ewart College.

Your committee would recommend that the following bill be not reported:

Bill Pr48, An Act respecting the village of Point Edward.

Your committee would recommend that the fees, less the penalties and the actual cost of printing, be remitted on Bill Pr46, An Act to incorporate Ewart College.

Your committee recommends that the time for presenting reports by the committee be extended to Tuesday, April 2, 1968.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister) moves, seconded by the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Wishart), that the provincial auditor be authorized to pay the salaries of the civil service and other necessary payments pending the voting of supply for the fiscal year commencing April 1, 1968, such payments to be charged to the proper appropriations following the voting of supply.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Mr. Speaker, this is a matter that has always been of deep and intimate concern to me and I would merely like to clear with the Premier, through you, that upon the presentation of a motion such as this, which deals directly with the voting of public monies, I take it,

not this time, but at some future time, this motion would be debatable and any member might, at this point, raise any matter of grievance to him before this motion would pass. I say this out of an interest to develop an orderly procedure consonant with the practice that is carried on, I think, both at Westminster and in the Parliament of Canada. In other words, this is a proper supply motion and this might be amended, or as I say, any member might raise any manner of grievance of any nature whatsoever.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, I am well aware that this motion is completely debatable—can be debated at any time. It always has been that way under the rules of this House. It is simply a question that we are approaching the end of the fiscal year, have not yet completed the estimates and voted the sums necessary in order to carry on the functions of government commencing on April 1. I know that this motion is used in other areas for great debates and sometimes it is used to hold up the government for various reasons that may tactically appeal to the Opposition at the time in that House. In this particular Legislature, because of the way we conduct our business, it really has not been necessary for this particular motion to be used for that purpose. After all, we are in the middle of the Budget debate at the moment.

We have just concluded the debate on the Throne Speech; we are about to commence the examination of the estimates and I quite agree with the hon. member, Mr. Speaker, that the motion is debatable.

By tradition or practice in this House it has not been debated for the reasons that I have put forward. It really has not been necessary to use this particular vehicle for debate because always there have been other areas in which members might express themselves on any matter they might wish before this House.

In presenting the motion as I have this afternoon, it is simply to put the provincial auditor in a position that he has the wherewithal to carry on for the government after March 31, 1968, when the present fiscal year will end.

But I reiterate I am well aware the motion is debatable. I do not believe there has been any pattern in this House on the debate. As I say, it really is not necessary to use this particular form.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, may I suggest to you this may well be another area in which our rules, which are about to be clarified, might be clarified. I do not think anybody disputes for one moment that this motion is debatable.

But I would assume that debate on this motion has been accepted by general agreement among the parties as taking place on any one of the three occasions which are now offered to the Opposition party to put a want of confidence motion on going into supply. I assume that procedure has, in effect, superseded debate here. If it has not, I repeat, this is an area for clarification as we restate our rules.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): Mr. Speaker, might I ask a question of the Prime Minister?

Does this motion just allow for necessary spending for the salaries or does it also include new expenditures?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, it will include the programmes of the government that are set out in the estimates which are before the House presently, but which have not yet reached the House in the committee stage when they will be examined item by item.

Mr. MacDonald: It is a pity the hon. member for Humber (Mr. Ben) is not here, because he would really go into orbit over this question.

Mr. Shulman: May I suggest to the hon. Prime Minister that I am sure that none of us would have any objection to emergency and necessary expenditures, such as salaries, but certainly I for one object very strenuously to some of these new expenditures—which some of us on this side of the House disagree with very violently—going ahead before they have been voted.

Mr. Speaker: Is there any further debate on this matter before I put the question?

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: Introduction of bills.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I have a question for the Minister of University Affairs.

Is the Minister concerned that his assistant deputy, Mr. A. P. Gordon, has stated publicly, according to the Toronto *Telegram* of March 25, that the government policy with regard to French instruction is, quote: "quackery"?

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I have a similar question, but an expanded one. Perhaps I can put it to the Minister and he can deal with both at the same time.

With reference to the remarks of the assistant deputy, Mr. A. P. Gordon, to a teach-in at Guelph University on Saturday, as reported in the *Telegram* yesterday, what explanation can the Minister give for a top civil servant openly criticizing stated government policy with regard to the teaching of French?

Also, can the Minister throw any light on Mr. Gordon's contention that: "We are well on our way to committing all errors at once in developing community colleges"?

Hon. W. G. Davis (Minister of University Affairs): Mr. Speaker, it is very difficult for a Minister to answer comprehensively for one of his senior civil servants, particularly when the report emanated from a discussion that took place, I believe, at the University of Guelph. It went over some three-hour period of panel-type discussion, where notes were not always kept as to the specific statements that were made.

However, I have discussed this with Mr. Gordon and I can assure the leader of the Opposition and the member for York South that not only does the senior civil servant, Mr. Gordon, support the policy of this government with respect to French, he supports it with enthusiasm.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I should perhaps point out one of the distinguishing characteristics between the members on this side of the House and that opposite, is that everything we do here we do with enthusiasm.

Mr. MacDonald: You mean you oppose and support at the same time, with enthusiasm?

Hon. Mr. Davis: In fairness I should also give just a little bit of background. The discussions, I gather, came about because of a discussion initiated by Professor Kirk from Michigan—and I think we might get into this during the estimates sometime—as to whether or not changes in academic programmes, particularly at the universities, are brought about because of academic need or because of popular appeal. I think you can see what might flow from these discussions with respect to our own jurisdiction, and I can assure the members opposite, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Gordon is, as I say, very enthusiastic about the policy of this government.

Mr. Nixon: Why did he change his mind?

Hon. Mr. Davis: He did not. It is as simple as that.

Mr. Nixon: It was simple after the Minister took him into the woodshed.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes, without any question. He also asked me to point out on his behalf that the article was inaccurate also in two or three other areas, such as research, and so did not accurately reflect either his statements or in his view the best tenor of the discussions.

Mr. MacDonald: The *Telegram* reporting was a little below par then.

Hon. Mr. Davis: In answer to the second part of the question from the member for York South, Mr. Gordon did keep some notes here in this regard. He was using a quotation from Clark Kerr, who is the former president of the University of California, a gentleman well known, I am sure, to the member for York South. Kerr was quoted as saying, "Change comes from spawning the new rather than reforming the old." He used this in the context of the community college development in this province and he suggested in his remarks that these colleges were devoloped and established to meet the changing needs of the community in the province of Ontario.

He is, once again, a very enthusiastic supporter of the college programme. He also pointed out something that the Minister has said on several occasions in this House, that any time you do create, particularly institutions of this significance, you go through periods where there are some errors made and rectified. You go through a period of experimentation. I want to make it very clear, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Gordon not only supports with enthusiasm the community college concept, he really has been very helpful in many aspects of this development here in this province. I hope this answers the questions of the two hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: It leaves us a little confused.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Prime Minister:

In view of the excessive increase in the cost of education to municipal taxpayers, will the Prime Minister undertake on behalf of

the province to absorb a more substantial portion of these costs, either by additional grants or by the implementation of the Smith recommendation?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, I believe the new grant regulations have not gone out to the school boards. They are in the process of being sent and the government's position in regard to grants to our school boards will be revealed in the estimates of The Department of Education.

As far as the Smith report is concerned, as you know there is some discussion going on presently between the government and the municipalities. We are receiving briefs from them and we propose to confer with them before anything is done about implementing those parts of the Smith committee report.

Mr. F. A. Burr (Sandwich-Riverside): Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Economics and Development:

In view of Windsor's urgent need for housing and despite the drainage difficulty now jeopardizing the 256 geared-to-income public housing project planned by Ontario housing corporation, can the Minister give assurance that either this or an alternative project will be carried through without undue delay?

Hon. S. J. Randall (Minister of Economics and Development): Mr. Speaker, as I advised the hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville (Mr. B. Newman) yesterday, Ontario housing corporation has arranged a meeting with officials of the city of Windsor for March 28 in an endeavour to resolve this matter and get the development underway as quickly as possible.

While I hasten to assure the hon. member that we will take all reasonable steps to expedite the provision of housing for the city of Windsor, I do not feel it would be proper on my part to comment further pending the outcome of the meeting scheduled for March 28.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs:

Does the Minister propose to bring mutual funds sold by life insurance companies and other corporations under the regulations of the Ontario securities commission?

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Mr. Speaker, presently the superintendent of insurance has the jurisdiction in this field. Currently, the whole matter is under study by the Canadian mutual fund committee, which is a committee made up of representatives speaking for all the provinces and the federal government as well. In the meantime, the matter is under the jurisdiction of the superintendent of insurance who is keeping watch over the situation.

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Speaker, may I ask a supplementary question of the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs?

Since the report of the Canadian mutual fund committee is not expected for another three years, is it the view of the Minister that the registrar of insurance companies is capable of managing this securities business?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: I do not think that that report will be three years. It may be three years for its final report but it would be my hope and it is my information that there will be some interim reports which will give us guidance in this matter.

I recognize that it is a very current matter of very great interest both to those in the mutual fund business as well as those who sell similar investment opportunities in the insurance industry.

Mr. R. H. Knight (Port Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the hon. Minister of Economics and Development:

In view of the current housing shortage, would the hon. Minister tell the House whether:

(a) The Ontario housing corporation would be prepared to investigate and to attempt to assist 127 families now living in mobile homes at Pleasant Valley in Mississauga township who in just two months will be faced with "no place to go" with their mobile homes when the park is closed, as reported in the March 20 issue of the South Peel *Weekly* and the March 20 issue of the Mississauga *News*?

(b) Whether the Ontario housing corporation would be willing to confer with the town of Mississauga council and planning board about the matter, since it has been requested to provide a 35-acre site on which to establish a new park for these 226 adults and 110 children?

(c) Is the Ontario housing corporation willing to look into the whole problem of making proper parking space available closer to Metro Toronto for persons like myself who have had to park our mobile homes over 100 miles from this city?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Speaker, in answer to the first question, the Ontario housing corporation is prepared to investigate the need and demand for Ontario housing units upon receiving a request from the municipality concerned.

At the present time 64 Ontario housing corporation family units are being constructed in the town of Mississauga and will be ready for occupancy in April 1968 which, as you know, is next month. Any family now residing in the town can apply and dwellings will be allocated, as is the customary procedure of the corporation, on the basis of greatest need. The 64 units were developed at the request of the town. When these have been completed the total requests of the municipality to date will have been met.

On the second question, Ontario housing corporation is willing to confer with the council of the town of Mississauga and the town's planning board concerning any aspect of land development the town may wish to discuss. The corporation has already been in touch with officials of the town concerning the Pleasant Valley trailer park. We are advised that there have been discussions concerning the rezoning of the area to permit the development of apartments, but to date no formal action has been taken in this regard.

On the third question, the matter of making parking places for mobile homes available close to Metropolitan Toronto is, we believe, the responsibility of the municipality concerned, and not that of Ontario housing corporation.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Prime Minister.

Will the Prime Minister consider placing on the order paper a government order permitting debate on the Royal commission inquiry on civil rights known as the McRuer report for a stated period of time?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, I really have no intention, at the moment, of putting that particular report on the order paper for debate. It has been debated in part here already on various second readings and it has been discussed in the Throne debate. I think there will be plenty of opportunity to discuss it without giving it a specific place on the order paper.

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Health.

What action is being taken by the province of Ontario to eliminate the air pollution resulting from the burning of bulk oil and the use of other pollutants by the Goodyear Tire and Rubber Company at its plant on Lakeshore Boulevard West in the borough of Etobicoke?

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, I want to take that question as notice.

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Speaker, I have another question of the Minister of Education. It is a two-and-a-half-part question.

1. What are the total capital costs to the government for converting the old public school building at 3459 Lakeshore Boulevard West, Etobicoke, for use as an interim community college?

2(a). Would the Minister consider retaining this property and its facilities as a separate and distinct community college serving the southerly portion of the borough of Etobicoke and its environs?

(b) In the alternative, would the Minister consider permanently retaining these premises as a branch of Humber College for such purposes and such a range of courses as its facilities reasonably permit?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I am not quite sure I understand what the two and a half parts are, as to which is the half part of the qeustion. But, I shall endeavour to answer it in any event.

The answer to the first part is $167,931.68, excluding the furnishing and equipment.

The answer to the other two parts are, I am sure, well known to the hon. member, Mr. Speaker. The question of site determination and locations is the responsibility of the board of governors subject to the approval of the council of regents, and the Minister.

The two other questions that the hon. member posed are really answered in this fashion. Any decision either to divide the campus in Etobicoke or to have this as a branch of the main campus is something that the board of governors would have to consider and I would suggest to the hon. member that he should perhaps make his views known to that particular body.

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Speaker, will the hon. Minister accept a supplementary question?

Would the Minister, with his well-known powers of persuasion, be prepared to go into consultation with that board of governors with that sort of object in mind?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, while I recognize the hon. member is very interested in developing any facility within his own riding, I think one must look at the total needs of the community, particularly with the large number of dollars involved. I do not think really it would be befitting for the Minister to bring pressure or enter into consultation with that particular board of governors if it does not meet the total requirements of the educational problems in this jurisdiction.

Mr. W. G. Pitman (Peterborough): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Education.

Since the cancellation of summer teacher training courses will result in a severe shortage of secondary school teachers, would the Minister indicate what measures his department intends to take to overcome the shortage?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, as a preamble to the question asked by the hon. member for Peterborough, I should point out that the decision to cancel the emergency summer course for secondary teachers was done after consultation with, and with very specific encouragement from the OTF, certain agencies of the OEA, the superintendents and I think all agencies connected with this particular problem. After consultations with them, it was felt that we could do this in this coming year.

The summer course, as the hon. member knows, will be discontinued in 1968 and the last qualifying summer course will be offered this summer. We are having discussions now and I will be prepared to discuss in this greater detail with the hon. member during the estimates of the department as to certain specific proposals. In the meantime, however, we have done several things.

First, letters of standing have been reintroduced at the secondary school level to accept well prepared secondary school teachers from anywhere in the world provided that the candidate can meet academic, linguistic and citizenship requirements. We have broadened this very substantially. Second, admission requirements for colleges of education have been redefined to permit more liberal—if I can use that term, I think really I should say generous—interpretation of—

Mr. Nixon: Yes, the two go well together.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —of the approved degree. Third, the summer course route will remain available for mature university graduates who have worked for a specified time in business and industry and for teachers for the vocational and occupational courses. Fourth, we have altered regulations to permit an elementary school teacher with an approved university degree and a permanent teaching certificate to be awarded a high school assistance certificate on being appointed to a secondary school teaching position. This gives us some flexibility and we think will go partially, at least, to the solution of the problem.

Fifth, Mr. Speaker—and I am not sure that I have included all the things we have done but I am trying to give the hon. members as comprehensive a list as possible. McArthur college of education in Kingston is now recruiting staff and will open in September of this year, which will give us, of course, a substantially increased number of students who will be graduating in time for the fall of 1969. We are also having conversations now with the authorities at the University of Ottawa with a view to establishment of teacher training at that university, to include the present University of Ottawa's teachers' college and a college education to prepare teachers for the French-speaking secondary schools.

Mr. Pitman: Mr. Speaker, I thank the Minister very much for the complete information. I wonder if I may ask a supplementary question as to whether this problem might very well place the building of McArthur college on a higher priority.

Hon. Mr. Davis: McArthur has been placed on a very high priority right now.

Mr. Pitman: I have another question, Mr. Speaker. In view of the decision to make the subject of history optional in grades 11 and 12, in programmes where it was formerly compulsory, what steps will be taken to revise the present courses to reflect this change?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I am once again a little confused by the question. The policy is one of introducing as much flexibility into the secondary school programme as possible, with a variety of options, and I am not yet sure that all courses necessarily reflect this change of philosophy—that is the courses themselves may remain the same.

This is not true of the history course. We are in the process of updating and altering not only the course structure itself, and this information will become available some time in the future for the hon. member, but we

are also, through the programme consultant, altering the philosophical approach to the teaching of history by greater student participation and involvement in the teaching and educational experience. And of course, we look upon the whole question of flexibility in options at the secondary level as being highly desirable, but they do not relate necessarily to course content themselves.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Port Arthur has the floor.

Mr. Knight: Mr. Speaker, a point of order. Mr. Speaker if I might—

Mr. Speaker: State your point of order.

Mr. Knight: Mr. Speaker, some of us put questions to the Minister of Education last week—myself as far back as Monday or Tuesday—and I am still waiting for these answers, but here in the House, I see the Minister answering questions—

Mr. Speaker: Order, order! Yesterday the Minister came prepared with the answers to the questions and I asked him if he would give them. He stated that certain of the members who had asked questions were not in the House, and I asked him to retain those answers until the member was in the House, and in due course this afternoon, he will have the opportunity. If the member is in the House, I trust that he will have his question answered. The member for Peterborough still has the floor.

Mr. Pitman: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I was wondering if, in view of the concern expressed by some of the chairmen of the departments of history of the provincial universities, whether the Minister would meet with these chairmen and discuss this matter on some future occasion.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I would be delighted to meet with them.

Mr. T. Reid (Scarborough East): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Attorney General. Is the Minister prepared to establish basic rights for pedestrians in Ontario, in view of the Metro Toronto report released yesterday that pedestrians should be given greater consideration in municipal planning?

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I have no knowledge of the matter, except for an article in the press, which I had a brief time to read. The matter appears to be definitely one of a municipal nature, and not of law enforcement, and therefore I would have no contemplation of action in that report.

Mr. D. M. De Monte (Dovercourt): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Provincial Secretary and Minister of Citizenship. Will the Minister initiate plans for a national conference on the standardization of Canadian liquor laws, in view of the encouragement for standardization by the Canadian restaurant association's new president Eric Walling?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, I must apologize for not having had the opportunity to read Mr. Walling's remarks in the newspaper. Of course I would want to discuss them with the chairmen of the two boards, who would be interested in this as well.

It would be my opinion at this stage that we might leave this matter with the conference of liquor commissioners which meets on a regular basis, and await their reaction to the practical implications of this plan. Then each of the commissioners would be in a position, perhaps, to advise their respective governments as to what the possibility of such an attempt might be.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of privilege.

The hon. Minister of Reform Institutions is reported in this morning's *Globe and Mail* as follows, and I quote:

> Dr. Shulman's assertion that some persons suspected of mental illness are confined in the Don jail for peroids of up to several months is not true.

End of quote. I wish to inform this House that the governor of the Don jail stated, in the presence of the member for Lakeshore and myself—

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): I wonder if the hon. member would mind speaking up, because I cannot hear him?

Mr. Shulman: I am sorry if the Minister has trouble with his hearing, in addition—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The member does not have to be sarcastic. I want to do him the courtesy of hearing him.

Mr. MacDonald: You do not usually listen anyway.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: If that is the kind of courtesy extended by the member, then I won't do him the courtesy of listening to him.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Oh, this is too much, how many prima donnas can one take?

Mr. MacDonald: Take off your shoes, and pound the desk!

Mr. Shulman: I will begin again, and I will try to speak a little louder for those on the other side who have difficulty in hearing. The Minister of Reform Institutions is quoted in this morning's *Globe and Mail* as follows and I quote, he said:

> Dr. Shulman's assertion that some persons suspected of mental illness are confined in the Don jail for periods up to several months is not true.

End of quote. I wish to inform this House that the governor of the Don jail stated, in the presence of the member for Lakeshore and myself, that some prisoners were confined in the cell for the mentally ill for periods up to several months.

In light of the Minister's statement and the fact that two members of this House have no reason to doubt the governor of the Don jail, it is apparent that the Minister has misinformed the public.

Mr. MacDonald: I rise on a point of order, and I suggest to you that the Minister walked out because he did not want to face this question. It is in the same category as the one yesterday, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. G. A. Kerr (Halton West): It is a point of order, not a question.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): That will happen a lot this year.

Mr Sopha: Could the member tell him that it was shocking?

Mr. Speaker: Order: The member for High Park has a series of questions. Perhaps now that he has the floor he will put them?

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs. Notice of this was given yesterday. In view of comments made by Mr. H. Egan, the director of Industrial Estates Limited, as reported in the *Globe and Mail* of March 23, does the Ontario securities commission intend to investigate trading in shares of Clairtone by insiders?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Mr. Speaker, this matter is currently under study by officials of the securities commission, and I expect to have a report and some further word on the matter in a day or so.

Mr. Shulman: Will the hon. Minister report to the House on this matter?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: I will have a look at the information I get and determine that when the time comes.

Mr. Shulman: I have a question for the Minister of Social and Family Services. This is the question that you did not wish yesterday, sir. Will the Minister introduce legislation during the next session of the Legislature providing a comfort allowance for persons confined to chronic hospitals who receive no pension or other income?

Hon. J. Yaremko (Minister of Social and Family Services): Mr. Speaker, the government in general and this department in specific, are always reviewing programmes, and changes, and often extensions follow such review.

Mr. Shulman: Would the Minister be kind enough to answer my question?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, for the hon. member's information, I have answered his question.

Mr. Sopha: We wants a translation.

Mr. Shulman: Would he please translate it, Mr. Speaker? I have asked him—

Mr Speaker: Order, the member has asked the question, and it has been answered by the Minister in the terms that the Minister wishes to answer the question, and unless the member wishes tomorrow to place another question, to clarify the matter, we shall have to go on to the next question by the member.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, I must point out that the Minister has not answered the question. He has made a statement on another matter entirely.

I have a question for the Minister of Agriculture and Food, in several parts. I will read all the parts, and he may answer.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Shulman: Is the price of milk higher in Newmarket than in Richmond Hill, Toronto, Hamilton and Oshawa? Has the Becker Milk Company been refused permission to sell

milk in Newmarket? Is the Becker Milk Company allowed to sell milk outside of area 4? If not, why not? Have any of the producers supplying milk to Becker Milk Company had their quotas cut?

Is the purpose of regulation 70-68, section 4, subsection 3, of The Milk Act, 1965, "No processor shall sell the milk produced by a producer," to raise the price of milk to the consumer, and in the Minister's opinion is regulation 68-68, section 3, subsection 4 of The Milk Act, 1965, dealing with the milk marketing board's power to refuse to issue a licence, in conflict with the principle stated in the McRuer report?

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): Mr. Speaker, I think that everyone would agree that that question should quite properly be placed on the order paper and we will deal with it in the fullness of time.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, may I make a point of order in that case? I believe this is an urgent matter inasmuch as the price of milk may be forced up very shortly because of this matter and as such it should not be on the order paper.

Mr. Speaker: The Minister has three choices always, and one is to answer the question; the second is to decline to answer it; and the third is to have it placed on the order paper when it is a matter that requires a considerable amount of research as this one apparently does.

The Minister has taken the attitude that it should be on the order paper, and I must say that I was of that opinion also when it reached my office, but I felt it should be a decision taken by the Minister who has the files and the necessary information from which this answer would come. Therefore, the Clerk will have noted this and it would appear on the notice paper. The member has further questions?

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, as a new member, may I ask you a question, sir? Is there a length of time on which a question may remain on the order paper?

Mr. Speaker: The question, of course, remains on the order paper until the answer is produced.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Shulman: I have a question of the Attorney General, Mr. Speaker. Will the Minister take steps to ensure that in future all persons remanded by the courts for mental examination receive such examination from a qualified psychiatrist?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, I am not sure this question should be asked of my department. In any event, I will take it as notice and I will attempt to furnish an answer.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Reform Institutions. How many mental examinations were performed by Dr. Hills in the Don jail during the past year?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I will take the hon. member's question as notice.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Rainy River.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): The hon. member is not in the House at the moment, I shall wait until he returns.

Mr. Speaker: Oh, he has gone, I am sorry.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Lands and Forests. Is the Minister aware of the rapid reduction of fish stock in Lake Wanapitei? And, would the Minister order a study into this reduction in an effort to determine the cause of the problem and a remedy for the situation?

Hon. R. Brunelle (Minister of Lands and Forests): Mr. Speaker, in reply to the hon. member for Sudbury East, yes, we have introduced herring into the lake which we believe has resulted in improved growth of the trout. Also, we have already prepared contour maps of the bottom of the lake in advance of studies which will be made as soon as feasible. Subsequent action will depend on our findings.

Mr. R. S. Smith (Nipissing): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests. Will the Minister and his departmental officials give consideration to the reversal of their decision to initiate the resident angling licence in the light of the widespread criticism of the decision, particularly in northern Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Speaker, in reply to my good friend, the hon. member for Nipissing, may I say to him that this matter is under consideration, and may I just qualify, under very active consideration. The reason for considering this move is to provide more access by roads to lakes; carry out surveys on more lakes, more stocking of lakes, more

research, and place more qualified staff to carry out more adequate management of the resources.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Education, notice of which has been given. Will the Minister investigate what Dr. Reginald Stackhouse claims are the irresponsible policies of some school boards in connection with budget and trimming as reported in today's Toronto *Telegram.*

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, Mr. Stackhouse is a member of the borough of Scarborough board which is a participating member in the Metro school board. I understand that all the boards are in the process of final budget determinations in conjunction with Metro and I have no intention of investigating anything at this particular point.

Mr. MacDonald: The electorate left him at home.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Attorney General. Will the Attorney General immediately instruct the public trustee of Ontario to take action under The Escheats Act to recover for the Crown from Viola and George MacMillan and their controlled companies the illegal net profit of $1,455,928, as set out in table 8 of the report of the Royal commission to investigate trading in the shares of Windfall Oils and Mines Limited?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, I have no intention of instructing the public trustee to take such action under The Escheats Act. First of all, there is no authority to do so. Second, this whole matter is still under criminal proceedings with prosecution coming up shortly against two of the principals.

I might say, third, that although that figure, which is stated in the question, is described as "an illegal net profit", it is not so described in the report of Mr. Justice Kelly. It may be in part or in whole illegal but there are a number of companies shown as having made a profit. Mr. Justice Kelly actually said—I think it is on page 87—he did not describe all of the profits as illegal but he said "to use an analogy"—and he is speaking of these companies—"they played better poker with the cards dealt to them but they did not attempt to deal from the bottom of the deck." Now, as I say, it may be illegal profit in all or in part but there is no authority to instruct the public trustee to proceed under The Escheats Act. The matter is still coming forward for criminal prosecution. With respect to Viola MacMillan, she was before the court, she was convicted, she was fined $10,000 which she paid, she was sentenced to jail, where she went—so that I have no intention of proceeding in the way suggested.

Mr. Stokes: Will the Minister accept a supplementary question?

Mr. Sopha: Where is she now?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: That is a matter for the parole board to decide. I do not interfere with that.

Mr. Stokes: Will the Minister accept a supplementary question?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Yes.

Mr. Stokes: What provisions are there, within the Ontario statutes, to protect people against theft?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: In the Ontario statutes there are few. But our whole criminal proceedings are set forth in the criminal code. That is a federal statute, and theft and fraud crimes, they are covered in the criminal code.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, a question to the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions. This is an easy one and he can stay in the House on this one. Will the Minister advise the number of people eligible for parole in Ontario institutions who cannot get parole because they cannot get jobs on the outside?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, it is a great pleasure to answer the hon. member's question because he does not show the arrogance of some new members.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I would also remind you, sir, of the remarks of the hon. member for York South about interjections yesterday.

Mr. MacDonald: Oh how petulant the Minister has become!

Mr. Speaker: Order, order! The Minister will please answer the question.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Very statesman-like remarks from the leader of a party, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MacDonald: The Minister's touchiness is increasingly significant.

Mr. Sopha: You all bruise easily. You should be thick-skinned like me.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, if I may be permitted. It is a matter of policy that no person is refused parole by the Ontario board of parole simply because he does not have the promise of employment. I am assured by the chairman of the Ontario board of parole that this policy is being carried out. Parole is granted in the interests of the inmate and in the interests of society. If a person appears to have a chance of success but does not have employment promised to him, our rehabilitation service assists him in finding suitable employment.

Our last published annual report indicates that almost 7,000 people were assisted by our rehabilitation staff in arranging employment, providing for board and lodging, meals, tools, special clothing, or other types of assistance.

I should point out that this is not restricted simply to those going out on parole but the service is available to any inmate who wishes to make a sincere attempt to establish himself in society.

Mr. Sargent: May I ask a supplementary question?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, you and I were both expecting this and I would not forego the pleasure.

Mr. Speaker: Go ahead.

Mr. Sargent: Well, a couple of things on parole here. It is alleged and rumoured that Viola MacMillan was allowed a visit—

Mr. Speaker: Order, order! The member can ask a question that is supplementary to his original question but not a new question.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sargent: Was she allowed to leave before she—

Mr. Speaker: Order, order! The member will please desist and observe the rules of the House.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sargent: On this question, I ask, Mr. Speaker, are there any—

An hon. member: She has a job, though.

Mr. Sargent: The Minister did not answer my question properly. Are there any people ready for parole who cannot be paroled because they do not have jobs?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, in the first place I am glad the member has given me the opportunity to correct a statement he made two or three weeks ago—it was that long ago—when he stated it was rumoured that Viola MacMillan had been seen at some convention or some meeting or other. I was a little surprised.

I rushed out of the House because I knew at that time she had not been paroled as yet and I established for myself that at that time she was still incarcerated. So let me assure the hon. member she was not paroled; she had not been paroled at that time; she was not given any special permission to leave before her actual parole date.

Mr. Sargent: It was general knowledge.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: General knowledge? I never heard it until the hon. member mentioned it. Mr. Speaker, I am sure you will agree I answered his first question. The question was: Would I advise the number of people eligible for parole who cannot get parole because they cannot get jobs on the outside? I answered this quite frankly. This has no bearing at all; this is not the factor which is involved in respect of them getting parole, so obviously there are no numbers involved.

Mr. Sargent: A question for the hon. Minister of Agriculture and Food.

In view of the editorial in this morning's *Globe and Mail* that Bill 35 is in direct contradiction with the McRuer report, does the Minister plan to rescind this bill and submit new legislation on behalf of the beef improvement association?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, I am happy to inform the House though you, sir, that immediately following the debate which characterized the second reading of Bill 35 last Thursday night I discussed with the secretary of the beef improvement association—and, through him with the directors of the beef improvement association—my desire that I might see them as soon as possible in order to relay to them the matters of concern which were so well expressed in the House last Thursday evening.

I had the good fortune to have the executive of the beef improvement association in Toronto yesterday to meet with me and we discussed these matters at some length. They made it emphatically clear to me that it was their impression that the regulations provided

for what they wanted to do, but I pointed out to them the problem that had arisen and they suggested that we incorporate it in the Act, spelling it out by specific sections in the Act —the intent, first of all, and the purpose of the Act—and secondly, providing in the Act for the refund of licence fees to those who did not wish to belong. I would say as well that we agreed there should be a section in the Act that would directly tie the Act into the express purpose and intent of the Act, so that I feel it will relieve any problems that might have existed—and quite rightly so—in the minds of the hon. members who entered into the debate last Thursday evening.

All these negotiations took place yesterday, Monday, March 25. The proposed amendments were drafted and have been thoroughly read and discussed by the executive of the beef improvement association. I would like to suggest that we would print the bill, identifying the proposed amendments in it, and submit it to the committee on agriculture, which will be meeting on Thursday, April 4, at 10 o'clock in committee room no. 1. I would hope that these new sections would clear up any misunderstandings that might have unfortunately occurred as to the intent of the bill. I would like to emphasize, Mr. Speaker, quite forcefully, that the beef improvement association wanted it particularly spelled out that they understood this to be a completely voluntary plan and the return of licence fees was to be an understood matter.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, on this point, I have the floor—

Mr. MacDonald: On a point of order—

Mr. Speaker: Point of order. No, the member has a point of order. State your point of order.

Mr. MacDonald: On a point of order, with regard to this, I would ask you to examine carefully whether or not what the Minister has said is a change in the principle of the bill. If it is, I submit it should come back to this House for second reading.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, I can readily understand what the hon. member has said. There is no change in the principle of the bill. I spoke on the bill the other night and frankly admitted that the regulations provided for the things that are now provided in certain sections. There is no change whatever in the principle of the bill; it is exactly the same as it had been and I give the hon. members my word of assurance on this because this was clearly the understanding that we had arrived at long before the bill was ever presented here. It may not have been worded as clearly as it should have been but I can assure the hon. members of the House, Mr. Speaker, through you, that there is no change in the principle of the bill whatever.

Mr. MacDonald: One wonders whether it is—

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Pardon?

Mr. MacDonald: One wonders, Mr. Speaker, whether it is a private or a government bill.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Oh no. This is a government bill.

Mr. Speaker: I will be quite pleased, when the bill is reprinted, to give it my attention and I am sure that the leaders of the two parties will likewise have copies—

Hon. Mr. Stewart: We will be very pleased to do that, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker:—so it can be discussed. If there is any change of principle appearing, the necessary action can be taken to have it put back on the order paper for second reading.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, in this regard may I congratulate the Minister on his frankness? I did suspect in the reading of the bill that he felt that there was an area of concern, and I do congratulate him for his frankness in this. I would suggest, sir, that you give us the courtesy—the Opposition does once in a while have something to offer to this House —and that you, sir, would acknowledge to The Department of Agriculture and Food that we were part and parcel of giving them a fair bill.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Sopha: Owen Sound papers please copy.

Mr. Sargent: Please copy. Mr. Speaker, a question to the hon. Prime Minister.

In view of the news report of wire tapping in the Quebec Legislature will the Premier advise the House if he will take steps to provide that wire tapping is not in effect in this House—that the parliamentary offices do not have electronic devices for bugging?

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps if the member had read his question as submitted we might have had more confusion than already, because it is addressed to the Hon. John P. Robarts, Premier of Ontario, and then the member has asked if the Prime Minister will advise the House as to the matter.

An hon. member: Just call him "John."

Mr. Sargent: Well, read the question!

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I would be delighted to answer the question I received. It read:

> In view of the news report of wire tapping in the Quebec Legislature will the Prime Minister advise the House if he will take steps to provide that wire tapping is not in effect in this parliamentary office by having an electronic device for debugging?

Mr. Speaker: That is the question which was submitted to Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: It is not an easy question to anwer because it is very difficult to understand.

Mr. Sargent: For the Prime Minister it may be.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I am not aware of any electronic device that has been developed for debugging.

Mr. Sargent: You can get them for $500.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member would give me a little more information in that regard. On the other hand I would say that I am not aware of any allegations or suspicions of bugging. I do not know—the question says "in this parliamentary office"—whether that means the entire buildings. There are certain routine security checks—

Mr. Sargent: How can you tell if your office is bugged?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I would just say to the hon. members, through you, Mr. Speaker, that there are certain routine security checks carried on throughout the buildings. There is no evidence of bugging that has come to my attention. There have been no complaints that I can recall anyone has made, so I really do not consider it to be a problem here. As I read the news report from which this question developed, apparently there has been some question over a period of time in Quebec as to the possibility of some interference with telephones there. I do not think we have this problem here and, therefore, the problem really has not arisen.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, in the form of a question, is the Prime Minister aware that Inter-Continental Telephone of New York are offering this service to industry and business and government for a fee of $500? I think it behooves the government to protect their own operation—

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. The member will confine himself to questions.

The member has still, with the Speaker's office, three questions sent in on March 21, addressed to the Prime Minister. Is he in a position to put them today so that the paper may be clear? I will send them to you for tomorrow and they can be dealt with then.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, perhaps I might answer the questions that were put, and I would point out to the member for Port Arthur that the only reason I did not give these answers yesterday was because he, on matters of urgent public importance, was not with us. I did it only as a matter of courtesy to him. This is why I delayed giving the answer with respect to the one question, Mr. Speaker, relating to history. I have covered this to a degree really in the answer to the hon. member for Peterborough.

I think I should make this observation, Mr. Speaker, that while I agree that there is a lack of awareness about the history of our country, I think there is a growing commitment and interest on the part of our young people in particular. I personally have been very encouraged in the past two or three years at the growing interest in history in this province and in the country generally.

I should point out the editorial to which the hon. member referred, in the Toronto *Telegram* of March 18, indicated or assumed that history has been dropped from the high school programme. This factually is not the case. The editorial writer says, "admittedly history is not and has not been a compulsory subject beyond grade 10." In fact, history has been compulsory in the five-year programme or the five-year course to grade 12 and it has been compulsory to grade 11 in the four-year course. I think, in fairness, that the editorial perhaps did not indicate this quite accurately.

I also should point out, Mr. Speaker, that history will, in fact, be available to the students in the school system and those who wish to select it right from grade 7 to grade 13. It will be compulsory to grade 10

and optional from grade 10 to grade 13. In fact, we visualize that as alternative courses are developed, a student will, in fact, be able to take more history than has been the case in the past. And this is all part of the programme I referred to earlier, Mr. Speaker, where I indicated that we were doing this to introduce greater flexibility into the secondary school programme to evolve a system whereby the secondary school students will be able to individualize their programmes to a much greater degree than has been the case in the past.

As I also indicated, programme consultants and others are assisting in the development of the approach to history in this jurisdiction and I can assure the members of the House and the editorial writer of the Toronto *Telegram* that history will be maintained as a traditional option at the senior levels in the school system.

Mr. Speaker, in answer to the other question from the member for Port Arthur, with respect to the reorganization and his reference to the state of New York and also the reference to the OSSTF, I should point out that representatives of the department have visited New York state and studied the organization of schools in that jurisdiction as well as a number of other jurisdictions. I think it is only fair to point out that the state of New York has a number of unique problems, such as those involving New York City itself, but I am not sure to which area the hon. member is referring in particular. I would be delighted if he would provide me with this information or data because we do not know what he means by the term "failure". I do not think one can relate the problems in and around the city of New York to the reorganization that is being proposed here. There is a completely different situation.

With respect to the OSSTF, I think it is fair to state, Mr. Speaker, that there have been consultations with the teachers' groups in the province. I would refer the hon. member to the current issue of the *Bulletin*—which is, of course, the official publication of the OSSTF—and to a short article written by a Mr. J. D. McNabb, a man well known, I am sure, to the member for Peterborough, who is a member of the OSSTF advisory board and first vice-president of the Ontario teachers' federation. I just quote briefly from the *Bulletin*, and Mr. McNabb writes:

> The advantages of larger administrative units in education have been a matter of conjecture since 1925. Educators and trustees have discussed this basic improvement many times but now a bold step has been taken by the Minister of Education and larger school jurisdictions are merely a matter for final legislative approval.
>
> We have no quarrel with the reorganization, which aims to extend equal educational opportunity to the secondary school students of Ontario, nor can we have any real difference with the hope that the new school divisions will extend to all students the benefits now enjoyed by our more favoured school systems. We do have a concern that such a far reaching reorganization may be accomplished successfully.
>
> The teachers of the secondary schools have an important task to do, a leadership function to perform, and a faith to hold that all persons concerned will work together to create equal opportunity in education for every girl and boy.

This is the vice-president of the OTF, the organization to which the hon. member referred. I think it would indicate that there has been liaison with that particular organization, in view of the article that Mr. McNabb has written.

Mr. Speaker, there are three other questions that were posed. First, by the hon. member for Thunder Bay relating to a question of the education of Indian children in the Armstrong area. I should point out, as I am sure is known to the hon. member, that the education of Indian children under the constitution is a responsibility of the federal department of Indian affairs. The province has co-operated in enabling the local boards to enter into agreements with the federal government and, at the present time, over 50 per cent of the Indian youngsters in the province of Ontario are integrated into the local school systems. In the area in question, Mr. Speaker, I understand that the federal government and the local school boards are having discussions as to how they might resolve this problem, and while the basic responsibility does lie with the federal authorities, we as a department, are prepared to assist in any way that we can.

Mr. Speaker, one other question by the member for Sarnia (Mr. Bullbrook)—which I think I have answered on two or three occasions here in the House – relating to representation before the committee on education. He asked whether representatives of the established groups involved in education will be able to appear before the standing committee. As I said earlier, Mr. Speaker, on

two or three occasions, without any question they shall.

And the last question, Mr. Speaker. I do apologize that the member for Waterloo North (Mr. Good), is not here, but just to avoid any confusion tomorrow perhaps I should answer it anyway and perhaps this answer will be conveyed to him. He was suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Education, and I assume he meant the Minister of University Affairs, should indicate to the universities that they should extend the ungraded philosophy or approach to the university community. I am very intrigued to know whether two or three other members on that side of the House would concur in this question or suggestion. I should only point out, Mr. Speaker, that I think the university community does adapt to changing situations and conditions and I am sure this is an area that falls without any question, within the academic responsibility of our institutions of higher learning.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): Mr. Speaker, on a point or order.

In respect to my question that I had directed, I did not ask the Minister whether he was going to permit established interested groups to come before the standing committee. I asked the hon. Minister if he could assure us that he was going to inform the established groups that they could come.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I assumed that I really had answered that at the same time. Not only will we inform them, we will make sure, although it will be up to the chairman of the committee, that they are invited to come and make their views known to the standing committee. No problem whatsoever.

Mr. Knight: Mr. Speaker, in relation to my question concerning the OSSTF, would the Minister permit a supplementary question?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes. I would be delighted.

Mr. Knight: In the light of what I understand to be considerable criticism of the department—not for the idea of reorganization but for the department's procedure in going ahead and introducing Bill 44 without consulting these groups—does the Minister not now feel that it would have been possibly more advisable to have consulted them before going ahead and introducing the bill?

Hon. Mr. Davis: With great respect, Mr. Speaker, the consultations took place before the introduction of the bill. There had been many discussions and consultations with many organizations starting early in January, and the bill was introduced, as the hon. member knows, a week ago Friday.

Mr. Nixon: A definitive announcement was made before that.

Hon. Mr. Davis: But that is not what the hon. member was asking about.

Mr. Speaker: The Minister of Labour has a statement.

Hon D. A. Bales (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I said last Friday that I would report early this week on recent developments in this House concerning the workmen's compensation board. With your leave, I would like to do so at this time. The hon. members may recall that on March 7 in this House, the member for High Park criticized the board and raised some questions about the manner in which it dealt with certain workers who came before it.

Mr. Speaker, I intend to deal with the matters that he raised, with the assistance of information supplied to me by the workmen's compensation board. But before doing so, I wish to make some general remark concerning the board, with particular reference to the appeal system. Understanding of it is essential to an understanding of the remarks that I will presently make, concerning the matters raised by the member for High Park.

Mr. Speaker, as most of the hon. members know, the board was established more than 50 years ago to provide benefits to employees who suffered injuries during the course of their work. The Workmen's Compensation Act states that accidents include: first, a wilful and intentional act not being the act of the workman; secondly, a chance event occasioned by a physical or natural cause; and thirdly, disablement arising out of and in the course of employment; and fourthly: an industrial disease that is peculiar to or characteristic of a particular industrial process, trade or occupation. This gives the board wide latitude when dealing with claims for compensation. In practice, almost 95 per cent of the claims coming before it have been allowed.

Mr. Speaker, it is also important to bear in mind the function and purpose of the board's appeal system. It was established for two main reasons.

Firstly, under the terms of The Workmen's Compensation Act there is no provision for appeal to the courts against the decisions of the board.

Secondly, because there is no appeal to the court, the board must have made doubly sure that fair and proper decisions are made in every claim. Provision is made for both employees and employers to appeal.

The present system of appeals has three levels: the review committee, the appeal tribunal, and the board itself.

Each level of the appeal system makes its decisions independently of what has gone before. No person on the staff of the board who has been party to an adverse decision can take part on the subsequent process of appeal. The board itself will reconsider a claim if new evidence is supplied.

With those facts in mind, I wish to move on to deal with the matters raised by the member for High Park on March 7, 1968. You will recall, sir, that during the Throne Speech debate the member referred in detail to four cases which he charged had been dealt with unfairly by the board. He also said that he would be citing another 30 or 40 before the end of the session.

Believing that it would be fairer to the persons concerned to have their cases brought to the board's attention immediately, I asked the member to supply me with a list of the cases, so that I would be able to turn them over to the board for consideration. The board has now considered the 40 claims listed by the member for High Park, and it has submitted to me, a report as follows:

Only one claim has been through the entire appeal system, and in this case, the decision based on medical evidence was confirmed at every level. In one case, no claim has been made under The Workmen's Compensation Act by the dependents, if any. Eight cases have been dealt with by the appeal tribunal, and the next level of appeal would be to the board. Another case which has been dealt with by the appeal tribunal and is now under consideration by the board following a hearing and a decision is still pending. Eleven cases could go to the next level of appeal, which is the appeal tribunal. There is one case which the appeal tribunal has heard but in which the decision has been withheld pending receipt of information from the member for High Park.

Three of the cases would go next to the review committee, and another two have already reached the review committee but no decision has been made so far. Another 12 cases are in the course of being dealt with by the operating departments of the board, and of course the whole appeal system would be open to the workers involved if they are not satisfied with the initial decisions. Of the 40 cases which the member for High Park has brought to the attention of the House, 38 are therefore in the appeal process. In some of the cases, Mr. Speaker, I can add that they have not been advanced through the appeal system because either the member for High Park, or the worker he has represented, have not taken advantage of the opportunities open to them.

Mr. Speaker, there are other statistics which are relevant to the issue before us. It may interest the hon. members to know that there are more than seven million claims on file in the workmen's compensation board office. Last year alone, nearly 375,000 claims came before the board, and these involved an estimated two million decisions. During the year, 4,500 appeals to the review committee were made, and this amounts to one fifth of one per cent of the decisions, and the percentage is actually smaller. Many of the appeals related to claims which had been reported in previous years.

In addition, I think that it is worth noting that of this one fifth of one per cent only about one third concerned the original decision to pay or not to pay compensation.

The point that I am making here is that the number of claims raised by the member for High Park consituted an infinitesimal part of the total dealt with by the workmen's compensation board. In view of this, and in view of the fact that 38 of the cases that he raised are still in the appeal process, and therefore are not final decisions, it is my contention that the remarks made on March 7 were totally unwarranted. For the benefit of any who doubt this, I will review as briefly as possible the four cases that he specifically raised in this House.

The first case that I want to deal with is that of the late Frank Gautlieri who died in the tragic fire at Downsview. The member for High Park has suggested that the board has been inhuman in dealing with the dependency claim for the workman's sister in Italy. The fact is that no claim has been made under The Workmen's Compensation Act that the board could consider. Instead, the solicitors for the workman's estate have now started an action for damages under The Fatal Accidents Act. Mr. Gautieri was paid compensation benefits up to the time of his death, and the solicitors acting for

the estate were advised in April, 1967, that the workman's pocket book containing a fair sum of money could be released to them on production of letters of administration, but this action was not taken. Any offer which has been made to the solicitors who are acting on behalf of the estate has been made by the solicitors or their representative in the action, and is not in any way related to benefits provided by The Workmen's Compensation Act. The board itself cannot determine liability in a civil action.

Mr. Speaker, I turn now to the case of James Lynch. The member for High Park alleges that the workman who was injured in the fire at Downsview had been offered $30 in full settlement of his claim.

The facts are as follows. The workman is represented by a solicitor who has commenced an action for damages relating to Mr. Lynch's injuries. The workman has two types of claim. One is for property damage relating to the loss of his wrist watch, and the other to his injuries. The board's representative has offered to settle the wrist watch claim for $30 and we have an affidavit attesting to this fact.

No settlement has been arranged concerning Mr. Lynch's personal injury and the degree of his permanent disability has not been established. The workmen's compensation board has made gratuitous advances equal to compensation benefits totalling $2,454.30 to Mr. Lynch, pending the outcome of his personal injury claim. In addition the board has taken care of all medical costs since the fire, and the cost to date is $4,965.75. It has offered the workman the services of its rehabilitation staff in finding suitable employment.

It should be noted that I am advised that the member for High Park did not contact the board in this case to obtain the facts.

In dealing with the case of Joseph Cutajar, the member for High Park claims that the workman is totally disabled, and that his compensation for partial disability is inadequate.

The facts are, Mr. Speaker, that compensation payments are based on medical evidence. The doctor and the orthopaedic consultant attending the workman both indicated in their reports that the workman was capable of light work and his employer agreed to provide light work. The work involved using a five-foot rod with a chisel end to chip caked fertilizer. While this was originally thought to weigh 12 pounds, I am advised that it actually weighed 4.25 pounds, and could be used with one hand while standing up. The work required no kneeling or bending. Another workman shovelled away the loosened fertilized and Mr. Cutajar was under no pressure to hurry. Despite this, he left the employment voluntarily after two weeks.

The workman was advised on several occasons to apply for light work and to apply for unemployment insurance benefits if work was not available.

The board informs me that its rehabilitation officer drove the workman around Toronto for his interviews concerning work and job training but the workman declined the work offered. Unemployment insurance benefits eventually were obtained for the workman backdated to July 30, and he has received $886.

The member for High Park represented Mr. Cutajar before the appeal tribunal and the tribunal confirmed the workman's entitlement to the benefits as paid. However, Mr. Speaker, because of the limitations Mr. Cutajar placed on himself, the board's rehabilitation officer recommended that he be admitted to the board's back rehabilitation clinic for testing and assessment, including aptitude tests to determine his work interests and abilities. The testing programme started on March 11 and he was admitted to the back rehabilitation clinic on March 18.

Mr. Speaker, the case of Mr. Branko Tuperic, which the member for High Park also raised in this House, is an illustration of the board's desire to see that justice is rendered to the injured workman. The member, I am informed by the board, appeared on behalf of Mr. Tuperic on February 27 last, and informed the appeal tribunal that he believed Mr. Tuperic's bronchial condition was the result of air pollution in his employment, and that he could obtain evidence to this effect.

The appeal tribunal deferred its decision on the understanding the member for High Park would forward the necessary information. But to the best of my knowledge, to this day nothing further has been heard by the board from the member for High Park concerning this case.

In reference to the other 36 cases, the board is holding the files open and would be pleased to receive any information which would assist it in giving benefits to the workmen involved. Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to go into details concerning these cases, but I can assure the member for High Park that they are available from the board if he wishes them.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to this detailed statement, I heave taken one additional step. Because the board's methods of operation have been questioned, I have urged the chairman of the committee on government commissions to arrange a meeting at which the board could appear to discuss its operations.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, I have some supplementary questions if the Minister would accept them.

Mr. Speaker: No, there will be no questions to the Minister's statement.

Mr. Shulman: But this is in reply to a question, sir.

Mr. Speaker: There will be no supplementary questions to that statement.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, yesterday I was asked by the hon. member for Sudbury East about a matter concerning a threatened milk strike in the Sudbury-Verner area. At that time I was not aware of what the hon. member was talking about. He was kind enough to send me a newspaper clipping which I believe appeared in in the Sudbury *Star*, in which this proposed strike was intimated.

Mr. Speaker, with your permission, I would like to read a brief statement that I believe gives some background to what has happened, because I understand that the report in the Sudbury *Star* is of a meeting which was held between dairy farmers in that area and officials of the Ontario milk marketing board:

> Since the Ontario milk marketing board was formed over two years ago, a number of changes in milk pricing and marketing should have substantially improved the position of northeastern Ontario milk producers. The milk commission first of all placed a ban on the reconstitution of milk except under licence. The Ontario milk marketing board, through its powers to set raw milk minimum prices, priced the grade "A" milk for processing into liquid concentrate in a fair relationship to the price for dairy requirements milk going into the fluid market.
>
> The price differential for grade "A" milk going into these competitive products has been maintained by the board at 44 cents per cwt. This has effectively curtailed the impact of the liquid concentrate sales in northern regions, leaving the fluid market for the producers in the area. Prior to this action, there had been the serious threat to the market for producers' milk. The current price comparison is $5.71 per cwt. for milk going into liquid concentrate, as against $6.72 for dairy requirements' milk in northern Ontario.

The Ontario milk marketing board started a pilot price pool project in northern Ontario on October 1, 1966, involving the districts of Nipissing, Sudbury and Manitoulin, and including in the project, the district of Algoma on June 1, 1967. The operation of this pool by the board has improved producer returns, because the board has had control of the direction of milk and has therefore been able to guarantee that the supplies in the north are used to meet the processors' requirements —which was not always the case before board marketing—and secondly, to direct excess supplies to the highest-priced markets for the milk. In addition, the Ontario milk marketing board, through the Ontario milk commission has introduced central milk testing which I understand has been very widely accepted by the milk producers of northern Ontario. Along with that, the milk marketing board has been able to market all the milk supplies from producers, which was not possible before board marketing.

It is true, Mr. Speaker, that in implementing the board's central payment system, it is converting from twice-a-month payment to once-a-month payment in the northern pool, effective March 1, 1968. The main reason for this decision is the cost to the board, which would have to be borne by producers if twice-a-month payments were continued. The known cost through the province would be about $100,000 per year. And to this would have to be added the unknown cost due to the loss of par crossing privileges in our banking system. The board believes this cost would be substantially higher than the known cost and could be as much as $300,000 per year. In face of this, and in order to treat all producers alike, which is a requirement of The Milk Act, the board decided to implement once-a-month payment in the north to coincide with the commencement of the grade "A" milk price pool in southern Ontario where there will be a once-a-month payments.

I am advised by my staff, Mr. Speaker, that prior to the Ontario milk marketing board taking over the marketing of all fluid milk in the province, more than 80 per cent of the milk marketed in this province was paid for on the basis of once a month.

Now, from the newspaper article which my friend was kind enough to send me yesterday, I note that the main point of contention at the meeting appeared to be the change from twice-monthly payment to once-monthly payment. But I hope that my hon. friend will recognize, in the policy which I have enunciated tody, which has been established by the milk marketing board, that it has been done in the overall interests of the producers themselves in lessening the costs of providing twice-a-month payment. And I am sure that—at least I would hope that—when the system is in operation, producers will be able to gear their payments or whatever their requirements may be, to once-a-month payment.

Mr. Speaker: I should have said to the member for High Park—and I will say it now and he can read it—that the statement made by the Minister of Labour was not in answer to a question by the member but was his statement of his department's policy with respect to matters raised in the Throne Speech debate, and that was covered in the opening remarks of the Minister as it will be seen from *Hansard.*

Mr. H. Peacock (Windsor West): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, in respect to your ruling that there would be no supplementary questions. Last week, during question period—

Mr. Speaker: This is not a supplementary question and that is what I was just pointing out, that the statement by the Minister was not in answer to a question by the member for High Park; it was a statement of his department's policy with respect to matters raised in the speech on the Throne debate by the member for High Park.

Mr. Peacock: I understand, Mr. Speaker, but my point of order is this. Last week, before orders of the day, on Thursday afternoon I believe, I asked questions of the Minister of Labour respecting these cases, and at that time he replied that he would be making his report to the House this week. Now I want to ask, in light of his reply at that time, if a supplementary question on my part would be considered to be in order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: If the Minister were still in the House, I would inquire of him if this statement was in answer to the questions of the member, and if so, then I think a supplementary question would be in order. Unfortunately, we cannot do that at the moment.

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Speaker, on the same point of order. You will recall it has always been a sore point with the Opposition that the answering of members in this manner—a statement before the orders of the day, for remarks or allegations they made in the Throne debate—is not the proper vehicle that ought to be used by Ministers, and if they wish in fact to enter in the true spirit of debate about matters raised in the Throne debate, they themselves should participate.

One of the persons who did not participate in the Throne debate was the Minister of Labour. Had he wished to he, like the rest of us, would have been given an opportunity. But as I conceive the role of Ministerial statements before the orders of the day, they themselves are confined within fairly restrictive rules, such as announcing new government policy, or explaining some action that has been taken by the department. Certainly, sir, you will recall that over the years we have complained, the member for York South has complained, that it should not be used as an argumentative means of seeking to answer matters raised by individual members.

Mr. Speaker: I would agree with the member and I do not think that this particular statement was an argumentative one, because it is merely a statement of the facts. However, I think that the proceedings in this House are to such a state that before too long the members will have every opportunity of dealing with matters in this department and the commissions who report through that Minister in the estimates which are about upon us.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, may I just speak to the point of order raised by the hon. member for Sudbury, because I would not want to allow the impression to be left that the government agreed that a Minister of the Crown, in the discharge of his duties as a Minister, was subject to the same rules as any other member of this House, because he is not. In view of the responsibility that a Minister carries, I think an examination of the rules of the procedures of the House will indicate that a Minister must be free to stand in his place and meet charges that are levelled against him or his department, because this is his ultimate responsibility. He is responsible for all the actions of those people for whom he has Ministerial responsibility.

While I will agree with the hon. member that it is unwise and perhaps impolitic in one sense for a Minister to use inflammatory and argumentative language when he is doing this, nonetheless I think the rules of this House indicate any Minister has the right to stand before the orders of the day and meet any comments that may have been made about his department and about the conduct of it. I would hate to see that privilege or right infringed upon and I will argue very vehemently that this right exists in a Minister and it is very necessary that it does exist. You cannot limit any member of the government from putting before the people of the province through this chamber what he is doing and why he is doing it. If he is wrong he will suffer. He has the responsibility. That right, in my submission to you, Mr. Speaker, cannot be limited by the rules of this House.

Mr. Sopha: Let me add one comment. That is fine, that is perfectly acceptable—provided that the statement he makes in discharging his responsibility is then open to reply by any other hon. member. Because if it is not open to reply, then you are in effect giving a Minister of the Crown the right of the last word. And he might encompass in his statement extremely provocative declarations, declarations that might not be accepted here as being based on fact. What the Premier is really saying is that when he makes a statement, that is the end of it. It is closed off and the other side will just have to accept it. I can never accede to that proposition.

Mr. O. F. Villeneuve (Glengarry): Why should he not?

Mr. Lewis: Nor should one honour it.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The 1st order; resuming the adjourned debate on the motion, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and that the House resolve itself into the committee on ways and means.

ON THE BUDGET

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, before I resume the latter part of my portion of the remarks on the Budget debate, I want to make a brief comment on the Prime Minister's (Mr. Robarts') reply to a question from my colleague from Lakeshore (Mr. Lawlor) with regard to debate on the McRuer report.

It has been past practice in this House that reports of the proportions of the McRuer report have often been put on the order paper for debate for a day or so. I would suggest to the Prime Minister that this would be a very appropriate procedure in this instance, not only because this is one of the most important reports that has come down in this House—indeed, perhaps far more important to the government than it is to the Opposition and to the public if the government has the interests of the public at heart—but also because this happens to be human rights year. It is a very appropriate time for this Legislature to debate an issue on which the United Nations is attempting to focus attention.

There is still another and, in my mind, conclusive reason why this Legislature should debate the issue, Mr. Speaker. And that is that I am shocked—and that is not putting it too strongly—at the persistence with which the government brings in legislation with the Minister introducing the legislation getting up and saying, "I recognize that this legislation does not take cognizance of certain recommendations that have been made in the McRuer report, but we have been considering this legislation for some time," and so the Minister pleads the House should accept it and consider any amendments in light of the McRuer report at a later date.

I submit that this is not the kind of approach to the implementation of principles that are as valid as the principles underlying the McRuer report. And if, perchance, the government is not persuaded of their paramount validity, then all the more need why we need a debate in this House to get the matter clear in our own minds. So I hope the Prime Minister will give some further thought to that issue.

Mr. Speaker, if I can just review briefly so that those who may be interested will see the context of the final portion of my remarks. After some introductory comment, I dealt with various aspects of the Budget itself and then moved to considering three background issues or background matters in relation to the Budget. One of them had to do with the economic development in this province, with particular reference to the problem of foreign control of our economy. The second one had to do with the Smith report and its essential bankruptcy, in my view, and the suggestion of more effective alternatives. The third one, that I want to turn my attention to now, is the broad issue of the cost of living.

As you may recall, sir, in my remarks in the Throne debate I devoted considerable attention to the problem of the high cost of living. I appealed to the government to take certain steps which could alleviate the difficulties encountered by the ordinary Ontario family in making ends meet. I make no apology for returning to this subject today. I do so because far from taking the appropriate steps, the government has used the Budget to render the cost of living burden even more intolerable.

With direct taxes up some $125 for the average family, including major increases in the cost of health care and hospital insurance, personal disposable income in the province has been sharply reduced. I note, for example, that a citizens' group is being formed in the city of Kingston to protest the way the Budget has aggravated these difficulties. This group hopes to present the Cabinet with a petition expressing their views, bearing the signatures of upwards of 60,000 citizens of that area, according to the news report. I wish them well in persuading this government to move.

The sense of indignation which Ontarians feel about the cost of living is sharpened by their suspicion that the prices they have to pay are not really justified. This is particularly true when a family comes to grocery shopping. Moreover, many people disapprove of the gimmickry like trading stamps and horse racing and expensive advertising which are used by the big chain stores to exchange customers—and I use that term advisedly, Mr. Speaker—not win customers. They are just winning them back and forth from each other, so it adds up to an exchange.

Recently a Royal commission set up to examine consumer prices and inflation in the prairie provinces brought down its findings. The Batten report, as it is known, confirms everyone's worst suspicions about food prices. The report made it clear that the grocery trade on the prairies was making excessive profits. The commission discovered that the two largest supermarket chains were so big that they did not have to worry about competition and so kept their prices deliberately high.

They found too many stores were being built; that these stores were often too big; that they were not being efficiently used. In fact, there were twice as many stores and twice as much floor space as could be justified on the grounds of efficiency. The commission also looked hard at grocery advertising which in the west runs from five to ten newspaper pages each week in every city. The commission found this was clearly an excessive amount in its view and bound to add more to people's food bills. Then there were the extras like over-extended parking lots which also add built-in costs for the shopping family.

When the Royal commission added up the excess profits, the inefficient use of space, the excess advertising, the gimmicks and the luxury, they found that the average family on the prairies was paying $114.80 a year too much for its food. That works out to $2.20 a week and whether it be on the prairies or Ontario there are few people who can afford to throw away that amount of money each week.

Now, Mr. Speaker, just let me for a moment turn to the Batten report itself and draw your attention to the details with regard to certain specifics in this connection, because I am confident that they have relevance—in perhaps somewhat different figures, but they have relevance—to the province of Ontario. I now quote from the Batten report, on page 205:

> For the year 1966 excess profits cost the consumers of Winnipeg, Regina, Saskatoon, Calgary and Edmonton in terms of reduced wellbeing a total of $3.5 million, or $9.40 per family of four. Quantitatively even more important is the loss of wellbeing arising out of enhanced prices due to excess capacity. In 1966 the loss for these same five cities was $19.3 million, or $51.88 per family of four. Taken together, excess profits and costly excessive capacity reduced consumer wellbeing by $61.28 per family of four in 1966. This is an extremely large loss when it is recalled that the gross margin of retail grocers is only 15 to 20 per cent, which means that retail grocers render only about $190 to $250 of service per family of four each year.

Later on page 206:

> In a market where store prices differ and where consumers do not have full information, some advertising is necessary to inform consumers about what is available and at what prices, but five to ten pages of newspaper advertising in every city for every week seems clearly excessive. Just where the balance lies is unclear.

And later again:

> Much advertising is combative and duplicative: Without judging what is excessive it may be noted that at present grocery advertising costs the average family of four $14.80 per year on the groceries it buys.

The report concludes this question in the following way:

> The same kind of consideration applies to the luxurious conveniences provided to grocery shoppers. The luxury supermarket is a form of sales promotion like advertising. If one store locates in a shopping centre with free parking, air conditioning, thousands of products, and so on, it will take many customers away from the other stores. When other stores do the same the cost of all stores is inflated. This inflation, which has cost consumers about three cents on the food dollar, or about $38.72 a year for a family of four, is desired by some customers and they should, of course pay for it. However it is not wanted by other customers and they should be able to shop at more utilitarian, low-price stores. The market has failed to provide them with this alternative in most cities.

Now, I am sure, Mr. Speaker, as hon. gentlemen listen to that, they will recognize the validity of the application of those comments to almost any city you want to name in the province of Ontario.

I pointed out in the Throne debate, for example, in regard to profits, that Dominion Stores were predicting a profit for this year that would be one third higher per share than the year before. That is a profit increase of 33 per cent, and the other food chains expect performances nearly as good, if not better. I noted just a couple of day ago in the Toronto *Daily Star* a little note to the effect that the net profit for IGA Oshawa Wholesale for the year ending January 27 was up sharply. Indeed they made 29 per cent on their investment in 1966 and their profit increase in 1967 was 58.5 per cent.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): They are a very aggressive company.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, they may be aggressive, Mr. Speaker, but I will come to what I trust the hon. member for Sudbury will recognize as a valid comment in one moment.

When these new profits are earned by better, more efficient management, there is less cause for complaint, but where they are earned by charging what the traffic will bear in the face of expensive gimmickry and inefficient management, as the Batten report confirmed, then the public is being made a fool of, and this government, by refusing to take the obvious and necessary steps, is condoning this unprincipled victimization of Ontario consumers.

We have repeatedly urged this government to establish a prices review board which would undertake on a permanent, continuing basis the kind of investigations into pricing policies carried out by the Batten report, or the joint Senate-Commons committee which held hearings in Ottawa over a year ago.

There is no question that the publicity attached to these findings helped to drive consumer prices down for a short time. In fact, Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to note that a report in the March 15 business section of the *Globe and Mail*, datelined Regina, points out that as the Batten report was being published, the grocery chains in Regina, in anticipation of its findings, began to cut prices substantially. A new discount supermarket which eliminated the frills and provided less individual service to customers, found it could provide consumers with the same goods at a saving of 13 per cent over its competitors. Shoppers flocked to it with the result that the other chains began cutting their prices and right now the Regina consumer is enjoying the unaccustomed benefit of a retail price war in the food chains.

The trouble is it will not last. One-shot investigations, like the Batten commission, can only have a temporary effect on pricing policy. When the publicity from the findings has died down, when the government has refused to follow the recommendations and the reports are pigeon-holed, the stores revert to the *status quo ante* and once more the shopper is the victim.

All the more reason why a permanent prices review board, operating the year round with an adequate staff, must be set up. Only in this way can the worst defects of managed prices and excess profits be freely checked. The alternative is the rigid price-control mechanisms associated with the war years. We are not yet at the point where we wish to advocate that element of rigidity and compulsion, though should retail outlets continue to ignore the public interest it may become necessary to do so.

What always fascinates me, Mr. Speaker, is the ambivalence of people like, for example, Mr. Sharp, who, when steel prices were to be increased—as one of my colleagues reminded the House a few days ago—warned

that it should not happen and threatened that, if they increased prices, he would turn the hounds on them by way of the Commons-Senate committee. That they did not want; they did not want the facts to get out to the public, so they withdrew their price increase. Then six months later they introduced it and Mr. Sharp had gone to sleep and forgotten the issue, so nothing else happened.

Now, Mr. Speaker, lest the House should get the impression that I, or we in the New Democratic Party, regard the Batten report as a bible for reference on all accounts, let me hasten to disillusion you. I think that the sections with regard to the retailing of food are in the same category as the investigations that took place in Ottawa and give us the kind of glimpse we need on a continuing basis. But I will hasten to add to the House that many other parts of the report are profoundly unsatisfactory and unconvincing. For example, when one has a commission argue through one whole section of its main chapter that there is no such thing as the cost-push factor in inflation, one wonders where this commission has been existing for the last ten years. And when it almost ignores and certainly places no emphasis at all on the whole question of managed prices, one wonders where it has been for ten years.

It was at least ten years ago that the economic advisory committee to the then President Eisenhower made the statement that 60 per cent-plus of the prices of the United States were managed prices that were not conditioned in any sense by the market forces. So, in many instances, the economic analysis of the Batten report is profoundly out of date. I suppose one should not be surprised by this because Judge Mary Batten was a former Liberal member of the government in Saskatchewan, and if not on the bench, certainly previously had very well developed—

An hon. member: Sense of delay.

Mr. MacDonald: Sense of delay, yes. Well, that was one of the things that was well developed and it will serve my purpose as well as anything else. A sense of delay in coping with these problems.

But I was rather interested, Mr. Speaker, in noting—and this is unbelievable when one thinks of this as a study of the prairies—the recent issue of *Co-op Commentary*, which is put out by the co-operative union of Canada. They draw attention to the fact that the Batten report virtually ignores the co-operative movement in its role in consumer prices in the prairies. Now, if co-ops were ignored down in Ontario there would be some validity to it because, quite frankly, consumer co-ops in Ontario have really never become established. But consumer co-ops are one of the institutions of the prairies, sir. They were the economic weapons that were developed by the people to protect themselves from the worst ravages of the depression years and the early pioneering years. And yet this report virtually ignores the whole role of co-ops. Let me quote just one or two brief passages from the *Co-op Commentary*:

> Consumer co-operatives receive some favourable comments but are almost overlooked as an effective protector of the consumer in a Royal commission report on consumer problems recently tabled in the Legislatures of the prairie provinces. The consumers' association of Canada was highly commended for its work on behalf of consumers but the contributions of co-operatives in this field was barely mentioned. A footnote to a section of pricing casually drew attention to the fact that a five-week survey of store prices conducted by the commission showed that in four of the five major centres studied, co-operatives had the lowest prices perhaps because they have a policy of meeting all low prices that are not loss leaders, the commission said.
>
> Unlike the other supermarkets they give refunds to members based on patronage, do not depend so heavily on advertising and strive to conduct all activities in accordance with the principles and methods of true co-operation, democracy and equality.
>
> Strangely, the reference to the fact that consumer co-operatives give refunds to members based on patronage, in the paragraph quoted above, is the only reference to patronage-refunds in the report.

In short, Mr. Speaker, as an authoritative, definitive study of the problem, the Batten report has some gaps that are almost beyond belief. However, perhaps the most outstanding shortcoming of the Batten report is that it does not recognize the merits of a continuing investigation through the medium of a prices review board.

Ironically, in view of the effect that its own publication had on prices in Regina, the report seems to feel that a prices review board would necessarily have to operate in an atmosphere of rigid price control. This is a kind of Liberal disease, we have seen some evidence of it in this House here a little while

ago—the belief that you cannot have a review without control. The report says:

> Price review must be accompanied by a rigorous income policy with power to enforce the board's injunctions, otherwise price reviews would be nonsense.

Well, Mr. Speaker, all I can say is that the Liberals in Ottawa now acknowledge that this is not the case so they are about to engage on some kind of review.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Yet the NDP in Ottawa say it is no good without it.

Mr. MacDonald: I will come to that in a moment.

Mr. Nixon: The member is inconsistent.

Mr. MacDonald: I will come to it in a moment. I have more faith in the wisdom of the buying public than the Batten report and I disagree completely with this conclusion. I believe that the public if continuously in possession of the latest facts behind pricing policy, will freely and voluntarily exercise its collective good judgment to punish those who were taking advantage of the consumers and reward those who are giving consumers a fair break. As I have pointed out, the effect the Batten report itself had on local prices is proof of this contention.

But I emphasize that price review must take place on a continuous basis and I urge this government to move now to institute an appropriate agency to begin in Ontario.

The Batten report further rejects the prices review concept on the grounds that it would only perform a useful function if inflation were of the "cost-push" variety. And, as I said earlier, they denied the existence of the "cost-push" variety of inflation. It argues that it is not costs which are driving up prices, but, rather, the interaction of heavy demand and short supply. Well that is a rather old-fashioned—at least considerably out-of-date—analysis of the modern inflationary problem. This is brought about, the report suggests, by a sudden and too large increase in the money supply, by changes in government spending patterns, by increases in the volume of foreign sales, and by abrupt switches in consumer spending patterns.

I question to what extent these are really factors in today's current economic situation. I do no know of anybody whose money supply is too large, not even the member for London South (Mr. White). Changes in government spending are, as in the case of medicare, mainly substitutes for another similar form of spending already taking place in the private sector. And there have certainly not been, as there was after the war, sudden upswings in the volume and nature of consumer spending.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Who wrote that down?

Mr. MacDonald: I did, make no mistake about it. On the basis of the evidence compiled by the Batten commission, part of which I have read into the record, the economic problem being faced by consumers is of the "cost-push" variety. Did not the commission itself determine that western families were spending $114.80 too much on food buying? That is what I call "cost-push." The commission admitted that the two largest food chains are not sensitive to price competition. In other words, their prices are managed. Managed prices, in my view, push costs to the consumer up. I quote from the *Monthly Business Analysis* put out by W. A. Backett Associates Limited here in Toronto:

> Corporate profits actually turned in a surprisingly good performance in the third quarter of 1967, in light of the slow progress in real output. This was achieved by price increases which show in wholesale and consumer prices, rather than by any improvement in the productivity and cost picture.

In other words, they were able to manage the situation to maintain their profits. Mr. Speaker, I want to make it clear that I do not think that all business enterprises take advantage of the consumer in the manner that I have indicated. But it is increasingly the pattern of our economy that large firms, or groups of firms, gain the commanding heights of their own particular industry, and having reached that position where they can afford to disregard the traditional mechanisms of the market, set prices at levels equal to what the traffic can bear, and the consumer has to pick up the tab.

If, while keeping prices at a reasonable level, a business enterprise can, with an efficient operation and good management, earn a good profit, well and good, as the member for Sudbury interjected a few moments ago. That business has earned it. But where there are companies whose management is slack, and whose operation is inefficient, who still manage a good profit by raising prices beyond a reasonable level, the public is entitled to know the facts in

these cases. It is not so, as the Batten report contends, that the best protection the public has is the market itself. We have seen too much evidence that the market is profoundly imperfect, and the public is entitled to more effective forms of protection.

We in the New Democratic Party have noted with interest the recent moves by the federal Liberals to introduce a prices and wages review board at Ottawa. Like so many good NDP ideas which the Liberals eventually are forced to appropriate—because both federally and provincially they are so utterly devoid of ideas themselves—

Interjections by an hon. member.

Mr. MacDonald: A little later I will document that when we get to the member's party's amendment. This one has been corrupted in the transition, or in the takeover. Mr. Sharp is operating on the simplistic notion that wages and prices are comparable components in the economic equation. They are not. It is wages and profits that are comparable, and prices are the mechanism by which each is earned. To compare prices and wages is to compare oranges and apples. They are not the same thing.

Mr. Sopha: I agree with the member.

Mr. MacDonald: Wages are the return to labour for its part in the productive process. Profits should be the return to capital for its part. If you want to review wages, and my colleagues in the labour movement have nothing to hide on that score—my hon. friend from Oshawa (Mr. Pilkey) said so in his contribution to the Throne debate—then let us review profits too. But why do you want to hide profits? In any case, let us review prices.

As most people already know, there is already in Canadian jurisdictions a public process which has the effect of wage review. It is known as the collective bargaining process involving free negotiation, arbitration, or conciliation if necessary, and it frequently finds recourse in legal strikes. At all phases of this process, a trade union must justify and substantiate its claim for higher wages and benefits in economic terms. The public is kept informed of these reasons.

I note that the UAW, for example, as reported in the *Globe and Mail* just a week or two ago before the commencement of bargaining, files a series of position papers setting out its reasons for many of its demands. No such public process is involved when prices are raised. As a result, it is not surprising that many people have been conned into accepting the fiction that it is wages alone that are driving up costs. Yet I venture if the public of Ontario are treated to a full and objective presentation of the other side of the story, the public would conclude that there are other and more serious reasons why the cost of living is driving inexorably upwards. The Batten report noted on page 361—and for those of you who want to take portions of it as a bible, I draw this to your attention—"as yet there are no counterparts to the federal Department of Corporate and Consumer Affairs at the provincial level."

This statement simply indicates one of two things, Mr. Speaker. Either the commission slipped up in its research, failing to note that our Department of Financial and Commercial Affairs has a consumer affairs branch, or the branch has done so little and has been so ineffective that it did not impinge itself on the commission's consciousness. I will leave the Minister to take his choice as to which is the appropriate explanation. In any event—

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): It is the only department in Canada—

Mr. MacDonald: Pardon?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: It is the only department in Canada that is really active in this field.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, the Minister is choosing the explanation that the Batten commission was doing bad research, and all I will say is that it is not the only area where it was bad research. In any event, there is much further work that this branch can undertake and must undertake in the field of consumer protection: against misleading advertising; enforcing reasonable labelling and packaging procedures; moving against shoddy business practices; providing testing and research services.

All of us in Ontario, Mr. Speaker, are consumers, and most of us are finding the climbing cost of living a difficult if not an intolerable burden. It has many components, all of which I have touched on in these remarks. But the clear and present need for action to inform the public about pricing and profit policies is such that the Ontario government must act—

Mr. Sargent: What about the high salaries of union officials?

Mr. MacDonald: —jointly, if need be, with the government at Ottawa—

An hon. member: For crying out loud!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, some interjections are worthy of acknowledgment.

Mr. Sargent: I am glad he said that.

Mr. MacDonald: What I was about to say in conclusion, in reference to this subject, was that the cost of living is everyone's concern, and I trust that it is going to be the government's as well from this point forward.

Let me turn for a brief comment on the amendment that is before the House. May I say, Mr. Speaker, that this is a rather good amendment. It is better than usual.

Mr. Sopha: The leader writes his own too.

Mr. MacDonald: It is better than usual in part, Mr. Speaker, because I note with interest that four ideas which we were expounding a year ago have been incorporated into the Liberal programme in the interval.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: I note, for example, when they get to housing, that they have not got all their eggs in that one rather questionable basket of second mortgages. They are acknowledging that a second mortgage is rather useless if you have not got the money for the first mortgage.

Mr. Nixon: Right!

Mr. MacDonald: So, now they are coming up with a proposition on which we fought the election campaign and have been pushing for years, that you should have subsidized first mortgages to bring housing money within reach of a growing proportion of our people.

Mr. Nixon: That is right.

Mr. MacDonald: Congratulations, they are now with us.

Mr. Nixon: I do agree we are far ahead.

Mr. MacDonald: Agree? You took it from us, why should we not agree?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: That is really a little "thick", Mr. Speaker, that when they steal a plank from our programme and then ask us whether we agree with it!

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Woodsworth did this with much more humility.

Mr. MacDonald: Secondly, Mr. Speaker, they have now accepted a "home for a home" programme, and this is wonderful because if it will not make him blush, there is one man in this province who has established a "home for a home" programme, who fought it against the establishment, who was chastised for taking inappropriate action on certain occasions, and that man is the hon. member for Riverdale (Mr. J. Renwick), the deputy leader of this party.

An hon. member: The leader of the Opposition was chastising him.

Mr. MacDonald: Yes, the leader of the Opposition was chastising him. While the Liberal Party was sitting on the sideline, he was fighting the battle and establishing the principle which now, let us be grateful, they have adopted.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: A third item, Mr. Speaker: Last year the Liberals, who had first crack at an amendment, made no mention at all of a guaranteed annual wage.

Mr. D. M. De Monte (Dovercourt): First crack this year, too.

Mr. MacDonald: Sure you have, right. I wish you would better use your first crack at this and you would justify your existence. Last year, Mr. Speaker, we attempted to bring some focus into the protest that the Liberal amendment sought to make, by our sub-amendment in the Throne Speech which spelled out a guaranteed annual wage. This year, it is not correct to say that they have adopted it—they want to study it.

Mr. Nixon: We voted for it and continue to support it.

Mr. MacDonald: They want to study it, Mr. Speaker. My God—forgive me for the invocation—after all these years they want to study it some more. They want to have a Smith report, another five years. However, at least they have accepted the principle, and now they want to study it.

As I have often said, the first step of the old parties, in acknowledging the validity of something that they have opposed for years, is to say that they are going to study it. I see it on that side of the House and now I see it on the Liberal side of the House. And finally, Mr. Speaker, we come to the prices review board.

Mr. Sargent: The hon. member is frustrated, he is frustrated.

Mr. MacDonald: Oh, on the contrary, Mr. Speaker, on the contrary. The prices review board—I am willing to broaden it to the wages-prices review board, as long as you will agree on wages, prices and profits. Because you know an interesting thing? I watched that great Liberal, John Munro from Hamilton, on a TV programme about a week or so ago, and it was interesting—David Lewis was on the same programme—CTV programme on Sunday afternoon.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: David Lewis put his finger on the one point, of getting the facts on profits. Even though Munro had been talking about the great profits of industry in the past year, he does not buy the idea that profits have dropped a great deal in the last year; he was saying that there were profits—when David Lewis asked "Are you in favour of examining and getting the facts with regard to profits?" even that great Liberal wilted into silence.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): I think he is supporting Sharp.

Mr. MacDonald: No, it is McEachen, I think. In fact he has delivered for the first vote all the block of the delegates from Hamilton.

However, Mr. Speaker, we have no objection to the extension from prices to wages. A leading trade unionist in this province has said in this House just two weeks ago—"Examine wages, but let us examine profits." As I have said, wages and profits are two main components that result in prices, but let us not kid ourselves or anybody else that you cannot examine prices without looking at these other factors.

However, let me get back to the prices review board, Mr. Speaker, because the history of the changes in the last year on the part of the Liberal Party are a little fascinating. When we were proposing this last year they were opposed to it. They said so. They got to the point during the campaign—and I can quote from this *Telegram* exposé of party policies if need be—of saying, as they are now tending to still say that price review involve price control, yet they are now willing to accept price review and apparently it does not involve price control—

Mr. Nixon: The governor of the Bank of Canada agrees with us.

Mr. MacDonald: But they said then that price review would mean price control. However, that is only one interesting glimpse of the transition, as they move in the direction of an effective policy; the other was—and I draw it to the attention of the House—the mechanism. A year ago they were opposed to it altogether.

Mr. Nixon: No.

Mr. MacDonald: In the election campaign, Mr. Speaker, they had moved to the point of saying that it should be investigated by a legislative committee and now they have moved from the legislative committee—

Mr. Nixon: Because the member will not support those legislative committees.

Mr. MacDonald: They have now moved, Mr. Speaker, from a legislative committee to the preposterous suggestion that the prices review agency of the province of Ontario should be that most ineffective institution of all, the Ontario economic council. The Ontario economic council meets once a month. It is merely an advisory body, yet this presumably is the body that is going to look into prices. May I just say in conclusion on this point, Mr. Speaker, that if the leader of the Opposition wonders why both the Tories and the New Democratic Party oppose the specific proposal advanced by Mr. Pearson in Ottawa, it is because they have no conviction that Mr. Pearson means it. Indeed Mr. Pearson had thought it through so little that he could not give any details of the kind of agency he was planning to set up. That was the reason for their doubts. But a genuine prices-wages-profits review board—make no mistake about it, we are in favour of it here and we plead for it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, because these ideas have provided the leaven in the loaf of Liberal thinking we have a rather good amendment and, of course, we are going to support it.

Mr. Nixon: We knew the member would get around to it.

Mr. MacDonald: This House regrets, it reads, that: "The government dependence on regressive tax and revenue increases, which impose harsh new burdens on lower and middle income citizens and employers, particularly in the financing of health services"—that certainly is a matter for deep regret and I think the great majority of the people of Ontario stand with us in regret.

Second, the paltry commitment in dollars and initiative towards relieving the worsening housing difficulties. The fact that, in a Budget of $2,700 million, involving an increase of $489 million, the total increase that this government is putting into housing is $15 million —2.6 per cent. This is the high priority that they give to housing.

Third, "the lack of initiative in maintaining the Ontario sugar beet industry which will add to financial hardships to the agricultural economy." This development is the best symbol of the hardships that are being imposed in the agricultural industry. It is the latest one. I think it is a very pertinent one to include.

Fourth, "the absence of a wage-price review board that should be operating in areas of provincial jurisdiction to assist in easing the cost of living and to act against inflation." Fine, we agree.

Fifth, "the lack of an overall reform of grant policy to assist municipalities in reducing local taxes, particularly as they are related to school costs." Obviously we will support that, Mr. Speaker, because, in general objective, it is meritorious. But I must, in expressing my support, draw attention to the rather petty and peevish reaction of the Liberal Party with regard to the municipal foundation programme that we have put forward. Not only petty and peevish, but inaccurate. At least, in the press release portion of his speech, the hon. leader of the Opposition is credited with saying this: "Mr. Nixon reviewed the weaknesses of the NDP foundation programme for municipal finances which he said was unworkable."

Well, Mr. Speaker, let me stop there. With the broadening of the concept which is working in the foundation programme for education—and I would be the first to say that if we can reduce its complexities let us do so but the important thing is if everybody acknowledges that in its working, that it has brought justice and a greater equity in the educational burden as distributed across the province of Ontario, we propose that if should be done for general municipal services. It is working, Mr. Speaker; it is working in Nova Scotia, working satisfactorily. Yet the leader of the Opposition says it is "unworkable" and "appeals only to the bureaucratic mind and the make-work politicians". Well, Mr. Speaker, it is one thing to deplore the chaos of grants and it is another thing to be so intellectually and research lazy that you come up with no alternative. That is what the Liberals have done.

Mr. Nixon: Eighty per cent assistance to education is precisely what you were supporting last year.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, not only were we supporting it last year but unlike the Liberals we do not change our policy from year to year without notice. We are still supporting 80 per cent and I enunciated it yesterday in reminding the leader of the Liberal Party.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, if I may sum it up so that the leader of the Opposition might finally, for the tenth time, grasp it—our three-point programme to meet the crisis in the municipal front involves a phased take-over of education costs up to 80 per cent, involves a take-over of the cost of health and welfare, and in addition to it, involves a municipal foundation programme which will remove the chaotic grant structure and rationalize an approach to the provision of monies from this government to the municipal level—rationalize it in a fashion that we can introduce equity all across the province of Ontario for the local taxpayer.

All I ask is, sure it is tough, it takes a little time to study and absorb it, but I beseech you to do it. However, we will support the general objective expressed in the amendment.

Sixth, "that no effective programme for the industrial and economic growth of northern Ontario has been proposed which could channel private and public funds into the development of our natural resources area." Well, Mr. Speaker, that, in essence, is one of the main points in our subamendment in the Throne debate—so, obviously we will support it now.

However, Mr. Speaker, I want to make another comment with regard to rules of the House and I do not know whether you are keeping in a little black book a listing of all of these points for consideration. I raise with you now seriously, just between you and me—

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Let us all in on it.

Mr. MacDonald: Members can listen in if they want. What is the tradition of the rule that forbids a subadmendment on the Budget debate? I cannot conceive of its validity. Yet in this House you cannot move a subamendment in the Budget debate. It is permitted in Ottawa, you have it in the Throne debate,

why cannot you move a subamendment to express a lack of confidence? I draw it to your attention that when we reconsider the rules, because, quite frankly, I do not propose to live by it. Of course I will have to technically live by it, because I cannot move it, since the rules deny permission, but there is nothing to stop me and nothing will stop me indicating what would be my amendment if I had the right and the privilege which I think I should have to move it. What I want to propose to the House is what our subamendment would be if we had completely fair rules in terms of confidence motions, from both of the Opposition parties.

Mr. P. J. Yakabuski (Renfrew South): Whining again, shame!

Mr. MacDonald: Well, we have completely fair rules in the Throne debate.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. MacDonald: Mumblings and grumblings from Lambton county up there. Sounds as though there is a sort of disturbance in the gas wells below the surface.

Mr. Speaker, if I did have the right to move a subamendment it would be to add to the six points that were listed in the main amendment: That this House regrets—

(7): The government's failure to solve the municipal tax crisis by adopting a foundation plan for municipal finance by assuming a greater share of education costs and taking over the full responsibility for health and welfare;

(8): The absence of a review board to investigate and report publicly, on a continuing basis on the reasons behind increases in prices and the extent to which profits, wages and other factors may be responsible for such increases;

(9): The government's failure to institute a rental review board;

(10): The government's failure to enunciate the principle of a home for a home, or equivalent re-instatement, as the basis of compensation in all cases involving expropriation for public purposes;

(11): The government's failure to take advantage of slack in the construction industry, by initiating a housing building programme with a target of 100,000 homes starts in 1968, including 25,000 public housing units for families and senior citizens.

(12): The government has shown no understanding that essential to the elimination of poverty in Ontario is a guaranteed annual income which will replace categorical welfare programmes and ensure that all citizens of this province enjoy the basic amenities of life;

(13): The government's failure to make the Equality of Industrial Opportunity programme an effective instrument for regional development, particularly in northern Ontario;

(14): The government's failure to adopt an expansionary budget in face of the rising unemployment, particularly among young people, and in face of a dropping rate of growth in the gross provincial product.

I must confess to you, Mr. Speaker, that there were so many failures of this government that I could have gone on to list 114 but I thought 14 might make the point.

Mr. R. G. Hodgson moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Clerk of the House: Second order, committee of the whole House; Mr. A. E. Reuter in the chair.

THE PERPETUITIES ACT, 1966

House in committee on Bill 1, An Act to amend The Perpetuities Act, 1966.

Sections 1 and 2, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill 1 reported.

THE COUNTY JUDGES ACT

House in committee on Bill 2, An Act to amend The County Judges Act.

On section 1:

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Mr. Chairman, I do not know the format here but can you ask questions on each section of the—

Mr. Chairman: Yes.

Mr. Sargent: Is the amount of monies involved, mentioned in the bill?

Mr. Chairman: I would say to the member that he can ask specific questions about each section as we proceed. We are dealing with section 1.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Minister, I am not sure if I should ask you this.

Is the pay for judges mentioned in this bill?

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): Mr. Chairman, could I answer the hon. member? What this bill does is simply add three county judges in Essex, Middlesex and Lincoln, where there is need for additional judges. These are county judges. They are appointed by the federal government, by the Minister of Justice.

The Judges Act which governs county judges is also a federal Act and the salary of those judges is set there in that Act, which is now $21,000, and it is paid by the federal government. We are just asking for three judges. The procedure is that, since we have the responsibility for administration of justice in Ontario we request a necessary number of officials, judges in this case, to serve. The appointments rest with the federal government and their salaries are fixed by the federal Act.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, what is the motivation; did you have any; is this a patchwork quilt? Did you have any planned approach to the need for a judge or are you just filling in as you see the need?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Well, filling them in as you see the need is a very good procedure. Perhaps that does not quite describe it. The work load—the number of cases in the particular county; judges are appointed by counties — is surveyed continuously. The chief judge of the county court brings the need to our attention, we examine the work load, backlog and so on, and where judges are necessary we generally consult the bar. This is all part of the study which goes into the need. And it is on the basis of requirement or need to meet the situation that we ask for additional judges from time to time.

Each year, as the hon. member will recall, I think almost with no exception we have asked for two or three judges. They are generally appointed to a county. Sometimes we have asked for appointments of what we call "judges at large" but the actual proper description is a judge for the province of Ontario and he serves at the direction of the chief judge wherever the need may arise, which might be a temporary need in one district or county or another.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, I think in effect then, you are appointing possibly 18 or 20 judges under this Act here.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: No. Three.

Mr. Sargent: But in the different sections you are. Well you would say in effect then, this is going to solve the backlog of cases that cannot be handled?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I would say we have enough county and district judges in Ontario, at present, that with the addition of these three, we will be able to adequately serve in the administration of justice in the county court area.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Chairman, may I ask the hon. Minister under section 2 and clause 2 whether the two junior judges, are two additional junior judges?

Mr. Chairman: Section 1!

Mr. B. Newman: Yes, section 1, subsection 2, and clause 2. Is that two additional?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: No, the footnote—the explanatory note explains there is now one. Where we say two, that means we are having one additional, in other words a total of two. We are just asking one in Essex, one in Lincoln, one in Middlesex and if it says three or two, this is just one addition. The Act is amended because it perhaps now reads "one", and we want another one, we change it to read "two."

Sections 1 to 3, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill 2 reported.

THE WAGES ACT

House in committee on Bill 4, An Act to amend The Wages Act.

Section 1 agreed to.

On section 2:

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Mr. Chairman, I desire to move an amendment to section 2 to the effect that this after the word "force", a separate sentence: "This Act applies to wage assignments whether given before or after this Act comes into force."

Mr. Chairman, with respect, I will not speak to any length in this matter. Obviously we are desirous of setting up a retroactive section in this Act for those outstanding ones for which people are being penalized at the present time due to the failure to pass such legislation at an earlier time. I think my amendment speaks for itself and the justice of it is evident.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, I would oppose this amendment on the simple ground that contracts entered into in good faith

should not be disturbed by a retroactive provision such as this amendment would bring about. Where a merchant perhaps has taken an assignment and given goods, given value on the strength of wage assignment, I think it would be most inequitable that we should suddenly say, "That security which you took becomes invalid".

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): They do not do it on the strength of wage assignment.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Well, that is why we are taking the wages assignment out because we feel it is not proper that wage assignment should be given for a debt of that kind. But if a contract has been entered into, it surely has some sanctity especially where value has been given and a wage assignment has been given to secure it; and I think we are doing a very good thing here in removing the wage assignment from those situations and leaving it only with the credit union, which is a co-operative form of organization where savings are encouraged and where credit is granted usually to groups of people who serve one employer or one industry. But to suddenly say something that you did in the past—everybody acting in good faith—should be destroyed without notice by this Act; I would not countenance such action. I would have to oppose the amendment.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, I believe it was in the name of the member for Sudbury that the official Opposition had on the order paper for the last two or three years our position by means of a private member's bill that we favour the abolition of wage assignments. We very well remember the position that had been taken by the credit unions on that occasion when the government sought to make some amendments as well, and therefore we certainly favour the bill that is before us. But it seems to me that it would be bad legislation to change it so that it was retroactive in its conditions. While certainly the agreements entered into with a wage assignment in times gone by may very well be inequitable, still they were entered into, I suppose, in the good faith that was associated with the legislation as it was then. Unfortunately we find ourselves in a position that we will have to oppose the amendment.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I would like to speak on this particular point. The Attorney General has left the impression that, if we make this bill retroactive, in some way the rights of the creditor are going to be eliminated. Now, that is not the point. The creditor has the obligation of the debtor to repay the money. He can have recourse to division court, or to the county court as any ordinary person must do who has not used the wage assignment in order to take an unfair advantage of the debtor.

The Attorney General knows—and if his study does not show it, he should know—that the wage assignment is a document which was slipped in, in most cases amongst a bundle of documents on a conditional sale agreement for the purchase of consumer goods.

I doubt very much if the Attorney General's study has indicated that any person who was a debtor realizes that he was signing a wage assignment. Now, what happens, Mr. Chairman, is very simple: The wage assignment is held for an indefinite period of time. Suddenly notice of that wage assignment is given to the employer of the person and the employer treats it as a garnishee and the man loses his job. All I am saying to the Attorney General is that the amendment which we propose is to remove that inequity. Otherwise we are going to have floating around in this province, from now for the next four or five years, people who have given wage assignments and creditors who hold wage assignments who will suddenly be in a position of threatening that person in his job. If this Act is to have any immediate application to protect the ordinary citizen of this province —who without knowing, in most cases has signed this wage assignment among a number of other docuuments—then I say the Attorney General should accept without hesitation this amendment. The creditor still has his right, he can go to the court as he should have gone on other occasions, and I urge the Attorney General to accept this amendment now.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Shame on the Liberals that they should oppose it.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, this is a very curious argument we have just heard. The hon. member gets up and in his first breath says, "If you destroy the wage assignment by this retroactive amendment, then the creditor can go to the court and get a judgment, and garnishee." In the next breath he says, "We are not going to have these wage assignments, what is happening is that the creditor is going to court and getting garnishees and the man is losing his job."

Surely you cannot have it both ways? You cannot get up and argue that if you take away the wage assignment the creditor can go to court to get a judgment and garnishee, which would cause the man to lose his job, and then say that if you leave wage assignment in he will go to the court—and he is going to the court on the wage assignment because there is a failure to carry them out. You can not surely argue both ways.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I do not understand the Attorney General. He does not go to the court on the wage assignment; he goes to the court on the covenant of the person to pay the money. It is quite true that because this government will only move so haltingly that they persist in leading the garnishee, but I am simply saying to you that the taking away of the wage assignment does not affect the obligation of the debtor to pay his debt. He has recourse to the courts at the appropriate time when there has been a judicial decision about his obligation to pay. The Attorney General knows as well as I do that there are many cases where notice of wage assignments is given to the employer and the employer is faced with having to deduct the money. And there is a very real question of substance as to whether or not the debtor is in fact indebted to the creditor.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Sudbury.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): May I briefly say that the leader of the Opposition is perfectly correct in the stand which he takes on principle. Our friends to the left cannot have it both ways. You cannot, when this Legislature embarks on a new declaration of principle, set out to re-order the affairs of the universe in the way that you would like to re-order them from the beginning of time. If another piece of legislation was introduced here which was made retroactive, our friends would be the first to scream the loudest. So either you abide by the principle of no retroactivity or you don't.

Mr. Lawlor: Oh no, you don't.

Mr. Sopha: And whereas, it is probably true that in some isolated cases some individuals will suffer hardship by reason of the fact that the Legislature says that those given before the passing of this Act shall remain valid. Yet, it is not proper, in our view, to sacrifice the overriding principle that would destroy the rights—just harken to me for a moment—

Mr. Lawlor: To the people who stand to be hurt.

Mr. Sopha: Just harken to me for a moment—that would destroy the rights that were acquired and given voluntarily in good faith before the passing of the Act. So, when faced with hard decisions of principle we in this party will always attempt to come down on the side that advances the principle, even at the expense of sacrificing thereby some immediate political advantage that might accrue from disregarding the principle.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sopha: Well, there is no intention to have a halo. If I seem to have one it is perhaps because I was next to Pierre-Elliott Trudeau last Sunday.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sopha: That in at nutshell is our position put in perfectly comprehensible fashion. We do not take the position that we are infallible.

Mr. Nixon: Close to it, close to it.

Mr. Sopha: We are pragmatic enough to see that—

Mr. MacDonald: You are not necessarily infallible; but on this you are wrong.

Mr. Sopha: —in the long haul this will advance the cause of justice to the most salutary end, and that is precisely why we shall vote against this mysterious and very narrow-minded amendment that has been put.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Before the question is called there may be others in my party who want to join in. The point we are putting in the course of this amendment is that if the wage assignment is now deemed an inequitable and iniquitous approach to collection procedures in this province then there is no earthly reason why it should not be made retroactive to cover those upon whom it will have a punitive effect should it not be made retroactive. And frankly, Mr. Chairman, I suggest to you that wage assignments were seldom entered into in good faith. We are not talking about an isolated handful of cases; we are talking about a device used by a creditor in an entirely malevolent way. That is why it is being removed from the bill in this instance

and that is why it should be applied retroactively. As the member for Riverdale points out, one always has recourse to the court.

Mr. Chairman, the member for Sudbury does a debating injustice when he says that one would think in terms of universal retroactivity. It is surely appropriate in measuring, in judging cases of legislation to apply retroactivity on a selective basis, and in this instance retroactivity is entirely valid because you will visit hardship on innumerable cases if the legislation is effective only from July 1, 1968.

Indeed, Mr. Chairman, I dare say that there has been a rush to level wage assignments since the announcement of this legislation. As the member for Riverdale pointed out, one is never sure of the substance of a wage assignment. They hang around for so long and they were granted on such unjustified terms. I have a wage assignment in front of me, Mr. Chairman, which came to me recently. I will mention the name of the company because they have been featured in Ron Haggart's columns and others before for their procedures.

Odeon Credit Jeweller and Household Products took out a wage assignment three or four years ago—the assembly might find this rather interesting—which held for a considerable period of time. And then, either in March of 1965, according to the debtor, or in March of 1966, according to the company, two further purchases were made, one for $105.60 which, I think, covered a suit and one for $182.30 which, I think, covered a washing machine.

The total cost of those items in March, 1965, I believe, was $287.90. Three years later, Mr. Chairman, after regular payment of between $5 and $10 dollars a month for the three years, a wage assignment is levelled against the purchaser for $297.45. A wage assignment in excess of the original purchase price, three years after the purchase whole payments were being made. Quite frankly, Mr. Chairman, there is question in this instance of the substance of the assignment.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: He must have missed a lot of payments.

Mr. Lewis: Well, I phoned the company—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: —earlier this afternoon. Mr. Chairman, let me point this out: I am not particularly interested whether they were $5 or $10.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: No, no, I want to tell the members that. If there had been a substantial number of payments for three years, and three years later the interest rate should be such that the amount remaining exceeds the purchase price, then it is a case for the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs and his consumer credit branch, not simply for the Legislature.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, I just got the case and I will draw it to your attention. As a matter of fact Mr. Chairman, I checked on the payments schedule before coming into the House.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: I am prepared to say—

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. Order.

Mr. Lewis: I am prepared to say that the payments were sufficiently consistent and of a sufficiently regular amount not to justify the levelling of a wage assignment. The wage assignment was obviously prompted by the imminent legislation in the hope that the collection could be made before the legislation became law. What this company did not understand, Mr. Chairman, was that the principle of retroactivity would not apply and therefore the company can get out from under for a considerable period of time.

Mr. Chairman, much is involved, we suggest to you, in the substance of such wage assignments. While one can see in other areas of legislation reservations about retroactivity, in this area where wage assignments were entered into, primarily in that case, and where they can do serious damage if they hang on after the legislation is enacted, the bill is amended. Thus we have put our particular sub-amendment to the clause.

I need not point out to members that another device which is used commonly in this field is to threaten people with a garnishee which, of course, hazards the job and then to apply the wage assignment which neither the debtor or the company entirely understands. And what we are doing, quite factually, is playing with men's livelihood. And the member for Sudbury put that very forcefully to the House on other occasions.

We are saying, Mr. Chairman, that that capacity to risk the economic security of the significant number of people by virtue of a wage assignment which this Legislature

has already seen fit to declare iniquitous should not persist and that retroactivity should apply; even if it saves but a few, it should apply.

Mr. Lawlor: I would like to wind up the debate, Mr. Chairman, if somebody else wishes to speak. That being the case, Mr. Chairman, the creditors are left with their full panoply of instruments of torture, including attachments and garnishees.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, the hon. member is not a Minister; he has no right to wind up the debate. If he is the last speaker he has wound it up. If he is not—

Mr. Chairman: I would point out to the member that we are in committee and that there is no restriction on the number of times a member may speak to a bill. The member for Lakeshore wishes to add further remarks concerning this amendment.

Mr. Lawlor: If the member for Downsview wishes to wind up I shall be pleased to see him do so.

Mr. Singer: I just do not like ponderous statements, that is all.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. Order.

Mr. Lawlor: Do you like the ponderosity of your own members?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Lakeshore will please proceed.

Mr. Lawlor: The contention is that if the practice is iniquitous, if it is a bad practice and it is a continuing practice, then the very reason for the legslation to eliminate it, also equally applies, and perhaps a *fortiori* to the continuing inequity. Now what is wrong with that proposition? The second thing is, you cannot live in a black and white universe in these matters such as the member for Sudbury apparently lives in. There is nothing wrong with retroactivity in principle; many pieces of legislation can be brought in, in all justice, to be retroactive legislation. You have to, as my friend says, proceed on the basis of a selectivity with respect to retroactive principles, and to set up any purblind principle of universality in connection with that is to mistake justice itself. It happens all the time. With that in mind, I would ask that the House vote for this measure.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Lawlor has moved that clause 2 of Bill 4 be amended to read:

> This Act applies to wage assignments whether given before or after this Act comes into force.

Those in favour of the motion will please say "aye". Those opposed will please say "nay".

Mr. Chairman: In my opinion the "nays" have it.

Call in the members.

All those in favour of Mr. Lawlor's motion will please rise.

All those opposed to Mr. Lawlor's motion will please rise.

Clerk of the House: Mr. Chairman, the "ayes" are 17 and the "nays" 81.

Mr. Chairman: I declare the motion lost and the section carried.

Section 2 agreed to.

On section 3:

Mr. Lawlor: I wish to move an amendment to section 3 of the bill to this effect:

This Act comes into force on the day it receives Royal assent. The Act as set up at the present time comes into effect on July 1, 1968. Why should that be? What is the delay about the thing? There is no reason in the world why, if the Act is going to go through—anaemic as it may be—it should not come into effect immediately.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, I would speak very briefly to this amendment and oppose it. The purpose of the date is to give the usual warning in our business procedures that wage assignments will no longer prevail after July 1 and that is simply the reason why the date of July 1 was chosen so that all may know that after that date this procedure in business will no longer prevail. I would oppose the amendment.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, the amendment does not seem to be one of great consequence. However, if it would be of some usefulness on the part of those people who might be inveigled into entering into a wage assignment before the bill comes into force, certainly we would like to do whatever we can

to assist the people concerned, and for those reasons we are in a position where we can support this amendment.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): You see how brief it was.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Oshawa.

Mr. C. G. Pilkey (Oshawa): Mr. Chairman, I just want to ask a question. If a wage assignment was signed, but had not been processed, prior to this date, would it become invalid?

Mr. N. L. Olde (Middlesex South): How does the union deal with it?

Mr. Pilkey: There would not be any wage assignments if we had our way with it. We are paying the real bill.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: If I understand the hon. member's question, when the wage assignment is given and signed properly—I do not know what the hon. member means by processing, except perhaps giving notice of it to an employer.

Mr. Pilkey: If they held it in abeyance.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: If it is signed and properly completed and the date is actual, if it is done before July 1 it would be a valid assignment.

Mr. Chairman: Any further discussion. The member for Scarborough West.

Mr. Lewis: Just for the interest of the House, Mr. Chairman, one might note some of the other of the Attorney General's bills. Bill 2, an Act to amend The County Judges Act. This Act comes into force on the day it receives Royal assent. Bill 5, a bill enacted to amend The Religious Institutions Act. This Act comes into force on the day it receives Royal assent. Bill 6, an Act to amend The Division Courts Act. This Act comes into force on the day it receives Royal assent. The only Act—Bill 3—that comes into force from June 1, 1968, is an Act to amend The Extra-Judicial Services Act.

In other words, Mr. Chairman, in all the other pieces of legislation of this Minister, the Act comes into force on the day it receives Royal assent or as early as June 1, 1968, but in order to convey to the creditors of the province that they should use wage assignments until the eleventh hour to turn the screws on unsuspecting debtors, the Minister is prepared to delay it until July 1. We will not buy that, it is inconsistent, by virtue even of his own legislation.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, surely the member is either dense—and I do not like to use that term with respect to him—or else his argument is—

Mr. MacDonald: It is dangerous.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: —or his argument is very specious. It is one thing or the other. I pointed out that the reason for the date chosen was because this Act deals with business procedures and it was fair warning to all concerned that after a certain date such procedures will not prevail. Surely the hon. member can understand that an Act requesting the appointment of three judges has nothing of that nature about it. As a matter of fact, we have to pass that Act, requesting the judges and then notify Ottawa so that they may make the appointments; the sooner it is done the better. But it has nothing to do with the business procedures. I do not recall the other two mentioned but the next one is certainly different in the same way, The Division Courts Act has nothing to do with business procedures and so on, and the distinction is very clear. Either again, I say the hon. member is not able to follow what I think a simple argument or else he is making a specious argument on his own behalf.

Mr. Lewis: I think we want to say to him that we are not debating my specific density, Mr. Chairman. We are debating this particular Act, and I suggest two things to the Minister, Mr. Chairman. I suggest to him that first, when he announced this Act on first reading in the Legislature, he proclaimed to all of Ontario, and it was given much publicity what the effect of the Act would be. He is now at liberty to have it brought into effect on the day it receives Royal assent with sufficient notice given to everyone, months of notice, he need not wait until July 1, 1968. May I be perhaps, unkind for a moment, Mr. Chairman and say that one of the reasons—not to the Minister never to the Minister—but one of the reasons we are waiting until July 1, 1968, is that there are too many Tories in this House who are uncomfortable about the amendment, who would like to see the perpetuation of wage assignment and they will fight for it until the last possible day. Mr. Chairman, that is why we have to wait until July 1.

Mr. Sopha: More's the pity. Let us just point out what is happening here. Normally, these bills would have gone to the legal and labour bills committee before they come into

the formal setting of the committee of the whole House here. When my mind goes back over the Attorney Generals I have known in the past, then I can say that this man usually adopts a very flexible attitude and willingness to compromise when we are down in the room below or up on the third floor, and if these suggestions were put to him in the standing committee he might be of a mind to accept them, but when you get into the formal setting here with the head man working over his shoulder and with the experience he has had with the head man in announcing some legislation somewhere else, then one can appreciate that he has to set the old vertebrae and say, "Oh no, I cannot give in."

It is a small point really and I would plead with the Attorney General and the first citizen. We are talking about a month's difference, perhaps a month and a half and really we do not have to use the time of the House and put the public of Ontario to the expense of the division here.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sopha: Really, I say to him through you, Mr. Chairman, it is sufficient notice to the public that when the Lieutenant-Governor comes in, whether it be before Easter or shortly after, that is the end of giving wage assignments in this province. I do not know what you are trying to accomplish. Is this your belated centennial project? I merely say, unbend a bit; after all, Parliament rests on the spirit of compromise.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Sudbury is always so persuasive and so generous in his compliments and his reason is so good that I would be prepared to bend to his persuasion and accept the amendment to the Act.

Mr. MacDonald: See what happens when the Liberals support our amendment!

Mr. Chairman: Shall the amendment carry?

Amendment agreed to.

Sections 3 and 4 agreed to.

Bill 4, as amended, reported.

THE RELIGIOUS INSTITUTIONS ACT

House in committee on Bill 5, an Act to amend The Religious Institutions Act.

Sections 1 to 3, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill 5 reported.

THE PRE-ARRANGED FUNERAL SERVICES ACT, 1961-1962

House in committee on Bill 8, an Act to amend The Pre-arranged Funeral Services Act, 1961-1962.

Sections 1 to 6, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill 8 reported.

It being 6 o'clock, p.m., the House took recess.

ERRATUM

Tuesday, March 5, 1968

Page	*Column*	*Line*	*Correction*
465	2	42	There was an error in one of the figures used in this sentence; for 19 per cent, read 90 per cent. Line should read: 90 per cent of that came out of the province

No. 38

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

First Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Tuesday, March 26, 1968

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1968

5

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Tuesday, March 26, 1968

Minors' Protection Act, bill to amend, reported 1259

Ontario Housing Corporation Act, 1964, bill to amend, reported 1259

Family Benefits Act, 1966, bill to amend, reported 1269

General Welfare Assistance Act, bill to amend, reported 1279

Vocational Rehabilitation Services Act, 1966, bill to amend, reported 1279

Estimates, Department of Highways, Mr. Gomme 1279

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Dymond, agreed to 1285

Appendix 1285

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

TUESDAY, MARCH 26, 1968

The House resumed at 8 o'clock p.m.

House in committee of the whole, Mr. A. E. Reuter in the chair.

THE MINORS' PROTECTION ACT

House in committee on Bill 9, An Act to amend the Minors' Protection Act.

Sections 1 to 3, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill 9 reported.

THE ONTARIO HOUSING CORPORATION ACT, 1964

House in committee on Bill 13, An Act to amend The Ontario Housing Corporation Act, 1964.

Section 1 agreed to.

On section 2:

Mr. Chairman: The member for Windsor-West.

Mr. H. Peacock (Windsor West): I have a brief comment; perhaps it is in the nature of a question. In section 2, I would like to ask the Minister why there is need in the issuing of debentures, bills and also charges or other instruments by the corporation, for the provincial guarantee. Surely there is sufficient security behind these issues in the name of the corporation, and its assets that it holds on its books, without the necessity of the province of Ontario itself coming in as a backer of these issues. I wonder if the Minister—

Hon. S. J. Randall (Minister of Economics and Development): Yes, Mr. Chairman, I would be glad to answer that question.

I think I outlined in the second reading of the bill that the acquisition of land is going to require great sums of money, if we are going to provide the land that is required for housing. We have under auction many areas of land in and around this province that would have to be paid for in cash, or in securities acceptable to the seller, that he in turn can take down to a bank or trust company and raise funds on. The feeling is that a mortgage from the housing corporation is not an acceptable document, or as negotiable a document as it would be if it had the provincial guarantee. Under the circumstances it is going to be necessary, if we use a mortgage-bank arrangement, that we have a provincial guarantee. We have already discussed this with a number of people who have land for sale. If that is going to be used, as I said, by the sellers as security to raise money for themselves off that security, they require a provincial guarantee which is not provided for in the old Act.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Before we leave that point, I would like to ask the Minister to explain how he intends to raise money. If he intends simply to raise money by way of security on real estate, in the traditional form that that money is raised, then surely the guarantee of the province of Ontario is not necessary.

Surely the Minister would agree that the Ontario housing corporation as a Crown corporation should be able to stand on its own feet in the market place so far as raising money. The establishment by the government of the Ontario housing corporation and its credit rating should depend entirely on the Ontario housing corporation. I think it is too customary in the government to always be giving the guarantee of the province to the kind of operation which should stand by itself.

If the security which the Minister is going to give is on the real estate which is held either by way of option or by ownership for the purpose of land assembly operations, then he should be able to go into the market place and borrow money at the best possible rate without relying upon the guarantee of the province. I think it is—

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): That is not so.

Mr. J. Renwick: Well, the member for Downsview may not think it is so—

Mr. Singer: What kind of provincial financing have you ever done?

Mr. J. Renwick: This is exactly the point. If any emanation of the Crown in the province of Ontario goes into the market place everybody says, "Oh, we must have the guarantee of the province." The fact of the matter is that the Ontario housing corporation could borrow in the market place—because it is an emanation of the Crown—at the going rate of interest, the amount of money which it needs without having the guarantee of the province.

We have this, of course, in Ontario Hydro and many other organizations which are emanations of the government. I simply point out that it is one of the things which is obviously always asked for—the guarantee of the province. Everyone knows—

Mr. J. H. White (London South): A very moot point.

Mr. J. Renwick: —if they have any credibility in the province of Ontario everybody knows that the Ontario housing corporation is not going to go bankrupt. And everyone knows that if they invest their money by way of mortgage with the Ontario housing corporation they are as secure as they can be. I make the point simply as my colleague the member for Windsor-West has made it, that there is no need to have the guarantee of the province of Ontario every time one of the emanations of the Crown goes to the market place to raise money.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Grey-Bruce.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): I would like to ask the Minister, Mr. Chairman, if the guarantees for land acquisition called for in this subsection—are these land acquisitions made on top of the CMHC lands you already have in the hopper now—this additional land acquisition you plan to make, is that correct?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I can answer the question this way. The federal authorities have placed a limitation on how much money is available for the land bank. We ran into that last year, as you recall. The federal authorities also want their 75 per cent out of the deal when the lot is serviced or at the end of 15 years. That was brought out in our discussions last year. They also are not prepared to put their 75 per cent into already serviced lots. So you cannot have instant housing on CMHC money.

In view of this, we had to look for a way in which we could acquire, as I say, many thousands of acres, if we are going to have satellite communities, or satellite towns we recognize that the federal authorities, like ourselves, have problems coming up today with cash. For instance, if 5,000 acres were available today and somebody said, "Well, I want cash or equivalent," the equivalent is to give him back a mortgage. Now, I appreciate what my hon. friend over here from Riverdale said, but this has been thoroughly discussed with the Treasury board, and it is the feeling of the Treasury board and their officials that at the moment we do not want to issue debentures or mortgages through the housing corporation. The time may come when we will do that, but at the present time it was felt this is the way for us to acquire land, the kind of land we want, the quantity we want, if money is short at the federal level and also at this level here.

In other words, we are going to be able to carry on with our HOME programme, extending our facilities such as the hon. leader of the NDP (Mr. MacDonald) said today, if we want to build and get a 100,000 housing starts going and 25,000 public housing units underway, we first of all have to have land. The biggest problem we all face is sufficient money to make these purchases today. After we have made the purchases, the next thing is to arrange for mortgage money for the man who has the lot and also has the house. These are the things that we are concerned with and our first objective was to find a way whereby we could buy land the same as any other developer over a time basis.

Mr. Sargent: This may not be the place to ask this. But the motivation—the only reason that you are in this Act now—is because the private sector has failed and you are filling in the gap, as it were. Right?

Hon. Mr. Randall: No, not necessarily. I think the government has to be in the housing field. We recognize that in public housing and senior citizens we have to have land acquisition for that. We also recognize if we are going to have housing for modest income families, this is where the government has to take a position. That is why we introduced the HOME programme. And, as I say, we can only do that if we acquire land on the same basis as other developers. As you know, today on the market place developers put almost a minimum amount down, give a

mortgage on the land, and whether it is developed this year or ten years from now, they just keep on paying the interest on it. Our exercise, of course, is to give them a mortgage on the land and put it into production just as quickly as we can.

Mr. Sargent: If you consider, Mr. Chairman, the American trend towards this now is to give the private building corporations tax concessions, to go into slum areas and do the job that you are trying to do. In other words, have you considered giving the private sector tax concessions to do these jobs that you are trying to use public money for? In other words, you could kill two birds with one stone if you would give tax concessions to the building industry, to build in slum areas and low income groups.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Chairman, our tax leverage in the province is not large enough really to be able to provide any meaningful incentive. This is an incentive, a tax incentive, which could be given by the federal government. It is not a question of shifting anything from them to us, or from us to them, but our share of the taxes that count is not large enough to provide a lever that is important.

Mr. Sargent: Would the hon. Prime Minister permit me to qualify it by saying that in the American economy it is the states that have this power to do this. Somewhere along the line, if you could use it as a lever, you could take the load off the public moneys to have private money work.

Hon. Mr. Randall: We welcome any suggestions. I might say that many of the things that we are doing in the Ontario housing corporation are being introduced in American legislation. Senator Percy himself called last year to get some of the facts as to our HOME programme. I read President Johnson's statement on public housing the other day, and he hoped to produce in all of the United States 70,000 units in the coming year. I think that on the basis of that we are doing equally as well on a per-capita basis, if not better. The only thing that I would suggest to you is this—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Sargent: I just suggest to you that I do not think at this moment we are in a position to depend on the private developer going in and producing the kind of homes that we need for the modest income families today. As we look at what the private developer is doing, we are still in the $25,000 and $30,000 homes. If we are going to get $15,000 homes, or multiple-family living at less than $15,000, I think that we are going to lead the way. But I would certainly hope that we can persuade—and we are beginning to persuade—many builders that perhaps two homes at $15,000 is just as good as one at $30,000. Perhaps, over a period of time, we can persuade more of them to get into it. Right now.

Hon. Mr. Randall: As the Prime Minister says, we do not have the tax incentive here, and that has to be a joint arrangement with our federal friends.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): I wonder if you could advise what interest rates you expect to pay under this Act at the present time. As you know, interest rates have risen alarmingly in the last year, and is there a limit you have set above which you will not go? Can you give us any advice on that matter?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I think that you know that if you went out to buy a piece of land today, you can pay anywhere from, say, 7.5 per cent to 9 per cent or 10 per cent, depending where you buy the land. The parcels of land that we are looking at are at about 7.2 per cent, which we think is a very reasonable rate, in view of the kind of money that we have to pay to raise money in the market place today. I think again, by buying on this term basis, there is some advantage also to the seller.

He has an opportunity of getting his payments for the land over a period of years—they don't all come in the one year. He does not avoid any taxes, he just defers taxes from year to year on this instalment basis. This gives us the land, so that the land that I am looking at, at the present, I hope to have in full production and completed in four years, and all mortgaged out and the money coming back before we have to start paying on the land acquisition ourselves.

Mr. Shulman: The point that I wish to make is that if you are borrowing money at 7.2 per cent this is fine, but if you go up to the 9 per cent, it would be much cheaper for the province to borrow the money as a provincial bond, than loan the money from that to the housing corporation.

Hon. Mr. Randall: That is why this method will get land for us at lower costs than going out and trying to pay cash.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): I am quite surprised that this government, a so-called free-enterprise government, would feel it necessary to have this clause so it can go into the land acquisition business. The reason that private developers are not building lower-cost housing today is because the municipalities, due to their assessment problems and their education burden, and tax burdens, are insisting upon a larger size home. The builders know that the market is for $15,000 and $16,000 homes, but they are not enabled by the municipalities to get subdivisions approved for these smaller type units. If the government would take steps to untie the hands of the municipalities, and provide the services, then we would not need to have our government credit tied up with land acquisition programmes, because there are plenty of people in this province who are eagerly trying to get their development programmes underway.

As a matter of fact, I noticed in the 1966 annual report of The Department of Municipal Affairs, there were over 860 approvals sought by subdividers, and only about 140 actually approved. Now, the main reason that these were not approved, was because of the resistance of municipalities first to the type of subdivision that these people wanted to put in, low-cost housing, and secondly, the lack of services for these subdivisions. Surely this government should get busy and provide the services so the ordinary private sector can go ahead and provide the low cost housing, instead of tying up the credit in land acquisition programmes? That credit would be far better used in putting the services in and reducing the education costs now being borne by the municipalities.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member will bring any of those builders to me with their plans, with reference to building homes for the kind of people we are talking about, I would be delighted to meet with them. I have not met any in the last year or two, and I would suggest to you that I know that there are difficulties in the municipalities because we ourselves as a developer, face exactly the same problems. We get no breaks from the municipality. We get the same restrictions to contend with as any other builder, or developer, and this is the thing that we are looking at, trying to find the solution to the difficulties of the municipalities. I know there are problems there, but I simply suggest to you I have not had any builders in to see me in the last few years with homes that are costing much less than $25,000. That is not the home we are talking about for the modest income families.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I had no intention of getting into this debate at all until the Minister's last statement. It is the sort of thing that we hear so often from the government front benches—if someone would only bring me the builders.

Where has the Minister been? Has he not looked in any of these municipalities? Does he not know what the planning requirements are and the reasons for them? Does he not know—in the municipality or the borough of North York, for instance—everything is based on a density factor? A density factor relates to the ability of the school board to provide pupils places, the ability to finance those pupil places, the ability to hire teachers, and on and on.

Does the Minister not know of the resistance of municipalities to multiple use of land? Does he not know that these density factors are designed deliberately to keep population down? Not because the municipal councils are mean or nasty, but because they have no choice. his government has left them no choice at all. They are unable to finance services; they are unable to finance education; and so they look after the people that are there in a vain effort to keep the tax rate down.

Municipal councils just cannot afford as much as they would like to, to look after people who might come in, because every new person that comes in and brings a child with them who has to go to school, under the present system of financing municipalities which the government controls, Mr. Chairman, adds to the municipal tax bill.

Who builds the sewers, who builds water mains, who builds the sewage disposal plants, who builds the schools, who builds the roads, who provides the public transportation? You have the municipalities in such a horrendous strait jacket that they just cannot get on with development that will provide $15,000 houses. You are only nibbling at the fringe of the problem in this bill and with your Ontario housing corporation. You have not come to grips with it at all. As you carry on presently, unless you take over education costs, unless you break through the planning bottleneck, and unless you provide municipalities with enough money to allow them to properly service, this housing thing is going to get worse instead of better.

Mr. Chairman: The member for York Centre.

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Chairman, I just want to point out to the hon. Minister that surely the province's experience with the land acquisition programme at Malvern is good evidence of the problem. They have only recently negotiated an agreement with the municipality for the provision of services and after 14 years, to take that long to hold the land and not put it into housing is one of the worst examples of delay in this province.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Chairman, I was going to talk about Malvern at a later date, I do not want to introduce it right here—

Mr. Singer: Oh you have been talking about it for ten years.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I just suggest to the hon. member that when Malvern was purchased it was away out in the country. There was a lot of barren land between there and Malvern and we were co-operating with the township of Scarborough, so we did not leave prairie land in between Malvern and where they had extended to, and the Don roadway was not in 14 years ago—these are some of the things. It is not a delay of 14 years, it is a basis of when was the time ready to develop Malvern and the time is now.

Mr. Singer: Looking ahead—in the meantime people have no place to live because you are so busy looking ahead.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Niagara Falls.

Mr. G. Bukator (Niagara Falls): Mr. Chairman, I find myself groping for questions and I ought to know something about these things —I am in the real estate business. I am wondering if, through you, Mr. Chairman, the Minister could tell me when you acquire these lands for which we are going to loan the money—you will buy it by mortgage or cash whichever is the most convenient. It appears that you would do it by mortgage, because of the money market being what it is. Once you have acquired these lands, is your department, or one of the departments of government, geared to call for tenders and put in the necessary services? If so, are they going to be the services that are required by that municipality?

When I say that to you I say that there are some municipalities who ask for sewers and water and roads of a type; others want asphalt with curbs and gutters and good drainage. Are you geared to handle both types of subdivisions? I have other questions I may ask but, first of all, I would like to know if it is your department, or members of your department, will go into this type of development.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Yes, as I said a minute ago, we are treated no differently than any other developer. We have to abide by the rules and regulations of the municipality and if they require certain kind of roads or curbs or underground wires, we have to abide by that. We try to persuade them, which is what we are attempting to do. I think what the hon. members on your side of the House are suggesting is that perhaps some of these rules and regulations should be relaxed so we can get housing without all these added charges. Yes, our intentions are to try to reduce these charges, but we have to abide by the rules of the municipality. We are just like any other developer.

Mr. Bukator: Then you will sell the lots—may I through you, Mr. Chairman, try to get a little more information—you will sell the lots to individuals or in blocks to contractors, or a little bit of both, is that the intention? All right. Then maybe you have taken a good look at what Kitchener, through Mayor Butler—who spoke to a group at the Royal York hotel which I was very impressed with. He informed us at that time that they decided to look at their subdividers agreement and by so doing, decided to cut away the frills and just put in the bare necessities. What I mean by bare necessities is a macadam road with ditches graded properly with outlets for the drainage and open ditches, and it is quite adequate in many parts of the province.

Along with that, Mr. Chairman, if I may, they put in just the sewer and water and I understand that in Kitchener—and I do not want to build their area up any more than I would like my area built—but I understand that the requirements of the city of Kitchener now puts the lot in the price of about $1,700 with necessary services, such as sewers and water, according to what the mayor told us at that time. I am sure the Minister was there and heard his speech at the Royal York hotel, during the conference we had on housing there.

Is there that type of development that you are acquainted with through your department, in the province where they can get by with just the bare necessities?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I think there are some areas where our people have negotiated

arrangements. I can think of Timmins as one, where I think we have negotiated a similar arrangement where they do not require all the frills that you have referred to. I would hope more towns would consider that in their residential areas, particularly in the areas we are talking about. I do not know whether that $1,700 price per lot was right, I cannot recall that, but as a rule the servicing is a pretty high factor in the cost of a lot, as you know. They range at various prices up to as much as $2,300-$2,400 in some areas, and this is where the big problem has arisen, with reference to getting a lot at a price for a modest family income home.

Yes, in the areas we are moving into, we are not talking about small lots in municipalities here, we are talking about huge acreages of land in which we would become the developer. So in the development of land, we ourselves, of the Ontario housing corporation, must sell off the industrial land. We will sell off the commercial land; we will sell off some of the high-rise apartment land; we will sell off some of the high cost home land, and with those profits, we will turn them back into doing the services as cheaply as we can—I hope providing the schools and some of the other amenities so that it is not a charge on the municipality after the project is completed.

In this way, acting as a developer in say, Malvern, 1,600 acres, there are many savings we can get to get lots at the kind of prices I think our people can afford, whether they rent them or buy them, and this is the objective of the programme—to acquire huge acreages. With small parcels of land it is pretty hard for us to do very much any more than any other small developer.

Mr. Bukator: May I, Mr. Chairman? I am not finished yet, if you do not mind.

I would like to tell you of the experience of some of our developers in the Niagara peninsula. Lots were sold there with the necessary services for something like $3,000 or $3,500. A working man could buy that home with something like $2,100 down, a payment in the neighbourhood of $100, with interest, principal and taxes.

But municipalities having the problem that you speak of, have come to the conclusion that they must have curbs, gutters, sidewalks, underground wiring, street lights, street signs and so on. Having done that, they have put that particular lot out of the range of a working man. Having done that, they do not have the $4,500 to $5,000 down for a $20,000 home that, just a few years ago, sold for between $14,000 and $15,000.

We find ourselves in this position. Homes being built, some of them sitting about because people cannot afford to buy them because, Mr. Chairman, they do not have that down payment.

It comes back to an argument that I make here annually. This government must go into the second mortgage business with a low interest rate on that second mortgage, even though they may have to subsidize it. This is the answer to the problem in many areas of our province. This is worth a good look.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): Mr. Chairman, in connection with section 2, subsection 2-4, I am concerned with respect to the words—"and the validity of any debenture, bill, note, charge, mortgage or temporary loan so guaranteed is not open to question on any ground whatsoever."

It seems to me, sir, that words of this all-embracing nature might be tremendously treacherous as far as any outstanding equities are concerned in connection with a real property transaction.

I ask you to consider for a moment your buying $1 million worth of property and there is, in point of fact, an outstanding equity in favour of, shall we put it, a poor widow someplace and you give back a mortgage for $900,000. Through some fault of your solicitors—this is not a good and valid first charge—there is, in point of fact, some outstanding position. It seems to me that all-embracing phrases such as this, might well negate the rights of individual citizens, or other corporations. I am wondering if you might explain to me the intention of the legislation and also your comments in connection with my worries.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Chairman, not being in the legal profession as my hon. friend is, I can just suggest to you that in this legislation, I think you will find a document used in most of the corporations under the corporation's law, which has a similar wording and this has been checked out very thoroughly by not only the legal authorities in the housing corporation, but also through The Attorney General's Department.

Whether the wording is any different to what you have been used to, I do not know, but I am advised by my legal authorities that this is a standard procedure, it does not place anybody else at a disadvantage

insofar as doing business with them but we have to have clear title to any document between us and the seller and this is exactly what I think is spelled out in this clause.

Mr. Bullbrook: I suggest with respect, Mr. Minister, that you should have the same obligation—at least, the Ontario housing corporation should have the same obligation as James E. Bullbrook if he is buying a piece of property. I wonder if it is appropriate, Mr. Chairman, if I might direct this question, or at least ask for the intercession or comment of the hon. Attorney General in connection with this matter. I really do not care, sir, whether this is embraced in any types of corporation procedures of which I am not aware; I am very much concerned that this is legislation that is going to be passed by this Parliament and, in effect, that it might fetter or, in effect, it might completely deprive the right of some other property owner.

I suggest, with the greatest respect, that you do not have that entitlement, nor should you have that entitlement, nor, with the greatest respect, should you request that entitlement of this Parliament.

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): Mr. Chairman, while the hon. member was speaking, I took occasion to get the statute which this Act amends, that is cited in the Act as The Ontario Housing Corporation Act 1964, and had a brief moment to look at this particular section the hon. member refers to, that is section 2, subsection 2. And it was subsection 4 of section 9, now section 9, subsection 4, referred as the law now stands—only to debenture bills or notes, and I would like to read it, subsection 4 says:

> Any debenture, bill or note issued by or temporary loan made to the corporation, payment was always guaranteed by the province under this section, is valid and binding upon the corporation, its successor and assigns according to its terms and the validity—

I think this is exactly the same language:

> —and the validity of any debenture, bill or note, or temporary loan so guaranteed is not open to question on any ground whatsoever.

The marginal note indicated reads this way, "guaranteed debentures etc. to be indefeasible".

I think the intention was clear that where a security was being given by housing corporation by way of a note or a debenture which was an agency of the government—not a government debenture in the first instance—where it had the government's guarantee, it was a gilt edged security.

Now this Act has simply done this, as my colleague, the Minister of Economics and Development has explained, in order to facilitate the purchase of property and to keep people from going to the money market and borrowing at a high rate of interest, we are offering a mortgage, or at least the housing corporation will be enabled to offer a mortgage.

I think he explained earlier, that the person holding that mortgage, which has on the back of it, or somewhere stamped on it, "payment guaranteed by the province of Ontario," will have a gilt-edged security. It will facilitate, perhaps, the getting of that mortgage and I would refer here to the remarks that the hon. member for Riverdale, that it would perhaps facilitate the obtaining of the mortgage at a lower rate of interest because it bears, not just the guarantee of an agency of the government, but the whole backing of the province of Ontario.

So I cannot accept or appreciate the argument of the hon. member who has spoken, that we should take away that indefeasible, completely valid, element which is being given to this type of security.

Mr. Bullbrook: Mr. Chairman, I entirely agree with the Attorney General in connection with documents such as debentures, bills and notes. The historical background of that, in effect, I submit with respect, is that documentation given by the Crown is *per se* valid and no informality of any nature shall invalidate that document. That is the historical background of it, and I entirely agree with the former legislation. But I ask you to consider, and ask the hon. Minister to consider this, that there is a difference here.

Before you were not dealing with the possibility of outside equities. When the Ontario housing corporation, or Her Majesty, in right of the province of Ontario, gives a bond, they give it unilaterally to somebody. And it is purchased by that somebody and there is no intermediate step, but we are now dealing with the law of real property, Mr. Chairman, and we are now saying, in effect, that any mortgage involved shall, for no reason be invalidated, and so, in effect, we can collaterally affect the rights of some second or third party. That is why I suggest, with respect, that there is a difference in the principle of indefeasibility here; there

should be indefeasibility if we can possibly attain that principle, and we can in connection with debentures, notes and so on, because, as I say, we have no third party possibility of equity involvement.

But we do in real property and I suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, that you must consider this here. I ask you, rather respectfully, that you do consider this. This is much too all-embracing and you could well affect adversely the rights of a person as remote as it might be, it could well be affected. Mr. Chairman, I therefore would move that the word "charge" or "mortgage" be deleted from the bill section 2, subsection 4, by reason of the grounds I have set forth.

Mr. Chairman: If the member wishes to move an amendment, would he please submit that in writing.

Mr. Bullbrook: All right, sir, thank you.

Mr. Singer: While my colleague is transcribing that amendment, I rise to support this amendment on the grounds that he has so ably set forth. What in fact you are doing is saying that once the province of Ontario housing corporation honours a mortgage, you have secured the title. You have suddenly evolved a new theory of titles, in the province of Ontario, by inserting the word "mortgage" in this.

You are saying that, if you find an OHC mortgage on here that is stamped in the way that you have suggested, that title is beyond question. Surely, sir, that is not the intention of this legislation. What you have in mind is an entirely different thing. But by putting the word "mortgage" in there you have changed the whole concept of real property law.

I have been after you for a long time to try to bring into the province of Ontario some reasonable system of land registry, and we seem to be a long way away from that now. Well, you are doing it in this Act. You are doing it in this Act *vis-à-vis* the province of Ontario, and nobody else by including the word "mortgage" in there.

Indeed, sir, if I go into the registry office after this is passed and I find on title an Ontario housing corporation mortgage, there is my root of title and you have said it in this statute. You have said it in this statute and surely that is not your intention.

If you are going to change the whole land registry system, we would all applaud that, but surely, you cannot wipe out anything else that might be on that particular title, by what you intend to do. Your intention is not a bad one. You have just overreached yourself, it is bad draftsmanship and you are producing a wrong result.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I think there is a misinterpretation here, of the intent, even of the language, of this legislation. It simply is speaking of a mortgage which is going to be given by the housing corporation. It goes out to purchase a piece of territory, a large area, and it gives a security by way of mortgage. There are various advantages as we have discussed here a few moments ago in doing it that way.

We avoid the money market. We avoid, perhaps, the high rate of interest. That mortgage is validated—the payment of it—beyond all question so that the holder of that mortgage may take it to his financial people, perhaps in a foreign country or, perhaps, to a bank in this country and with the validation upon it, he is able to do business in a much more effective way than if he had simply a mortgage which rests for its security on the title alone.

All this section is really saying is that that mortgage, similarly to the debentures, similarly to the note, similarly to the bill—that its validity, having geen guaranteed by the province, is not open to question on any ground whatsoever. In other words it is simply a gilt-edged security.

Mr. Singer: Let me put it to you this way. Supposing by error, which occasionally happens in our profession, someone has wrongly certified to the Ontario housing corporation that they have a valid mortgage.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: It will not make any difference.

Mr. Singer: It will, because I come along, or my client comes along, and wants to buy that mortgage and the first thing he will instruct me to do is to go and search the title. I look at this section and I say, "OHC mortgage—that is the end of my search."

By acquiring the mortgage, I acquire the title to the land. So I have got to go through all the mechanics to certify the title. This is what you are excluding. You are establishing a new rule to title for a particular kind of instrument.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Chairman, I would say simply that what this section does is, if such a mistake has been made by the lawyer who served by the title to the corporation, the corporation would be barred from using

that defective title as a reason for not paying. It simply means that the corporation itself must pay. I think this is the intention of the section.

Mr. Singer: Well that may be the intention but—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: And I think this what it says.

An hon. member: We have about five lawyers here and a nice legal debate.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Grey-Bruce.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, according to the amendment, I think what we are talking about tonight is the commitment made by the corporation to be honoured by the province. But this bill is a vehicle, as it were, to expedite such housing programmes we have in progress, or in projection rather, and we are talking here mainly money supply. We are talking about commitments you may make that the province will have to back up. We are talking about money supplying. We are talking about the cost of money. Now currently what we do have, Mr. Chairman, we do have it tonight in providing millions of dollars. No matter how much money we supply, it is not going to do the job. No part of it goes to the people who need it.

My colleague mentioned the plight of municipalities and Collingwood was a good example. They have all kinds of industry by designation, but they have a boomerang now. They are almost into bankruptcy. They cannot supply housing and no one can supply housing in the present set-up.

What happened to 50-year money? We had 50-year money available for senior citizens' departments, that is 5 per cent limited dividend. Why can we not bring this into the housing picture.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Sargent: You must get into the act the whole way in housing, if you are going to do it properly. You must get your feet wet. You must not stand off as executive and run this show. You must get down there and talk about sewage systems. And getting people who are on welfare. Make them pay for their welfare. Make them work for it. But you must get into the housing game yourself and get long-term money and 50-year money and do things properly.

So what we are talking about tonight is the supply of money and the lack of it and the cost of money. I think you must go back to the federal government and say, "We need 50-year money at 5 per cent limited dividend."

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. G. A. Kerr (Halton West): Mr. Chairman, referring to the remarks of the hon. members for Sarnia and Downsview, I think they have misread the section. I do not think that this provision in any way supercedes the provisions, for example, The Registry Act. It does not affect, for example, the prior mortgagee or any other equity which may be registered against this property. The section does not refer to any other statute. It refers, I am convinced, Mr. Chairman, to an agreement between two parties. It does not affect, for example, the hon. member for Sarnia, for he himself is an example as a third party. He would still have the protections of The Registry Act as far as mortgages were concerned. I think that if you searched the title and you saw that there were prior mortgages registered you would have the advantage of that notice. The words "is not open to question on any ground whatsoever," in my opinion, Mr. Chairman, does not in any way mitigate the rights of a registered mortgagee as far as this land would be owned by the housing corporation.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Riverdale.

Mr. J. Renwick: I have a minor financing point to make and that is that the provision of this clause 2 of subsection 2 of the clause is required for the very simple purpose of perfecting the guarantee of the province. This is the reason why it is in there.

If I could state it very simply. A person who is lending the money on the obligation of the Ontario housing corporation, backed by the guarantee of the province of Ontario—if that guarantee of the province of Ontario is to be of any validity, the person has got to be certain that the underlying obligation is a binding obligation. If we accept—I have dissented from the proposition of the government guaranteeing the obligations of the Ontario housing corporation—but if you accept the proposition that the obligations of the Ontario housing corporation are to be guaranteed, then the person who is going to lend the money is going to say, "Well, I am not going to let the province of Ontario as guarantor off the hook, unless they can assure me that the underlying obligation is in fact

as the marginal note says, indefeasible." Therefore, with great respect to the member for Sarnia and the member for Downsview, it is a necessary corollary of the giving of the guarantee by the province of Ontario, that this kind of provision be inserted in order to make the primary obligation indefeasible. Otherwise any lender is going to say, "There is an out for the province of Ontario on its guarantee."

Mr. Bullbrook: Mr. Chairman, for the last time, if I might?

Mr. Chairman: No, the Chairman will decide whether it is the last time or not, if you do not mind. The member for Lakeshore has the floor I believe.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): I will not be long, Mr. Chairman. Much as it hurts me deeply and to the quick, to have to agree with the government on this occasion, I feel that there is some validity in their position and that my good friend from Sarnia is in the wrong. If the section is read with great care: "Any debenture, bill, note, charge or mortgage issued or made by," and then you come to the "or" and I suggest—this is where the ambiguity arises, perhaps—that the "or" is a disjunctive "or"—"or temporary loan made to the corporation." The charge or mortgage is given by to the corporation to other entities.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lawlor: It is not money being given the other way round and, with that in mind, I think that there can be little question that that money must be guaranteed on the public treasury and must be backed by the government in order to obtain those funds and in no way is title called into question. It is a completely separate and distinct matter, I would suggest.

Mr. Bullbrook: Not wishing to carry this on *ad nauseam*, I would say this to the Prime Minister and the hon. member for Halton West. I recognize the desire and intention in connection with the indefeasibility. I believe what you are saying in effect, Prime Minister, is this: that as between the mortgagee and mortgagor there are no equities. This is a valid mortgage and nobody can take any form of dispute with it. I believe this to be the intention. This is the principle of indefeasibility and I accept it. As the hon. member for Riverdale said, I accept it. But hearken to the words that you use.

You say, "So guaranteed is not open to question on any ground whatsoever." I suggest to you with utmost respect that then the question of priorities might well arise, because this is a ground in which a mortgage might well be attacked. This is the problem that scores in my mind so heavily. I am not attacking the principle of indefeasibility. From the practical point of view I suggest this, I find it very difficult, Mr. Chairman, to accept this, if the housing corporation buys $1 million worth of real property and puts down $400,000 in cash and gives back a mortgage for $600,000, if the principle of indefeasibility is so paramount therein. In effect, on a purchase money mortage, he has security of $1 million.

The point in connection with supporting my motion is this, and I submit most respectfully, Mr. Chairman, that these words are too broad. The intention is real and the intention in connection with indefeasibility is proper, but the words are too broad and can effect adversely the equities of other people.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Sarnia has presented a motion, which reads: "I move that the word mortgage or charge be deleted from section 2-4." Does the member refer to the words "charge" or "mortgage" on the first line of the section and the words "charge" or "mortgage" on the seventh line also?

Mr. Bullbrook: Yes, wherever they appear, sir.

I must suggest, Mr. Chairman, that I was prepared to make the motion that the prior statute stand. I certainly agree with the principle as enunciated by the Attorney General in connection with bills, notes and debentures. If this is really the only amendment, as I understand it, in connection with mortgages and charges, I am prepared to make my motion that the entire amendment be deleted and that the former legislation stand.

Mr. Chairman: I would say that the principle of the bill has already been carried, as it stands, on second reading. The member can make a motion to amend a section of this bill as it now stands.

Mr. Bulbrook: I would ask that the amendment go as I have written it, sir, referrable to the words "mortgage" and "charge" throughout the subsection.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Sarnia has moved that the words "mortgage" or

"charge" be deleted from section 2, subsection 4.

All those in favour of the motion, will please say "aye."

All those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion the "nays" have it.

I declare the motion lost and section 2 carried.

Section 2 agreed to.

Sections 3 and 4, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill 13 reported.

THE FAMILY BENEFITS ACT, 1966

House in committee on Bill 46, An Act to amend The Family Benefits Act, 1966.

Section 1 agreed to.

On section 2:

Mrs. M. Renwick (Scarborough Centre): Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment covering a number of points which I think should be covered in this clause. I would like to move the amendment and will comment after the amendment has been made, if I may.

I move that clause 2 of Bill 46 be amended by thereto the following amendments:

To section 11, following subsection (2a):

"(2a) Among those appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor in council as members of the board of review shall be persons in need and in receipt of benefits under The Family Benefits Act, 1966 at the time of their appointment so that at least one member of the board of review constituting a quorum for any hearing and review shall be such a person."

To section 11(a):

At the end of subsection (1) the words "and promptly following the request the hearing and review shall be held."

By adding thereto subsection (5), as follows:

"(5) For the purposes of the hearing and review the director shall make available to the applicant or recipient all the records of the department affecting the applicant or recipient in the possession of the department."

By adding thereto subsection (6), as follows:

"(6) Any applicant or recipient shall be entitled to be represented at such hearing and review in person or by any other person selected by him."

By adding thereto subsection (7) as follows:

"(7) The costs and expenses of the applicant or recipient in the preparation for and attending at the hearing and review shall be borne by the department."

To subsection 11(b):

By adding thereto subsection (1a) as follows:

"(1a) The question whether a person is a person in need and a question whether a person in need is entitled to a benefit under The Family Benefits Act, 1966 shall be deemed for all purposes of appeal to the court of appeal to be questions of law."

Mr. Chairman, do you have enough copies?

Hon. J. Yaremko (Minister of Social and Family Services): I would like an extra copy. Perhaps we should supply the Prime Minister with a copy.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Speaking about section 11, subsection (2a), this point is designed to include people on the review board who fall among those who benefit from this Act. Some actual recipients, Mr. Chairman, one such person to each of the three groups of three to be appointed, who in all likelihood will bring to the board a valid and perhaps different view of the problem brought there, a view of realism through experience.

Speaking to the next point, 11(a), the addition to the end of subsection (1).

When this government is dealing with cases of people in need, need the Minister be reminded it is dealing in all likelihood with people in dire economic circumstances and, obviously, a prompt hearing and review for a recipient or applicant must be assured in this Act. What to the government is just a delay, to the person involved and his family could be severe hardship from this delay in their economic position.

By adding subsection (5), surely, Mr. Chairman, the Minister would agree that the department has as much to gain as the applicant or recipient. With a precedent established in the high court by Mr. Justice Hartt in the case of Kucyk *v.* Workmen's compensation board, where the records of Mr. Kucyk finally had to be brought in, reluctantly released by the workmen's compensation board, does the Minister not foresee the inclusion of subsection (5) will prevent the same sort of thing happening to his department? A lengthy and costly way, Mr. Chairman, of a citizen being able to use records which involve him intimately.

Surely Mr. Chairman, the applicant or recipient should be entitled to see and use

such records for the purpose of his hearing or review.

Subsection (6). This Mr. Chairman, is such an elementary point of justice in our province today that I find it embarrassing to have to speak for its inclusion in this amendment to a government Act. The right to representation named by choice when a citizen is not able, for any reason, to speak for himself surely cannot be denied by any member of this assembly.

Subsection (7). The design of The Family Benefits Act, Mr. Chairman, is to afford protection to persons in need. Establishment, therefore, of a review board for hearings is absolutely meaningless if it is going to, somehow, mean cost and expenses to the applicant or the recipient in order that he might appear and appear effectively before the review board.

Lastly, Mr. Chairman, to section 11(b). Mr. Justice McRuer has set upon the record, that to be a recipient of assistance allowances under The Family Benefits Act is the right of a person in need an entitlement by law. Therefore, it would hold, Mr. Chairman, that a person in need is a question of law and should be set out as such in this act for the purposes of appeal to the court of appeal.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Etobicoke.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the hon. member for Scarborough Centre would permit me a question.

Where does Mr. Justice McRuer indicate that the question of whether "a person in need" is a question in law?

Mrs. M. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, on page 1140 in volume 3, Mr. Justice McRuer drew the difference between allowances and benefits and in saying so, he enlarged upon the fact that for a person in receipt of allowances it was an entitlement. And since this report is about law, I presume that this is an entitlement by law for a person in our province to be entitled to the benefits of The Family Benefits Act by law, a person in need.

Mr. L. A. Braithwaite (Etobicoke): Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a few comments in support of this amendment and relate them to the bills before us this evening.

The hon. member for Scarborough Centre has several points—some of which came up yesterday on second reading, Mr. Chairman. I think that perhaps we could expand on some of them and I will discuss them in order.

The question of a member of the board of review being an individual who is presently in receipt of an allowance came up yesterday. We asked certain questions as to the salary that might be involved and the hon. Minister, at that time, stated that he felt that it would be sufficient. There were some cries from my hon. friends to the left that perhaps this might mean that we would have a blue ribbon board. In that event, individuals who sat on the board, although they were trained, might turn out to be individuals who had no sympathy, no empathy with those who were in need of an allowance or a benefit. And, for that reason, it would be beneficial to secure an individual, or a group of individuals, who are presently on relief or are in receipt of allowance or benefits under The Family Benefits Act.

These people could make up part of this board of review which, the Minister has said, will be travelling around the province and which will be sitting in groups of three from time to time in various parts of the province. I think that any possibility of this board becoming what was referred to as "blue ribbon", will then be eliminated. I am certain that the Minister can secure the right types of individuals. There are many. Some are incapacitated because of a physical deformity; others for many reasons are in receipt of an allowance or benefit under the Act. This, in no way, would interfere with their capacity to judge the capability of others to receive an allowance or benefits under the Act. For that reason, we would support section 2(a) which amends section 11 of clause 2 of Bill 46.

When we come to the amendment under section 11(a), it was pointed out yesterday, on second reading of these bills, that the question of an applicant being able to secure all the records in the care of the Minister's department was most important.

I think it was mentioned, more than once, that with several of these boards and in particular, the workmen's compensation board, it becomes a game of cat and mouse. So often we find a person attempting to go before a higher board within the department, unable to secure all the documents required by him or his counsel, in order to prepare a case for proper presentation.

For those reasons, I cannot see why the Minister should have any obejction to the amendment which is proposed here to section 11(a).

I refer now to the amendment to subsection 6 of section 11(a). The question of representation was brought up my myself yesterday. Although the Minister pointed out that an individual had the assistance of a welfare worker or a trained worker employed by the department, we tried to point out to him that it is imperative that an individual appearing before the director or the board of review or the court of appeal, be entitled to have someone to assist him who is, at the very least, impartial. If possible, there should be someone who is particularly interested in the applicant and who would be quite certain to ensure that everything in the applicant's favour was put before the board or court.

For that reason, Mr. Chairman, we would support the amendment subsection 6 which would be added to section 11(a).

There should be no need for anyone to have to speak to the amendment suggested—this is subsection 7—the question of the cost and expense of the applicant.

It was taken for granted, and it should be taken for granted, that any individual making an application before the board of review or the court of appeal, would have no worry about finances.

It would seem that any person should be able to come forward and say this is the individual I want to represent me, I want all the facts that are necessary for he or she to prepare my case and I have no money in the bank—if I had money I would not be here asking for an allowance.

So, there should be no objection on either side of this House, as far as the amendment in subsection 7 which is proposed.

Now with reference to section 11(b).

Yesterday I brought up the matter of fact and law, with reference to the court of appeal. This is one of the things that disturbs me, Mr. Chairman. I asked the Minister, in particular, how he felt about the fact that many of these people who would be coming to him would be people who did not have appropriate records. They might not be able to prove what money they made in the past, or what education they had.

For those reasons, and for many other reasons which I am certain the Minister can imagine, the question of making an appeal to the court of appeal would be something that might not be quite clearly one of law.

I am happy, on behalf of this side of the House, Mr. Chairman, to say that we would like to add section 1(a) to amend section 11(b) to clarify the case of an individual who is in need, particularly if there is any doubt at all as to the "need"—as I mentioned yesterday, Mr. Chairman, this question of entitlement and allowance has not been cleared up by the Minister, even though such a recommendation was made by Mr. Justice McRuer. Such a clarification would prevent any possibility of there being doubt on the question of "need".

For those reasons, Mr. Chairman, we would support this amendment.

When a person makes an appeal to the court of appeal, attempting to prove that he is in need, if there is any doubt at all in the mind of the Minister, or any one of his employees, it should be deemed that this question is one of law. Then there could be no possibility of the appeal being struck down on this technicality before it is heard.

For these reasons, Mr. Chairman, we would support the amendment which has been put forth by the member for Scarborough Centre.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, in speaking to the points raised by the hon. member for Scarborough Centre as set out in her amendment, I speak to each item by item. I do not think that we should single out any particular class or type of person to be represented on this board of review. Any appointment that will be made will be made based on the merits of the person. I, myself, cannot conceive of anybody wanting to be designated as being on the board of review as a representative, by virtue of being a person in need. One of the things I have discovered within this department, and I knew it before, is that with respect to people who are recipients we go to the greatest of extent to keep their identity a private matter.

Mr. Braithwaite: Will the Minister permit a question?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: It has reached the point that if I send out letters to my constituents, I have to put on them that it is a letter from the Hon. John Yaremko and not from the Minister, as it used to be, Minister of Public Welfare.

Mrs. M. Renwick: That is because of the whole philosophy you have developed.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: It used to be the philosophy, but is no longer the philosophy; "social and family services" is the philosophy of the department. We have changed the attitudes but it would appear that the members of the Opposition have not recognized

the change. Now, when a person is appointed, he will be appointed on the fact that he will be able to discharge his duties capably, regardless of any other fact.

I did mention that it might be advisable to have a technical person, such as a lawyer or a medical man. On the other hand, I then said, you can always hire the services of experts. Whether they will sit as members or whether they will be hired remains to be seen. I do not think it is really necessary to have a person on the board of review that is a person in need—not that I do not subscribe to the theory that if you really want to know what goes on, you should go to the persons involved or affected.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Well, that is it.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): But you exclude those involved.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I do not exclude them. The interesting thing—and I brought this to the attention of the member for Scarborough Centre and other members of the Opposition —is this: that fortunately for those who are on the rolls, or are clients of The Department of Social and Family Services, that I have a very vivid recollection of what it is to be on the other side of the fence—

Mr. Braithwaite: So do I.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: —in the great city of Hamilton. Yes, I do, so that is why I subscribe to the theory that once in a while it is good to consult the patient or the client—

Mr. MacDonald: Once in a while? That is the key to your philosophy. Consultation once in a while!

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: —and get his point of view.

Mr. Braithwaite: I just want to point out, Mr. Chairman, if I might, that in every one of the low-rental housing areas that I have had the occasion to visit or be associated with —and we have several in north Etobicoke, Mr. Chairman—there is always, in each one, a group of two or three families—sometimes it is two or three individuals—who are doing their best to uplift the whole project, because in many of these low-rental areas there is a certain stigma that the rest of the area is trying to place on those who live within the housing project. Therefore, there are two or three people who rise to the top as leaders. I am certain that these are the type of individuals that the member for Scarborough Centre has in mind when she suggests, by this amendment, that individuals who are in receipt of a benefit be placed on this board.

The hon. Minister knows, I am certain, Mr. Chairman, that what I say is quite true. There are those who might be looked upon as being impossible or unfit. They could not serve; but there are others of very high calibre who are doing their best to start improvement groups—they call them associations, with different names. Really what they are trying to do is to get everybody to keep their place clean, to get the kids into cubs and scouts, to start programmes for the mothers, to do everything they can to make the place a model for the rest of the community.

These are the type of individuals I would point out to the hon. Minister, Mr. Chairman, whom I think he could find in any one of the housing developments. You can go, or the Minister can go and he can speak to the social worker who is involved in the area, and I am certain that he will get not one but at least ten names of individuals who are the leaders. These people, I am certain, would be most interested in serving on a board such as this. Might I add that the Minister is mistaken if he feels that he is the only individual who knows what it is to be poor.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: No, I knew that.

Mr. Braithwaite: There are many on this side who feel the same way and this is why we support this amendment Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, I say this, that whoever is appointed to the board will be appointed on their merits. And if there are such persons—of whom you say there are ten that you know of—off your cuff —they would be appointed, not because they are persons in need, but because they have the qualities for serving on a board of review.

Mr. Braithwaite: Will the Minister give us this understanding then: that the parties, both of the parties in Opposition, will have an opportunity to suggest, shall we say, two names apiece?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Braithwaite: If you will give us that undertaking there will be no argument.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: This position has been taken before and it will be taken by me—

we were elected to govern; I will take the responsibility.

Mr. Braithwaite: And we will try to help you!

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Some day in AD 2000, or some time when the people give you the responsibility, you will then be called upon to discharge it. I am given the responsibility now. I have to answer in the House I assume responsibility for the department, I assume responsibility for the Acts; you have no such responsibility—

Mr. Braithwaite: Oh, yes we do!

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: —except as a member of the Legislature.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): You won't even accept advice.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, does the hon. member want to talk on that point?

Mrs. M. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the hon. Minister would tell us any single requisite that all of these people then on this board probably should have? I do not really feel that your view in not having people in need participate in this is a valid one; your view being that these people would not want to be known that they are people in need. Some of the best programmes of our time have involved the actual people for whom the programmes are designed in housing, in many of the areas of government in relation to social reforms for people.

When you said that you were here to govern, this is exactly what I find in my short experience in this House—in the area of housing—in the area of regional development—in the area of dividing our boards of education.

Referring to the teachers—we govern and we tell you and you do it and then we will tell you after why we did it. In this case, if you bring these people into your board, one for every three, you will have a person from the people whom you are governing. Can you give me one requisite, Mr. Minister, that your people will have then on this floor that will be in common with all of them?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, it is a wonderful thing to be in the Opposition—you can blow hot and cold. Regrettably I was not in the House—unfortunately I had to leave and it really pained me, and I say this to the hon. member for Scarborough Centre and I hope it never happens again—I was not in the House when the hon. member gave her maiden speech, but she castigated the appointment of Judge Waisberg to investigate, or look into, the Timbrell case. Why? Because he had served on a children's aid society and knew all the intricacies.

Mr. MacDonald: He was the sole judge.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Oh, no. In that case, because he had this experience, it did not suit the hon. member or the members of her party, so that was bad. I say this, Mr. Chairman, whoever is appointed will be appointed by me—at least by the order of the Lieutenant-Governor in council now, on the basis that he will be able to discharge his duties as a member of the board of review and that will be the basis. I do not think that it is proper to single out any particular group for representation in this way.

Mr. J. Renwick: The Minister makes a very plausible argument that we must not, in any way, designate who will sit on a particular board. Its plausibility is totally specious when we are dealing with the kind of board that the Minister is proposing to set up.

I would say, as the member for Etobicoke says, that if the Minister will undertake in this House that these people will be represented on his board, then that is quite a different matter. But for the Minister to suggest that he ever countenanced in his mind the possibility that a person who was entitled to benefits under the Act, and was in receipt of benefits, should sit on this board, is a matter which is so far removed from him as to be unbelievable. That is the reason why the member for Scarborough Centre put in this amendment.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: You see—

Mr. J. Renwick: Just a moment for me. We want to make ourselves abundantly clear that where boards are set up—internal boards, not independent boards—we obviously have to wait for the McRuer commission recommendations to seep through to the government. When internal boards appointed by the government—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: This is an independent board.

Mr. J. Renwick: This is a board appointed by the government—appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor in council—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Who else would appoint it?

Mr. J. Renwick: —with no independence of status.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Who else would appoint it?

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I would suggest to the Minister that when he gets around to detailing the professional protection of persons on boards appointed by this government, we will have made some progress. But until that time comes, this is an internal board and what we are saying to the government is let us make certain that the persons who are named to that board are from amongst the group of people that this Act passed by, that this legislation was designed to assist.

I, Mr. Chairman, just do not buy the Minister's argument that we would not want to suggest for one moment in this society that there are classes of people. That is exactly what your statute does with the allowances —it classifies people. We are saying that so long as you, in your statute, classify people for the purpose of receipt of benefits, we want those people represented on the board which is going to conduct the review, and the hearing, to determine whether or not they are entitled to that kind of protection.

I need only say, Mr. Chairman, if the Minister wants an analogy, that one of the problems in the workmen's compensation board is that, at no level of the board, with all its internal review procedures, there is nowhere in that board that a person from amongst the injured workmen of the province of Ontario is represented.

Let us get right down to the core of it. We stand and fall on the principle that until an adequate administrative appeal tribunal is established, these internal arrangements for your department have got to have on them, representatives from the classes of persons who are categorized by your stature.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, the Opposition, and especially the NDP cannot see what has taken place in this province in the last quarter century. When the hon. member used the expression for the Minister to suggest he "ever countenanced", he was so far off the beam that he does not even begin to understand what I would countenance. Because I bring to his attention, since I do not have to beat the drums all the time, that, in the province of Quebec, there is going to be a conference sponsored by the Christian council of churches, I believe.

It will be a conference in which there will be participation by those who are classified as persons in need. It is not just going to be a conference of social workers, or members of the clergy. They are going to try to involve the people who are recipients, and this government, upon my suggestion to the Prime Minister, through the Minister of Education (Mr. Davis), are supplying a grant of $5,000. And if that is not countenancing—I bring that to the attention of the member for Riverdale.

Mr. Chairman, as to the board—I do not know whom he thinks would appoint this, if not the Lieutenant-Governor in council of the province of Ontario. Is it a board to be appointed by some other province, by the federal government? Who is it?

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: We? We are governing and we have to appoint. I tell you, it is no easy matter sometimes to make the right appointments, because I have to live with them. I have to take the responsibility of them.

Mr. Chairman, in going to the amendment to section 11(a) and the words "and promptly following the request the hearing and review shall be held"—how much do you want to put into a statute? I can assure the hon. member that the insertion of these words into a statute would not do any one whit more to speed things up. They will either be done promptly or not promptly, and words in a statute will not be the governing factor.

I will say this, that if they are not held promptly, the Minister will be the first to hear and he will hear not just members of the Opposition, but from all 116—I am the only one who does not write letters to myself —116 other members of the Legislature and I.

Mr. Stokes: You will be answering a lot of them after this.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The easiest way to get prompt service on behalf of the 110,000 cases and 300,000 persons is to get at the Minister, and I tell you that it is quite a job to get these things done. I say that we will either have the machinery to do them, or we will not, and I take the position that we must have the machinery because as I stated in my remarks, justice delayed is not justice.

Mr. Peacock: Will the Minister not permit these points as he goes along? Mr. Chairman,

some discussion on my point is in opposition to what the Minister has just said. I think that we must be emphatic that the bill itself contains a requirement for a prompt review, and let me give the Minister one illustration to contrast and oppose what he just said that these matters now are handled in this fashion, and will certainly be handled in this fashion under this bill.

Shortly after I was elected on October 17, a recipient of the Minister's beneficence—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: No, not of mine, of the people of Ontario.

Mr. MacDonald: It was going to be, "of this government"—you just switched quickly there.

Mr. Peacock: Mr. Chairman, whichever way the Minister wants it—got in touch with me, and said that his benefit had been reduced by about half. And it took from October 19, or 20, until the benefit cheque paid at the end of February, to get an adjustment, and all because of a very simple error in the manner in which the recipient's income was reported to the worker in the field.

It took all that entire amount of time from the middle of October to the end of February before any adjustment was made back up to the level of benefit that the recipient was enjoying before October—and the retroaction portion was made up.

I suggest that the delay that occurred in that case points up the necessity for this amendment.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Mr. Chairman, I merely want to say to the Minister through you, that I cannot understand, in the interval between the time that this legislation was framed in his department, and its introduction in this House, and its arrival at this stage of the proceedings—in that interval, of course the report of Mr. Justice McRuer had been tabled—I find it difficult to comprehend why the government, gracefully, and without conceding, or surrendering anything, does not have some competent people. They probably will be found in The Department of the Attorney General, the people who would be versed in what Mr. McRuer said. Why does he not have them have a look at the legislation, in order to bring it into line with the injunctions that Mr. McRuer has down in respect of what he calls—the emergent statute calls them agencies, and the British call them tribunals, but he statutory boards. His first volume, around chapter 15 or 16, as the Minister knows, sets out the minimum requirements.

Now, he does say this—and we must never lose sight of the context that Mr. McRuer puts it in—he says, "In examining the specific powers and the procedure of these boards, one must have in mind the purposes for which they are intended." However, he sets out certain minimum requirements and having those requirements in my memory, I am far from satisfied. I have looked at section 11 within section 2, and I would prefer if the sittings of the board were to be at the place most convenient to the applicant, instead of leaving it in a discretionary manner, as it is left here.

There are all sorts of other things. The power to compel the issuance of subpoenas, the necessity, in order to do justice, in informing the applicant what the issues are, so that he will be expected to compute at the hearing. That, of course, is merely giving fair notice to the applicant, so that he will not be taken by surprise when he comes to the hearing. He will come prepared to meet the issue of fact or law that the department will meet him with. Such matters as the necessity for giving real reasons for the decision—nothing in this statute refers to mandatory order to the board to give reasons for the decision that it comes to.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I would like to bring the hon. member's attention to subsection 3. "Shall certify to the registrar of the Supreme Court," where the record is set out.

Mr. Sopha: Yes, that is all the proceedings, correct.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Item (c), "the decision upon the review together with the reasons therefor."

Mr. Sopha: All right, fine, forget it, forgive me for that. All right, we will leave that go, but what I am merely saying is that in that interval, this statute ought to have been looked into in the light of what Mr. McRuer has said. Is it asking too much, really is it asking too much—and somebody will tell me that it is, if they so feel, that here was a good example of an opportunity of this department—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Will you give me the opportunity of answering that? I am quite ready.

Mr. Sopha: Let me tell you what I was going to say. Here was an opportunity for

the Minister to go to Mr. McRuer, who is on the Ontario law reform commisison I understand, and say to him, "How does our statute here fit with the report that you have just handed down, and the injunctions within that report that make for a fair hearing and the doing of justice at the administrative tribunal level?" There are many other things. Really, the amendment proposed—I was not here—the amendment proposed by the member for Scarborough Centre merely seeks to fill in the deficiencies you see, the deficiencies that you have left out. I make so bold as to say that if you took the amendment to Mr. McRuer, he would look it over and he would say, "Well, those are proper matters for inclusion in this statute," and he would probably suggest several more.

Finally, may I be permitted to say to the Minister—and I do not want to lecture him as a Dutch uncle, but is it right, when discussing an important matter like this, which I am sure was put forward objectively by the member for Scarborough Centre, is it really proper for him to get up and scold this lady for previous remarks that she made about Judge Waisberg? Are you not, and I speak very frankly, Mr. Chairman, to the—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, I would never dream of scolding the young lady. If I were ever to scold, it would be in private where we could have a *tête à tête.*

Mr. MacDonald: Flattery will not get you anywhere.

Mr. Sopha: When I came in, you were scolding.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Oh, was I? Well, I say to the member for Scarborough Centre that if she thought I was scolding her, I withdraw the scolding completely and unreservedly.

Mr. Sopha: All right, I will encapsulate it.

Mr. MacDonald: He is accusing you of being a bit caddish.

Mr. Sopha: All right, I will encapsulate it. Mr. Chairman, the chief trouble with the Minister is that while he is trying to pilot a piece of legislation through the House, he reverts to four or five red herrings that the members of the Opposition feel require an answer, instead of keeping to the matter at issue in the House.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Name one red herring.

Mr. Sopha: Well, probably three or four will now want to speak upon the advisability of appointing Judge Waisberg.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, I assure the hon. member for Sudbury that when Mr. McRuer's report came in and we had this statute that we were going to bring in, it so happened that he chose The Family Benefits Act for comment. I can assure him that I not only read The Family Benefits Act section, but I read the whole report once and then picked out sections.

If you were to take this Act and if you were to take the report, you would be surprised how closely they jibe. I explained on second reading the parts that we were implementing and what we were doing with the balance. Interestingly enough, he did not refer to procedural sections specified with respect to this Act, he did it in chapter 14. If I may say without being accused of scolding by the hon. member for Sudbury, for I will address my remarks to the hon. member for Scarborough Centre, if perhaps in the course of the coming year, she will read chapter 14, she will see where Mr. McRuer sets out, what he calls, "procedural safeguards for the exercise of statutory powers in Ontario." And he does go into some detail. He mentions the things he calls "minimum rules of procedure for all tribunals with specified exceptions": notice of hearing, notice of the case to be met, adjournment, subpoenas, hearings, enforcement, oaths, counsel, counsel for witnesses, examination and cross-examination, evidence, official notice, decision, enforcement of decision.

The hon. member for Scarborough Centre has, I will say this, come up with the Kucyk case which Mr. McRuer may have overlooked. I think he might have it inserted into his minimum requirements because that would appear to be the one item which he did not touch upon. He touched upon many others which the hon. member for Scarborough Centre has not included in her amendment, but she has inserted this one.

I have taken this position, Mr. Chairman: We are going to appoint a board to do a job and it is going to do the job in the interest of the people who are entitled, by virtue of the legislation of this Legislature, to assistance. All of these matters will be set out administratively. We may work out additional safeguards of our own and if necessary, all will be put in regulations where they can be made flexible. There is no intention, on the

part of this government, to appoint a board and then not have it carry out its terms.

Now with respect to item six of the amendment, the representation at such hearing. That, of course, is—

Mrs. M. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, may I make a comment before the hon. Minister finishes that section?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Yes, please do.

Mrs. M. Renwick: I am wondering, if you are following the guidelines of Mr. Justice McRuer's report, what happens to the "non-political" remarks which he made with regard to the appointees of the board? And also, are we trying to have these people appear without any expense? He mentions that the hearing should be convenient and inexpensive for the individual concerned.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: He was talking about, he made reference to, the fact that he hearings were going to be held in Toronto—when he examined the Act we had in the regulations a board of three, and it became patent that a board of three might have to sit in Toronto, and this is where the difficulties would be created.

As I explained on second reading, the concept we have of the board, and this is pioneering as I stated, we have these quorums of three which will sit all over the province of Ontario and we will see how it works out.

Now there are 1,000 municipalities—and that is a lot of municipalities for a board of nine to cover—so that what is going to be involved remains to be seen. But this is the intent of the enlargement of the board. We have examined Mr. McRuer's remarks with relation to where the people must come and we are going to attempt to set up a board on that basis.

The set-up of the board as envisaged now and as under the section repealed are poles apart—very different.

Now with respect to non-political—

Mr. Braithwaite: Would the Minister accept a question?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: All I can say is this, that I could have a halo and a stack of bibles and walk on water and do everything else but I am afraid no matter what I would do somebody from that side will say it is political.

Mr. Sopha: Would you think there are enough defeated candidates left to staff them all?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, I do not know whether there are any defeated candidates who are persons in need.

Mr. MacDonald: Their needs have all been met already.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, with relationship to—

Mr. Braithwaite: Mr. Chairman, would the Minister answer a question on the question of the make-up of the board?

Yesterday on second reading we were discussing the question of the possibility of regional boards. The Minister has just made a statement that there may be thousands of different places the board will have to sit, and so on. If I recall correctly I brought this point up yesterday because it seems impossible that a board of nine could serve Ontario —it does not really matter how many groups of three by combinations and permutation you have.

I do not know how that board is going to serve the whole province. And I am asking the Minister is if it appears that a backlog does develop, does the Minister have—has he given any consideration to the establishment of regional boards?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, I do not think we can think in terms of regional boards. We think in terms of quorums of the board which will serve the province of Ontario and they will move around—just how they will move around remains to be seen. They may be—is the word perambulatory—boards. They will be able, I trust, to serve great areas in that the board will move and not be stuck in a region. The minute you have a regional board, there is the concept that they sit here and everybody comes to them.

Mr. Braithwaite: That is not what I had in mind. There is no reason a regional board itself could not be itinerate within its region.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I envisage these quorums being itinerate all over the province of Ontario, wherever the need for their services arises.

Mr. Braithwaite: Well, the point I am making is what if it does develop that we have backlogs?

Is the Minister so inflexible in his thinking that he rules out altogether the question of regional boards?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Then I will be back here in a year from today asking for an enlargement of the board from nine to whatever.

Mr. Braithwaite: And what about the need of applicants for a speedy hearing?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Well as a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, come to think of it, we have had that in mind because—and this I bring to the attention of the member for Sudbury for a lot of thought has gone into this, whether it works or not remains to be seen—the phraseology is that "there shall be a board of review that shall be composed of not more than such a number of members as is prescribed by the regulations."

We may prescribe seven to begin with, increase to nine, increase to 11, whatever the need is. This is one of the advantages of having the flexibility of regulations.

An hon. member: Oh but there are so many disadvantages!

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I beg your pardon.

An hon. member: There are so many disadvantages!

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Yes there are, but what if you were to freeze a number into a statute?

Mr. Braithwaite: If you set up regional boards you would not have that problem.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Well I say to the member that to me the province of Ontario is one big region.

Now Mr. Chairman, with respect to the cost of representation and other costs, this is a matter which we will have in mind at the time the board is in action. We are fortunate in this respect, that we have under the Attorney General's Department one of the finest systems of legal aid in the world and that is available to the people of the province of Ontario generally.

Now I bring to the attention of the member for Scarborough Centre that in reading page 1140 that I asked her to read, about the determination of a person in need, the phraseology of Mr. McRuer is:

> Once eligibility under the Act and regulations has been determined, an allowance is a matter of entitlement. The entitlement comes after the determination of eligibility.

And from Mr. McRuer's recommendations, which we have examined very closely, we have adopted almost word for word his recommendation with respect to the appeal to the court of appeal on a point of law and his method of appeal, which appears in a different section of the bill. So that all in all we have, and I think the member should be aware of it, we have really a piece of legislation which has been basically based on the report of Mr. McRuer, subject to this, that there are certain matters of procedure to be studied and developed, and also the vehicle of future appeals might await general legislation sometime in the future.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister, where you referred to page 1140 of Mr. Justice McRuer's report, that eligibility only after it has been determined is a matter of entitlement. You will be having both kinds of cases come before the board of review—those who have already been determined eligible and are appealing, as well as those who are not yet recipients.

Mr. Chairman: Any further discussion before the amendment is put? The member for Scarborough Centre has moved that clause 2 of Bill 46 be amended by adding thereto the following amendments:

To section 11, following subsection 2(a):

Among those appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor in council as members of the board of review shall be persons in need and in receipt of benefits under The Family Benefits Act, 1966, at the time of their appointment so that at least one member of the board of review constituting a quorum for any hearing and review shall be such a person.

To section 11(a), at the end of subsection 1, the words:

And promptly following the request, the hearing and review shall be held.

And by adding thereto subsection 5, as follows:

For the purposes of the hearing and review the director shall make available to the applicant or recipient all the records of the department affecting the applicant or recipient in the possession of the department.

Adding thereto subsection 6, as follows:

Any applicant or recipient shall be entitled to be represented at such hearing and review in person or by any other person selected by him.

By adding thereto subsection 7, as follows:

The costs and expenses of the applicant or recipient in the preparation for and attending at the hearing and review shall be borne by the department.

And to section 11(b), by adding thereto subsection 1a as follows:

The question whether a person is a person in need and the question whether a person in need is entitled to a benefit under The Family Benefits Act, 1966, shall be deemed for all purposes of appeal to the court of appeal to be questions of law.

All those in favour of the motion, will please say "aye".

Those opposed will please say "nay".

In my opinion the "nays" have it.

Call in the members.

The House divided on the amendment to the bill moved by Mrs. Renwick which was negated on the following division:

Clerk of the House: Mr. Chairman, the "ayes" are 36, the "nays" 49.

Mr. Chairman: I declare the motion lost and section 2 carried.

Section 2 agreed to.

Sections 3 and 4 agreed to.

Bill 46 reported.

THE GENERAL WELFARE ASSISTANCE ACT

House in committee on Bill 47, An Act to amend The General Welfare Assistance Act.

Sections 1 to 3, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill 47 reported.

THE VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION SERVICES ACT, 1966

House in committee on Bill 48, An Act to amend The Vocational Rehabilitation Services Act, 1966.

Sections 1 to 3, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill 48 reported.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves that the committee of the whole House rise and report one bill with amendment and several without amendment and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of the whole House begs to report one bill with amendment and several without amendment and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Clerk of the House: The 19th order, House in committee of supply; Mr. A. E. Reuter in the chair.

ESTIMATES, THE DEPARTMENT OF HIGHWAYS

Hon. G. E. Gomme (Minister of Highways): Mr. Chairman, following the practice of recent years, early in January each member was given a report on some of the new construction and reconstruction carried out in 1967 up till the end of December. Although that summary ran to better than seven pages, the various projects described were simply representative of an ambitious programme of improvement and expansion.

Statistics in themselves seldom tell the full story, but those pertaining to The Department of Highways' work in 1967 are certainly impressive. For example, in 1967 some 540 miles of hot-mix asphalt pavement and 35 miles of two-lane concrete pavement were laid. In addition, some 100 miles of highway were resurfaced and 88 new bridges were built.

Because the data gathered in the individual needs studies for county road systems—carried out by the counties a few years ago—is valid only until the end of 1969, I asked the counties in November of last year to update them and project their needs to the end of 1974. Only by re-examining and re-evaluating their road requirements on a long-term basis, taking into account increases in construtcion costs and other changes that have occurred, can the counties provide my department with the esesntial information required to fairly allocate the greatest measure of financial aid that can be extended to them.

So that the members may have some appreciation of the substantially higher level of additional or direct aid—as distinct from normal road subsidies—that is being made available to the counties as a result of their

needs studies, two figures should suffice. By the end of 1967 my department provided a total of $37 million in this form of supplementary help to carry out pre-engineering and construction of 770 miles of municipal roads. That has been our response to date to the county roads needs study programme instituted in 1965.

The same type of progressive thinking that prompted the launching of the county needs study in 1963 is demonstrated in the department's use of electronic computing. Having pioneered the application in Canada of the computer to highway engineering problems, in addition to areas of management and administration, the department continues to develop and implement new computer programmes on a broader scale. Briefly stated, the function of our electronic computing branch is to provide programming and data processing services to all branches of the department in their diversified engineering, accounting, statistical and managerial responsibilities. In addition, the branch has been designated as the official engineering and scientific computer installation for the government of Ontario in recognition of the service it has extended to other departments over the years.

The department initiated in the fall of 1965 a far-reaching research project to evaluate the effectiveness of inhibitors for reducing salt corrosion of motor vehicles. The conclusions reached in this most exhaustive 19-month study were published by our research branch early this year and given wide publicity in the Press.

The key finding in this 67-page report was that the addition of inhibitors proved ineffective and uneconomical.

However, the research branch will continue its investigation as new inhibtors become available. Also, it will continue to explore new avenues where corrosion might be reduced through modification of the department's sanding and salting procedures.

Obviously, there is not time in the course of this address to go into the mass of detail available in this report. If any members would like copies of the report, I shall be pleased to provide them.

The most spectacular research project initiated by the department in 1967 was the testing of the post-and-cable guiderail system more commonly used on rural two-lane highways. This programme was carried out on a former air force base at Fingal, near St. Thomas. We felt that they were necessary because of higher traffic volumes and the higher speeds of modern vehicles using this type of highway.

The tests involved running remote-controlled vehicles into various types of guiderail at speeds of 50 to 60 miles per hour to evaluate the effectiveness of systems now in use, and to experiment with other types of guiderail to ensure the best system is used on Ontario's rural highways.

It was possible to carry out only 17 tests last year and the programme will be continued to provide more conclusive information on which to base future design changes.

To illustrate the department's constant striving for greater operation efficiency, a management research section was formed late in 1967 within our research branch to provide an internal management consulting service to branch managers.

I also wish to report that the results of the maintenance management study initiated in 1965 have been most gratifying. The purpose of the study was to survey the department's maintenance procedures and operating practices, as well as the procedures followed by selected municipal road authorities. The aim of this study was to improve cost accounting procedures and develop more efficient methods in the planning and scheduling of maintenance work. Without going into detail on specific precedural changes which have been implemented as a result of the study, I am pleased to say that notable increases in work production have been effected without increasing the amount of equipment or manpower in our maintenance forces.

As I mentioned previously, the study included a survey of the municipalities' maintenance procedures and this aspect of the study is still in progress with a promise of further benefits to the municipalities. It also should be emphasized that during the study period the department has kept the municipalities informed on the findings of the survey and the resulting recommendations to ensure maximum benefits throughout the province.

Before moving on to report on the GO transit service, I would like to take a moment here to mention two bridge design awards received by the department's bridge division, design branch. The awards programme, sponsored by the national design council and The Department of Industry, honours architects and engineers for the creative use of concrete in the design of buildings and bridges.

We were honoured to receive awards for the design of bridges on two of our major freeways. The award-winning structures were the third level bridge at the Macdonald-Cartier freeway-Spadina expressway interchange and the Black Creek bridge on the Highway 400 extension near Jane Street.

The estimates for my department include $6.8 million to cover capital and $3.5 million to cover operating costs of the government of Ontario transit rail commuter project.

To refresh the memory of members in the last House—and for the benefit of new members—I shall briefly outline the overall concept and bring you up to date on its operation.

Almost three years ago the government decided to embark on a rail commuter operation to evaluate the effectiveness of this form of public transportation.

In undertaking this project it stipulated that in the first two or three years of its operation, studies would be carried out to find the best means of operating such services in this region, measure public acceptance, and, most significant of all, to determine whether it could provide a meaningful alternative that could reduce the need for building highly-expensive freeways in densely-populated areas.

I am sure that those of you who live in the Toronto area are aware that its public acceptance has already been amply proven. At the time that GO transit was planned it was estimated that it could attract 15,000 riders a day.

Happily, that figure was achieved, and even surpassed, in a much shorter time than had been anticipated. The service has had peak carryings in excess of 18,000 a day and it is anticipated that it will handle more than 4,000,000 riders in its first year of operation.

Its public acceptance was proven so early that a further order was placed during the summer for 14 cars to expand the GO transit fleet of 63 units. With this additional equipment, GO transit's capacity will be increased to 20,000 riders.

Unfortunately, this is the limit that we can expand the service under operational restrictions dictated by track availability and the capacity of Union station.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): May I ask a question? You are talking GO transit?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: There will be ample time in the estimates to answer all the questions on GO transit.

Mr. Chairman: I think that we should determine right now, that the committee should permit the Ministers to deliver their remarks at the beginning of each department.

Mr. Sargent: Why should we? They do not—

Mr. Chairman: Order, there will be ample opportunity during the estimates to discuss any point as the votes come along. The Minister has replied to the member for Grey-Bruce that he would prefer not to answer the questions. Please be seated.

Mr. Sargent: He does not know the answers.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Probably you do not know the questions, so we are equal.

The operating experience that we have been gaining since inauguration of the service on May 23 is providing a great deal of data for our analysis of this form of transportation.

On the basis of experience, we are considering a number of alterations in the scheduling of trains. Any changes that may be decided upon will not take effect until April, when operational changes for all railways are normally made.

Also, it has been decided to carry out a preliminary evaluation which will cover the operation to the end of 1967, a period of seven months. It is expected that this will be completed shortly.

More time and operating data will be required before a complete analysis can be carried out with any degree of assurance. This, of course, not only means its capability of attracting sizeable volumes of people off the roads, but also involves a careful assessment of the financial aspects involved in moving large numbers of people most efficiently.

We shall undertake such an analysis at the end of the first year of full operation this fall. Whether additional time will be needed to provide a conclusive report will depend on the results of the initial analysis.

Although a two- to three-year period was the estimated requirement to carry out the various studies, every endeavour is being made to complete them as soon as there is sufficient data for analysis.

The prevailing financial situation has imposed limitations on the capital programme which has been prepared for the coming year.

The total demand for road improvements that are absolutely essential continues to grow

and we must continue to provide and maintain a high standard of transportation services that are so important to the further development of our economic potential.

With these matters taken into consideration, we are proposing a gross expenditure programme that will be just $46.8 million higher than the programme for 1967-68.

Before comparing the estimates with last year's Budget, I wish to point out to the hon. members that more than half of this year's increase—just over $26 million—will be in the form of additional assistance to municipalities. That amount is two and half times the amount of the increase in municipal assistance that was included in the 1967-68 Budget.

(The comparative figures may be found in the Appendix on page 1285.)

Before detailing some of the many projects on which we propose to start or continue work in the months ahead, I would comment that, as in the past, the programme represents an equitable distribution of the funds over all parts of the province on the basis of respective priorities of need.

On the Macdonald-Cartier freeway the last two contracts have been awarded for the paving of 15 miles between Highway 137 and Long Beach, west of Brockville. This work is scheduled for completion in 1968. The freeway then will provide a minimum of four lanes over its entire 510 miles between Windsor and the Quebec boundary.

As part of the continuous programme to eliminate at-grade road intersections on the Macdonald-Cartier freeway, it is proposed to award contracts for several more structures this year. Covering locations in both western and eastern Ontario, this part of the Budget represents a substantial expenditure in the cause of safety.

Major construction will be much in evidence on the Queen Elizabeth Way complex required for the new high-speed interchange that will link this key freeway with Highway 27, a heavy-volume carrier on which traffic continues to increase.

In the Oakville area, it is planned to extend westerly for a further 3.5 miles the reconstruction and widening of the Queen Elizabeth Way to six lanes.

Significant progress will be made under the programme of yearly improvements to increase the control of access on this and other freeways. The extent of such work is limited only by the proportion of the total budget that judiciously may be allocated for this purpose. The largest project of this type planned for the Queen Elizabeth Way in 1968 is the construction of service roads on both sides of the highway between Lake Street, in Hamilton, and Grimsby. Over this ten-mile distance, structures will be built to carry intersecting roads above the freeway.

In the vicinity of the western limits of Hamilton it is proposed to pave the section of Highway 403 between the crossing of the Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Railway line and Hamilton Drive. Once this work is completed, Highway 403 will provide a direct freeway link between the Freeman interchange on the Queen Elizabeth Way, near Burlington, and Highway 2, west of Ancaster, a distance of 16 miles.

On another freeway, Highway 406, it is planned to award grading and paving contracts to extend the route southerly from the south limits of St. Catharines for two miles toward Beaver Dams Road. This work will include extensive interchange facilities at the St. Davids Road intersection.

In eastern Ontario, the construction of the new Highway 417 freeway, east and west of Ottawa, the new linking of the Cornwall area with the nation's capital via Highways 138 and 417, plus the programme for Highway 416, will combine to contribute significantly to development of the region. East of Ottawa, Highway 417 will run south of the existing Trans-Canada Highway 17 and will extend for some 63 miles from the national capital to the Quebec border in the vicinty of Pointe Fortune. There it will meet Quebec Highway 40, which provides a direct, high-speed route to Montreal. As the initial work on the route of Highway 417, it is planned to award contracts for grading and related structures from Ramsayville easterly for five miles.

On the west side of Ottawa, Highway 417 will extend westerly from the Ottawa Queensway, on an alignment just south of Corkstown Road. The route, which passes through the Green Belt established by the national capital commission, has been selected to conform as closely as possible with the recommendations of the Ottawa-Hull transportation study. As a continuation of work already started on the first stage, grading of the route between the Queensway and Carleton County Road 9 will be awarded this year. Also, as I said, Highway 417 will serve as part of the new King's Highway route between Cornwall and Ottawa, the balance being provided by the new King's Highway 138, which will join 417 near Casselman.

As the initial stage of Highway 138, an 8.5-mile section of former Stormont County Road 16 is scheduled to be reconstructed under the 1968-69 programme. For the first phase of a plan of staged construction for Highway 416 to provide a controlled-access highway between the nation's capital and the Macdonald-Cartier freeway, it is planned to award, under the 1968-69 programme, the grading of the 3.5-mile Spencerville diversion.

We also have scheduled a contract for clearing eight miles of new Highway 416 right-of-way that will be required for the Kemptville diversion. A new crossing of the Rideau Canal, just east of Kemptville will be a key part of the construction programme. Although only two lanes are being built at this time, full provision is being made for expansion to four lanes. In Prince Edward county, it is proposed to award a contract for grading and paving over four miles of Highway 49 from Picton northerly, thereby improving the accessibility of the Quinte Skyway, which was opened last fall.

A noteworthy project in Muskoka will be the proposal to award a contract this year for the construction of a new 3.5-mile Gravenhurst bypass for Highway 11, which will cut across the eastern end of Gull Lake. The new bypass will be a high-standard, four-lane divided highway and will contribute significantly to the movement of traffic between urban centres and this popular resort area.

A large volume of new work will be undertaken this year in northern Ontario. Contracts are scheduled to be awarded covering 31 miles of clearing, 213 miles of grading, 185 miles of paving and the construction of 14 structures. In addition, construction will continue on carry-over work in northern Ontario on contracts awarded previously. There are 39 projects of this nature at various stages of completion.

Of major interest for northern Ontario is the new highway to link Sudbury and Timmins, Highway 144. Work will be continued on this important project. Clearing of the right-of-way between Gogama and Benny is near completion. Grading will be in progress this year over 43 miles of this new route.

On the extension of Highway 101 between Wawa and Chapleau, asphalt surfacing is proposed from Chapleau westerly for 43 miles. This will complete the programme of providing a hard surface over the 80 miles of this important east-west route between Wawa and Chapleau.

Work will be completed this year on the final eight miles of Highway 651 which extends northerly from Highway 101 to Dalton. This will provide direct access to the King's Highway system for communities in the Dalton-Missanabie area. Under the programme being proposed, work will be in progress on three contracts to speed the extension of Highway 631 from Hornepayne southerly to Trans-Canada Highway 17 at White River. Clearing will begin on a 12-mile section extending northerly from White River. Work also will be in progress on two contracts for grading over a 21-mile section from a point seven miles south of Hornepayne. The construction of a bridge over the West Beaton River also will be underway.

The reconstruction programme on Highway 614 between Trans-Canada Highway 17 and Manitouwadge is well advanced and contracts have been scheduled for a new bridge over the Black River and for grading the final 1⅓ miles. Asphalt surfacing for the reconstructed highway southerly from Manitouwadge for 18.5 miles also is scheduled for 1968-69.

A high volume of work will be in progress on the reconstruction programme for Highway 71 in the Lake-of-the-Woods area. Grading will be carried out on two sections north of Nestor Falls, totalling 17 miles. Paving of the nine miles of new grading south of Nestor Falls also is scheduled for this year.

On the main route of the Trans-Canada Highway, the continuous programme of improvement will be in evidence at several points. A major reconstruction project is scheduled for a 12-mile section between Thessalon and Bruce Mines. Resurfacing also is scheduled from Iron Bridge westerly for 11.5 miles and for a 19-mile section between White Lake Narrows and Rous Lake.

To effect a smoother flow of traffic on the Trans-Canada Highway, it is proposed to construct additional climbing lanes for trucks on Highway 69 south of Sudbury and on Highway 17 between Sudbury and Sault Ste. Marie, and also north of Sault Ste. Marie.

Due to a delay in determining the location of the exact route for the Sault Ste. Marie diversion, it is now planned to award a contract for the construction of this project in the latter part of this fiscal year. The 3.5-mile route will extend from Trans-Canada Highway 17 in the east end of Sault Ste. Marie on a north and west alignment to connect with Highway 17 near its junction with Highway 550.

The reconstruction and improvement of Highway 68 on Manitoulin Island will continue this year. We propose awarding a seven-mile grading contract covering a section from 4.5 miles south of Sheguindah southerly, and a contract for clearing another 6.5 miles preparatory to future reconstruction of this section.

Another important consideration in the development of northern Ontario's road system is the construction of access roads to remote areas to encourage the development of resources. These roads also play an important part in attracting tourists and sportsmen to this great recreational area.

Clearing of the right-of-way is now underway for a new access road northeasterly from the north end of Tertiary Road 800, 74 miles north of Port Arthur, and we propose awarding contracts this year for the grading of this 7.5 miles and clearing an additional 7.5 miles.

Farther west, another new access road is being built, extending northerly from Highway 125, near Balmertown. A contract was awarded in January for clearing the first nine miles of this new road and a further contract for the clearing of an additional nine miles is due to be awarded this year. Grading of the first nine miles also is programmed to start this year.

As announced in the Speech from the Throne, a "Roads to Resources" committee of representatives of six government departments is being formed. The purpose of the committee will be to co-ordinate and integrate transportation developments for remote areas in the north to promote better use of natural resources and tourist and recreation potential.

In the past 10 years, programmes for the development of resources roads, mining and access roads, forestry roads and industrial roads have illustrated the importance of roads of this nature in the economic development of northern parts of our province and, I am sure, the committee will give added impetus to this continuing programme.

It is proposed to award major new work on both the Lakehead and the Kitchener-Waterloo expressways. These are the two instances to date in which the department has undertaken the construction of controlled-access urban expressways under special agreements.

The Lakehead expressway is being built under agreements between the department, the federal government—as the route will form part of the Trans-Canada Highway—and the Lakehead municipalities.

The department is paying 75 per cent of the cost of the Kitchener-Waterloo Expressway and the municipalities 25 per cent.

In summarizing the examples of highway improvement which have been mentioned, it may be observed in the first instance that they have been selected from a great many projects proposed for the 1968-1969 programme. It also may be noted that the programme, coupled with the substantial carry-over of work from previous awards, will provide a total, balanced approach to highway construction, taking into consideration the relative priority of specific needs in all areas of the province and our financial ability to undertake them.

Before closing, Mr. Chairman, I would like to take this opportunity to pay a tribute and extend an expression of gratitude to the employees of The Department of Highways throughout the province. The excellence of our maintenance, both winter and summer, and the extent and quality of our projects are, I am sure you will agree, tangible examples of the teamwork efforts of this well qualified and dedicated branch of public service.

Since assuming the portfolio of Minister of Highways I have travelled as extensively as possible throughout this province and have met many thousands of department employees at their places of work. I must say that I am always impressed by the enthusiasm and the pride that they have in the work they are doing.

Such a vast and complex organization could not function efficiently without the dedicated leadership and administrative capabilities that I have the good fortune to have in my Deputy Minister. A great measure of credit for the enthusiasm and pride that I have found throughout this department is due to the capable administration directed by this man who is now in his 35th year in the public service of this province. I am sure that all of you who have come in contact with him in the course of his duties will agree that he has shown himself to be one of our outstanding civil servants and it gives me great pleasure to publicly express my gratitude—and I am sure the gratitude of all—for his being there.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, it was our understanding that the hon. Minister of Health was

going to move that the committee rise at this point. Is that not so?

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health) moves that the committee of supply rise and report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey South): There is no progress in that last report.

Hon. S. J. Randall (Minister of Economics and Development): If you do not listen, you cannot ask questions. No questions.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report progress and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, in moving the adjournment of the House, I would advise that we will continue with the estimates of The Department of Highways.

Hon. Mr. Dymond moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 10.55 o'clock, p.m.

APPENDIX

		This Year	Last Year
King's Highways—construction		$181,834,000	$172,903,000
King's Highways—maintenance		72,995,000	68,668,000
Municipal assistance		190,975,000	164,930,000
Subsidies	$137,800,000		
Other	53,175,000		
	$190,975,000		

Under the heading "other", expenditures budgeted for connecting links and special construction agreements are included, as well as direct aid—extended chiefly through the development road programme—and special forms of assistance in unincorporated townships.

Commuter rail project	10,376,000	3,600,000
Administration	7,724,000	6,960,000
Gross expenditure	$463,904,000	$417,061,000



No. 39

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

First Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Wednesday, March 27, 1968

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1968

5

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Wednesday, March 27, 1968

Lord's Day (Ontario) Act, 1960-1961, bill to amend, Mr. Wishart, first reading 1289

Municipal Corporations Quieting Orders Act, bill to amend, Mr. McKeough, first reading 1289

Statute Labour Act, bill to amend, Mr. McKeough, first reading 1289

Judicature Act, bill to amend, Mr. Pitman, first reading 1289

Questions to Mr. Davis re children with learning difficulties, Mr. Nixon 1290

Questions to Mr. Wishart re Hal Banks, Mr. Nixon 1290

Question to Mr. Wishart re retail meat sales, Mr. Nixon 1291

Questions to Mr. Dymond re air pollution prosecutions, Mr. Bullbrook 1291

Question to Mr. Stewart re retail meat sales, Mr. Makarchuk 1291

Questions to Mr. Dymond re licensing of hearing aid salesmen, Mr. Trotter 1291

Question to Mr. Haskett re school buses, Mr. Burr 1292

Question to Mr. Dymond re air pollution, Mr. Burr 1292

Questions to Mr. McKeough re mobile homes, Mr. Knight 1292

Question to Mr. Haskett re the transportation of gasoline, Mr. Ruston 1293

Question to Mr. Dymond re air pollution, Mr. Lawlor 1294

Tabling answers to questions on the order paper, Mr. Robarts 1294

Third readings 1297

Estimates, Department of Highways, Mr. Gomme, continued 1298

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Rowntree, agreed to 1327

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 27, 1968

The House met at 2:30 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are always pleased to have visitors and today we welcome as our guests, students from the following schools: in the east gallery, Transfiguration separate school in Weston; in the west gallery the adult education centre of Peterborough, and in both galleries students from Ryerson senior public school. At 3:30 p.m. we shall be joined in the west gallery by students from Ryerson polytechnic school here in Toronto.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Motions.

Mr. L. M. Reilly moves, seconded by Mr. R. G. Hodgson, that Mr. R. D. Kennedy be substituted for Mr. D. H. Morrow on the education and university affairs committee.

Motion agreed to.

Introduction of bills.

THE LORD'S DAY (ONTARIO) ACT, 1960-1961

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Minister of Justice and Attorney General) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Lord's Day (Ontario) Act, 1960-1961.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, I should like to say to the members of the House that this Act, which is number 2 amendment of The Lord's Day Act, removes the necessity of a vote of the electors—the assembly electors in respect of Sunday games, public games of sports—and permits the conducting of horse racing after 1:30 p.m. on Sunday in municipalities that adopt a bylaw permitting such activity. It removes the requirement for the assent of the electors with respect to Sunday movies. I would point out that Bill 41, which was introduced some short time ago, with respect to trade fairs and exhibitions, things of that kind, required only the bylaw and not the assent of the electors. So removing that requirement from the Act, makes it consistent with the bill previously introduced. There is provision, of course, by bylaw, to obtain the assent of the electors where it may still be required. But this would be a matter for the judgment of the local municipal council.

THE MUNICIPAL CORPORATIONS QUIETING ORDERS ACT

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Minister of Municipal Affairs) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Municipal Corporations Quieting Orders Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, that legislation is in the nature of housekeeping.

THE STATUTE LABOUR ACT

Hon. Mr. McKeough moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Statute Labour Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, this bill repealed the authority to levy an annual poll tax.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Against everyone or just you?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Everyone.

Mr. Singer: The select committee recommended that five years ago—

THE JUDICATURE ACT

Mr. W. G. Pitman (Peterborough) moves first reading of bill initituled, An Act to amend The Judicature Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: An explanation.

Mr. Pitman: Mr. Speaker, very simply this is a bill to carry out the wishes of a committee of this Legislature and end the necessity for *ex parte* injunctions.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Education.

Does the Minister have any plan to assist the board of education in Toronto in meeting the heavy backlog of 1,500 to 1,900 unattended requests for examination by psychologists of individual children suffering from psychiatric and learning problems, as reported to the management committee of the Toronto board?

Hon. W. G. Davis (Minister of Education and Minister of University Affairs): Mr. Speaker, as I am sure the hon. leader of the Opposition is aware, this is a matter that falls within the jurisdiction of the local board, and as far as the department is concerned, any way we can assist we would be delighted to do so.

With respect to the increased supply of professional personnel as it relates to the teaching aspect, not to the psychologists or psychiatrists, the department is in the course of, and has for the past two years, increased the number of courses for improvement of the supply of teachers who are qualified in this particular area. Of course, a number of the universities have instituted graduate and undergraduate programmes as well. But this does not resolve the problem which I think exists for the Toronto board and for other boards, and for, I guess, our total society, and that is that there is just not sufficient trained personnel when we get into the field of psychology, which are necessary for part of this evaluation.

Mr Nixon: Mr. Speaker, if I might ask a supplementary question, if the Minister would permit?

There is an indication that quite a number of these that are not reported might be from those groups in the school system in Toronto that have language difficulty associated with their recent immigration. Is there a possibility that the government might be able to step up their assistance through that particular area of responsibility—that is assistance in the provision of language instruction—rather than trying to meet the impossible demands that the Minister has pointed out for trained psychiatrists and psychologists?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I did not read that in the report and we have had no indication of this from the Toronto board. Really, our involvement with the board has been related to the provision of additional financing, which has been made available to them as of the amendment to the grant regulations, but I would be quite prepared to take a look at this.

Mr Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I have two questions for the Attorney General.

1. Has the Attorney General been contacted by the federal government with regard to the continued refusal of the American government to authorize extradition of Harold C. Banks?

2. Does the Attorney General see any further action that might be taken by either level of government in this regard?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, yes, we have been kept aware by the federal government of the status and proceedings in this matter. As to any further action, I cannot speak for the other level of government, certainly not in the sense of advising what should be done, but there is nothing that Ontario may do further. The original hearing was before a commissioner appointed by the Secretary of State at Washington and we carried that hearing and the order for extradition was granted. Then the Secretary of State decided to hold his own, or another hearing, within his area and while we felt this was an unusual thing, which it was, that procedure was followed and extradition was refused.

At this stage at least, after the first hearing, which is not a judicial proceeding and has no appeal procedures in it, there is no opportunity to take the matter to a court, it is not a court matter—I am quite certain it is a matter between the states who are parties to the extradition treaty, namely Canada and the United States—and between the government at Ottawa and the government at Washington. As I think the hon. members are aware, the Secretary of State for Canada has made representations to the Secretary of State in Washington which have been refused.

What further action might be taken, and this I would not want to put in the form of advice, has been indicated by our Secretary of State. It might be an appeal to some international tribunal, but insofar as Ontario is concerned we exhausted every means at our disposal to bring Harold Banks back to face trial in this province.

Mr Nixon: Mr. Speaker, could I ask the Attorney General if we were represented at the special hearing held by the American Secretary of State?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I do not want to answer without absolute certainty. I think we were but I have not got the name of counsel or the fact of that answer. I will get it for you.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I have a further question for the Attorney General.

Will the Attorney General explain the background leading up to the raids on meat stores across the province yesterday? What charges will be laid against the individuals taken into custody? Is there any evidence that uninspected meat was sold from any of the outlets?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the wide public interest in this matter and I appreciate the motives which prompt the questions for information in this matter, but it is *sub judice* and I must say that at this time I am not prepared to discuss it. I have a good deal of information but I think it would be improper to detail it at this time. I think I would prefer, if the hon. member would allow me, for the reasons I have given, not to discuss this matter at this time.

Mr J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Health.

In view of the decision of Magistrate Michael Clooney quashing seven informations under The Air Pollution Control Act 1967, by reason of ambiguity and obscurity, and presuming that the informations, as is the custom, were laid in conformity with the wording of the statute or its regulations, could the Minister advise this House what he intends to do to strengthen the statute or its regulations, to avoid such ambiguity and obscurity so that successful prosecutions will result?

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, this is a question of disagreement between legal authorities. The legal people in my department advised me that our law is good; the court ruled otherwise, therefore we will seek other opinion, and if we are upheld, we will appeal. If the law is not good, we will see that it is made good.

Mr Nixon: As your director said, "Back to the drawing board."

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Back to the drawing board.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, I wonder, just before the record goes too far, if I might include the question which was asked by the hon. leader of the Opposition. We were represented at all hearings in New York, in the matter of the extradition of Harold Banks, by Richard Kuh, who was our lawyer there on the original hearing, and who was present at all hearings.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Sarnia has the floor.

Mr. Bullbrook: Mr. Speaker, I was going to ask your permission to direct a supplementary question.

Am I given to understand by the Minister's reply, that he intends to appeal the decision?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, I did not say that. I said that if the opinion of my departmental lawyers is upheld and the law in the outside opinion is good, then we will appeal.

Mr. M. Makarchuk (Brantford): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Agriculture and Food.

Can the Minister assure the House that all meat sold for human consumption in Ontario has been inspected?

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to say, unqualifiedly, that all meat sold in Ontario was inspected. All meat sold in Ontario, west of the counties of Peterborough, Victoria and Durham, and including those counties, is now inspected either by provincial or federal inspection. This involves 162 red meat slaughtering plants in the 27 counties so inspected. As well, in the other parts of the province where federal inspection is taking place, meat is inspected.

We will also have provincial inspection in those plants that are not covered by federal inspection in the remaining part of the province just as quickly as the present class of trainees is fully qualified to take over full inspection.

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Health.

What action, if any, has the Minister taken in order to license hearing-aid salesmen in the immediate future? And have the necessary regulations been prepared?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, the regulations are undergoing final stages of preparation. We have run into a good deal of difficulty with this operation but it is expected that within the next few weeks they will be in a form so that we can discuss them fully with those concerned and then they will be put into operation.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister a supplementary question.

Why have you had the difficulties in this matter? It has been kicked around for years and a year ago we changed the legislation, but still nothing has been done. What is wrong?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I cannot tell you, Mr. Speaker, what is wrong. I find that when we get involved in legal matters they are rather slow-moving many times.

Mr. Trotter: You can say that again for this government.

Mr. Speaker: If the member has a further question—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I think it is the same no matter what government they belong to, sir.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Parkdale has a further question?

Mr. Trotter: I have a question for the hon. Minister of Economics and Development.

What price did the government pay to Compeau Construction for subdivision property in Ottawa to be used under the HOME plan? Did Compeau Construction have the first opportunity to repurchase 50 per cent of that land for HOME purchases? Did any construction company or real estate firm have an opportunity to purchase HOME lots in Ottawa prior to the public announcement that subdivided land under the HOME programme was to be available in that city?

Hon. S. J. Randall (Minister of Economics and Development): Mr. Speaker, I will have to take notice of this question. I was not in my office and did not have a chance to get the question before I came here. I will get it for you tomorrow.

Mr. F. A. Burr (Sandwich-Riverside): Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Transport.

In view of the fact that Middlesex county has given permission to the raising of the maximum speed limit in the hamlet of Wellburn from 30 miles per hour to 40 miles per hour, to enable the school bus driver to turn on front and rear flashing lights while discharging school children, and thus stop traffic, will the Minister consider revising present regulations to permit school buses to bring traffic to a halt while discharging school children, even though the posted speed limit is less than the 35 miles per hour now required?

Hon. I. Haskett (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to recommend that The Highway Traffic Act be amended to permit the school bus stopping law to be applicable where the speed limit is 35 miles per hour or less. The law as it is now written is consistent with the principle embodied in legislation in all jurisdictions in North America.

Mr. Burr: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Health.

Inasmuch as federal Energy Minister Pepin said last Friday that the federal government is drafting a Canadian Water Act that will broaden the scope of federal action in conservation and pollution control, after previously contending that air, soil and water pollution were provincial responsibilities, will the Minister now urge the federal government to take similar action regarding air pollution?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, while we recognize that the prime responsibility for air pollution control rests with the provinces, we have emphasized to the federal government that in our view they have the responsibility in this area. Up to the present time we have dealt in my department with the Minister of National Health and Welfare to whom we have made our views eminently clear from time to time. Now since I see that the Energy Minister, the hon. Mr. Pepin is involved, I shall correspond with him.

Mr. R. H. Knight (Port Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs.

In view of the statement in this House yesterday by the Minister of Economics and Development that the responsibility for relocating 127 families in mobile homes in Mississauga rests with the municipality and not with the Minister responsible for housing, will the Minister of Municipal Affairs use his good offices to assist the municipality in the question of providing a location for these families and their mobile homes?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to be able to give the member the background information which he has requested and which has been before me some two or three months now.

On December 27, 1967, amendment number 193 to the official plan of the township of Toronto—now the town of Mississauga—was submitted to me for approval under section 12 of The Planning Act. This amend-

ment submitted by the council of the municipality proposed to change the use of land from a classification "to be determined" to "residential—multiple family and greenbelt." The amendment was recommended by the planning board to the council. Following normal practice, the application was circulated by my department to a number of public agencies for their views as a basis for determining my actions on the application. All replies have been received and none have opposed the proposed change.

During the period of circulation, on February 16, 1968, we received a copy of a brief from the mobile home owners' association which had been initially prepared for submission to the town of Mississauga planning board. In this brief the association pointed out the need for mobile home parks in the town and requested that a study be initiated to find alternative sites within the municipality. This brief was acknowledged and the association was advised that the official plan amendment was still being considered and that the contents of the brief would be taken into consideration in the determination of the decision. I further indicated that I would like to be advised of the results of the negotiation between the association and the municipality. On March 15 I received a reply from the association as follows:

Dear Sir,

I was much heartened to receive your letter of March 13, 1968, and on behalf of our association I thank you. As previously arranged, we did meet with the Mississauga town council and planning board on Tuesday evening, March 12, and presented our brief, of which you hold a copy. This was received most warmly if not even enthusiastically by the council, and on conclusion we were congratulated on the brief for clarity and understanding. We were further congratulated on the way that it was presented and advised that as we had now laid new and interesting facts before council, they would like to discuss this further among themselves and duly advise us.

I would appreciate hearing some decision within the next two weeks, because council is aware of our problem, but feel more than sure that they will accept the moral responsibility which we have laid before them. In this light we would hope that an equitable solution could be evolved and we await their decision with anticipation. Meantime, it is our request, that the delay as asked for initially, on the subject amendment be seriously considered, until some further progress and/or negotiation, has been made with council.

Yours very sincerely,
James Q. Gailey, Vice-President.

That is where the matter now rests, Mr. Speaker. I will not act further on the application until I receive information from the municipality advising of the results of their discussion with the association.

Mr. Knight: Mr. Speaker, would the Minister accept a supplementary question?

Will the hon. Minister continue to oversee not only the application for amendment of the zoning bylaw, but also the problem faced by 127 families of relocating and securing another property? Will the Minister continue to be concerned that these people should find a new location in which to park their mobile homes?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Having expressed my concern since December 27, when this dialogue began, I would hardly think that I am going to stop my concern at this point, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Transport.

Is it the intention of the hon. Minister to approve the use of gasoline transports on provincial highways carrying over 11,000 gallons of gasoline, and if so, is this not a very dangerous practice to allow such vehicles on our highways?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Speaker, the safe transport of gasoline comes under The Gasoline Handling Act, to which my colleague, the Minister of Energy and Resources Management (Mr. Simonett) is answerable.

Mr. Speaker: If the member wishes, I will have that question transferred to the Minister of Energy and Resources Management.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Why did he not transfer it?

Mr. Speaker: Because the Minister of Energy and Resources Management is not in today.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Speaker, we are only wasting the time of the House. It could have been handed over to another department and then we would have had the answer today.

Mr. Speaker: The time of the House is now being wasted.

Mr. B. Newman: By the Minister.

An hon. member: By Ministers.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Before the orders of the day, the hon. member for Lakeshore (Mr. Lawlor) asked me a question yesterday, which I took as notice.

> What action is being taken by the province of Ontario to eliminate the pollution resulting from the burning of bulk oil and the use of other pollutants by the Goodyear Tire and Rubber Co. at its plant on Lakeshore West in the borough of Etobicoke?

We have had some complaints recently over the past several months concerning pollution by the emission of carbon black during unloading operations, and this condition was corrected at our instigation. We are advised that the company is still co-operating with us, but spot checks are being made, and if there should be any further outbreak, it will be dealt with.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I would like to table answers to questions 1, 3, 5, 8, 10, 14, 15, 16, 17, and 28, standing on the order paper.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Does the Prime Minister eavesdrop on our caucus?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I can assure the hon. member that he is not bugged.

Mr. MacDonald: We were about to raise this question, but he scooped us!

The Prime Minister tabled answers to written questions as follows:

1. *Mr. E. W. Sopha* (Sudbury)—Enquiry of the Ministry—Under the contract entered into between the government of Ontario and Ports of Call International Limited for the management of the facilities in the Ontario pavilion at Expo '67 during the period April 28 to October 27, 1967: (*a*) what was the amount of the gross receipts from the operation of such facilities; (*b*) what was the cost to the government of Ontario for the performance of its obligations under the contract; (*c*) what percentage of the gross sales was paid to Ports of Call International Limited; (*d*) what was the amount in dollars paid to Ports of Call International Limited; (*e*) what was the amount paid out by Ports of Call International Limited for the performance of its obligations under the contract?

Answer by the Minister of Economics and Development:

(a) $1,505,965.40, gross receipts

(b) $90,774.00, management fees

(c) 6 per cent

(d) $90,774.00

(e) An amount of $1,236,075.32 was paid out by Ports of Call Limited for the performance of its obligations under the contract.

3. *Mr. E. Sargent* (Grey-Bruce)—Enquiry of the Ministry—What was the total cost to the taxpayers of Ontario for the Confederation of tomorrow conference held in Toronto last November?

Answer by the Minister of Economics and Development:

Services – translation, switchboard and telephone costs	$ 12,501.73
Stationery, supplies and printing	12,852.71
Rental of furniture and equipment	17,891.02
Manufacture of booths, displays and other construction work	38,384.76
Lighting	10,714.00
Catering	29,758.73
Installations and production re radio and TV coverage	19,164.20
	$141,267.15

5. *Mr. D. M. De Monte* (Dovercourt)—Enquiry of the Ministry—What is the basis for calculation of permanent disability pensions under The Workmen's Compensation Act and its regulations?

Answer by the Minister of Labour (Mr. Bales):

Permanent disability is evaluated when the workman has reached the maximum degree of recovery. Sections 40, 42, 43B and 44 of the Act govern the calculation of awards. The workman's condition is assessed by an expert medical examiner and the degree of disability is expressed in percentage terms.

A rating schedule has been compiled in accordance with section 42(2) and provides standards for most obvious permanent disabilities such as amputations and immobilization of joints. For example, a man with a mid-thigh amputation of both legs is rated at 100 per cent permanent disability, while if only one leg were amputated the rating would be 50 per cent permanent disability. Other disabilities are evaluated using the schedule as a guide. The same schedule is used by agreement by all the provinces of Canada.

Pensions for permanent disability are based on the workman's average earnings during the

12 months prior to his accident. The maximum compensation rate is 75 per cent of his average earnings up to $6,000 per annum, thus a 100 per cent pension would equal 75 per cent of his average earnings prior to the accident up to that maximum.

Pensions are awarded for life regardless of future income. A permanently disabled workman may be rehabilitated into useful employment without it affecting his pension. Occasionally where there is a possibility of further change in the condition a temporary pension may be awarded and the degree of disabiltiy reviewed a year or two later. In any case where the workman's compensable condition changes the pension may be reviewed on request.

In cases where the disability causes special hardship a supplementary allowance may be paid on a temporary basis under section 42(4) and reviewed from time to time.

A full range of rehabilitation services is available to all seriously disabled workmen to assist them in re-establishing themselves in gainful employment.

8. *Mr. P. D. Lawlor* (Lakeshore)—Enquiry of the Ministry—What are the actual or estimated costs to the government for producing the four volumes on family law, a study prepared by the family law project for the Ontario law reform commission.

Answer by the Attorney General:

The Ontario law reform commission initiated a research project on family law in the spring of 1965. The function of the project was to analyze the existing law affecting all areas of family relations within the legislative competence of the provincial Legislature, to evaluate the adequacy of those laws in view of changed economic and social conditions pertaining to the family, to state the basic principles required for a modern Ontario code of family law and to recommend remedial legislation to establish such a code.

The research team under the direction of Professor I. F. G. Baxter has submitted to the commission its study and proposals on the property subjects of the project. Since this part of the study is largely self-contained, the commission released the study on January 16, 1968, and invited comment of all interested parties. The proposals were the subject of a full day's discussion by the members of the legal profession at the annual mid-winter meeting of the Ontario branch of the Canadian bar association on February 2, 1968.

The cost of conducting the necessary research, consulting with acknowledged specialists in the field and printing the study in four volumes is as follows:

Salaries for research and administrative personnel	$42,068.15
Consultation expenses	1,388.31
Printing	2,533.18
	$45,989.64

10. *Mr. T. Reid* (Scarborough East)—Enquiry of the Ministry—How many people have resigned, left or requested transfers from the office accommodation division of the real estate branch of The Department of Public Works since August 1, 1967?

Answer by the Minister of Public Works:

Resigned 3; left 1; transfer 1.

14. *Mr. Sargent*—Enquiry of the Ministry—Will the Minister of Economics and Development advise: (*a*) the net effect of the Kennedy Round of tariffs on the Ontario industrial picture; (*b*) whether the government adjustment loans to industries, which are severely affected by the Kennedy Round of tariffs, will be applicable to Canadian subsidiaries of United States companies in Ontario?

Answer by the Minister of Economics and Development:

(a) More than one-third of Canada's $10 billion annual exports will be affected by the tariff reductions. Ontario's share of total exports is over $3 billion from which about $1 billion is expected to benefit from the Kennedy Round agreement.

On the import side, concessions granted by Canada will affect some $2.5 billion worth of goods of which Ontario's share is in excess of $1 billion.

The most significant changes in tariff rates are in the area of industrial and manufacturing products. Since Ontario is the manufacturing centre of Canada, with over 50 per cent of total manufacturing activity centred in this province, the effect of the Kennedy Round will be more accentuated here than in other parts of Canada.

A major effect of reduced tariffs is that productivity becomes a more important factor in industrial activity. New competition in our own markets, new opportunities in foreign markets necessitate that our producers increase productivity through longer production runs, rationalization and specialization on product lines in which they are most competitive.

One of the first industries to be affected by the tariff cuts is our industrial machinery and

equipment industry. The new tariff rate of 15 per cent, reduced from 22.5 per cent, took effect on January 1 this year for many of that industry's products. In addition, the duty will be remitted in cases where a machine is not available from Canadian sources.

Ontario's annual production of industrial machinery and equipment is valued at about $800 million. Of this, we export about $200 million, but import about $600 million.

It is difficult to predict the detailed effects of these tariff cuts at this early stage of implementation but in general it appears that in the long run they will be beneficial for our economy. The short-term prospects, however, will include difficulties requiring adjustments.

The impact of these changes is not likely to be disruptive. Canadian tariff concessions have been moderate and left our industries with a still rather high tariff protection. Except for machinery, tariffs are cut gradually over four years providing a reasonable transition period to adjust.

Concessions of our major trading partners have been more substantial than ours:

U.S. — 35 per cent
U.K. — 38 per cent
Common market — 35 per cent
Japan — 30 per cent
Canada — 24 per cent

As a result, our export opportunities will improve.

There has been concern among exporters that the success of the Kennedy Round tariff cuts is being jeopardized by non-tariff barriers. The GATT council is trying to tackle the problem. A list of such hindrances is to be filed with the GATT secretariat by the end of April, 1968. Canadian complaints will be part of the list.

The federal Trade and Commerce Department has sent out more than 6,000 questionnaires to trade associations and exporting manufacturers asking them to identify foreign non-tariff trade barriers (import controls, customs administration, marketing and labelling, foreign exchange, and so on) they feel should be reduced or removed.

The GATT committee will probably meet in June but negotiations between governments are not expected to take place until next year.

(b) Under the federal adjustment assistance programme all Canadian incorporated companies, including U.S. subsidiaries, can be eligible for adjustment loans if they can establish that they had been seriously affected by or faced the threat of serious injury as a result of the Kennedy Round tariff cuts. Applicants must also establish that they cannot obtain adequate financing from usual sources.

15. *Mr. R. Haggerty* (Welland South)—Enquiry of Mr. Allan—re the Niagara parks commission's $90,000 study for preservation of parks in the Niagara peninsula, will he advise: (a) if this study includes the land and shores of Lake Erie for recreational potential of Niagara region; (b) have tenders been let for the site for a new marina on Niagara River at the old shipyards in Bertie township?

Answer by Mr. Allan, chairman of the Niagara parks commission:

(a) This study does not include the lands and shores of Lake Erie.

(b) Tenders have been let for the perimeter dock, which is the first stage of construction.

16. *Mr. T. Reid*—Enquiry of the Ministry—(a) How many per diem instructors of English and communications at the Kemptville agricultural school received payment in the fiscal years 1965-66 and 1966-67 (April 1 to March 31): (b) what was the per diem rate; and (c) how many hours of classroom teaching constitute a day's work?

Answer by the Minister of Agriculture and Food:

(a) There were no "per diem" rate instructors of English and communications at the Kemptville college during the fiscal years 1965-66 and 1966-67. There was, however, one instructor hired on an hourly rate. She worked 211 hours in 1965-66; 27 hours in 1966-67.

(b) $4 per hour.

(c) This instructor was only hired for the exact number of hours necessary to teach. The shortest working day was 2.5 hours; the longest was six hours.

17. *Mr. T. Reid*—Enquiry of the Ministry—1. How many students were enrolled in each of (*a*) the Kemptville agricultural school, and (*b*) the Western Ontario agricultural school, during the fiscal years 1965-66 and 1966-67 (April 1 to March 31)? 2. What were the current expenditures for these two schools for the fiscal years 1965-66 and 1966-67?

Answer: The Minister of Agriculture and Food:

1. *Students Enrolled:*	1965-66	1966-67
(a) Kemptville	218	217
(b) Ridgetown	173	202
2. *Expenditures:*		
Kemptville	$711,242.09	$815,747.64
Ridgetown	574,141.40	624,059.92

Note: If division of expenditures between education, and research and services is required, they are, as follows:

Kemptville—		
education	$349,562.22	$407,094.77
research and services	361,679.87	408,652.87
	$711,242.09	$815,747.64
Ridgetown—		
education	$193,868.64	$198,812.46
research and services	380,272.76	425,247.46
	$574,141.40	$624,059.92

28. *Mr. M. Shulman* (High Park)—Enquiry of the Ministry—During the past three years how many complaints have been received against the different automobile insurance companies doing business in Ontario?

Answer by the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs (Mr. Rowntree):

A total of 526 written complaints have been received during the past three years against the different automobile insurance companies doing business in Ontario.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

THIRD READINGS

The following bills were given third reading upon motion:

Bill 1, An Act to amend The Perpetuities Act, 1966.

Bill 2, An Act to amend The County Judges Act.

Bill 4, An Act to amend The Wages Act.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Speaker, before this bill is put, I would like to reiterate the position of this party on the question of The Wages Act. We got led aside on the red herring of this being retroactive legislation if the amendment which we had introduced had been adopted—that amendment was defeated on division—and we wish simply to reiterate our position about inequity of the wage assignment which will be removed by this Act when it receives Royal assent. In accordance with the amendment which was adopted yesterday, it will declare invalid wage assignments in the future, and we simply reiterate our position that it should be made retroactive to invalidate all wage assignments whether given before or after the coming into force of the Act.

Third readings continued:

Bill 5, An Act to amend The Religious Institutions Act.

Bill 8, An Act to amend The Prearranged Funeral Services Act.

Bill 9, An Act to amend The Minors' Protection Act.

Bill 13, An Act to amend The Ontario Housing Corporation Act.

Bill 46, An Act to amend The Family Benefits Act.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, on Bill 46, we attempted last night to persuade the Minister that the provisions of this bill should be amended to provide for representation from amongst the class of people who receive benefits under The Family Benefits Act. We also endeavoured to get acceptance by the House of the proposition that an applicant or a recipient who appeals to this board for a hearing or review should have available to him, by legislation, the complete record affecting that person in the hands of the department in line with the law of the province of Ontario as it now stands. We endeavoured to have a provision inserted that the costs and expenses incurred by an applicant or a recipient would be borne by the department.

We wished in the Act to make it abundantly clear that the person who is the applicant or recipient could be represented either by himself or by another person, which is a statutory requirement of The Workmen's Compensation Act, but is not a requirement for this Act. We endeavoured in that Act to point out to the Minister that until such time as there is an administrative appeal tribunal in this province, it is absolutely essential that the quality of the persons and their representative character on these boards be such as will enhance the purposes for which the board is being established, and not be subject to any imputation that they are purely an internal appeal procedure of his department.

The government did not see fit to adopt any of those amendments and I simply want to record the position of this party that we stand by those amendments; we think each and every one of them were eminently reasonable, eminently fair, and are required;

and we urge the Minister, if the rest of his colleagues will not get on to the business of implementing the McRuer commission report, that he amend this bill in this session to give effect to the equitable principles of a fair hearing in questions relating to the Acts which are under the administration of his department, particularly The Family Benefits Act, The General Welfare Assistance Act, and The Vocational Rehabilitation Services Act.

Hon. J. Yaremko (Minister of Social and Family Services): Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to get into a debate with the hon. member. May I say this, that it is the intention of the department and myself to have a board of review set up, a cross representation of the people of the province of Ontario who are all vitally interested either as receiving the dollars, or services for which dollars are paid, or who pay the dollars as tax dollars in order that others may share in the wealth of this province.

Secondly, I may say that I reiterated to the House that those provisions which are necessary in order to give justice from a procedural point of view will receive thorough study. I pointed out last night that the hon. member for Scarborough Centre (Mrs. M. Renwick), in her resolution with which I see a great deal of merit and do not quarrel, chose one item of many items in the realm of procedure which could be implemented. I assured the House that this will be given study—long before the members of the NDP put it forward. The procedural items will be studied to be put into effect as administrative practices, incorporated into regulations if necessary, in order that the board do give the kind of service which it is the will of this Legislature —all the members of this House—that it give.

I point out again, and I say this because the Attorney General (Mr. Wishart) is always a very modest chap, that the legal aid system of this province is unequalled in the world and those benefits are available to all the people of the province of Ontario. I am confident that in this field, which we will be pioneering at a scale unequalled in any jurisdiction on the continent, we will end up with what is the very best for the people of Ontario whether they be on the receiving or the giving end. I urge third reading of this bill.

Mr. L. A. Braithwaite (Etobicoke): Last evening, speaking on behalf of this party, we, too, did our best to point out to the Minister that not only must justice be done but it must appear to be done. I agree with the Minister that we have a very, very good legal aid system, but we tried to point out to him yesterday that all road blocks should be removed. There should be no possibility of an individual coming to grief or suffering any undue inconvenience because his case could not be heard quickly. For those reasons we tried to get the Minister to change his Act. We are basically in agreement with the propositions put forward by our friends to the left with reference to these matters. It is hoped that the Minister will accept some of the suggestions that we put to him last evening so that before this bill comes out along with its regulations, some of our ideas will have been incorporated into the bill and into the regulations.

Mr. Speaker: Is there any other member wishing to speak on this matter?

Third readings continued:

Bill 47, An Act to amend The General Welfare Assistance Act.

Bill 48, An Act to amend The Vocational Rehabilitation Services Act, 1966.

Clerk of the House: The 29th order, House in committee of supply; Mr. A. E. Reuter in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF HIGHWAYS

(Continued)

Mr. G. W. Innes (Oxford): I wish to congratulate the Minister (Mr. Gomme) on the presentation of his estimates last evening. May I also pay tribute to the workhorse of his department, namely, the Deputy Minister, Mr. McNab, for his courtesies to me during the year. I also want to commend the staff of the various departments for the very thorough highway needs studies which they have been carrying out. I feel the projected 1958 studies of the provincial highway systems have been completed in great detail. Certainly these studies have pointed out to the department the magnitude of the task before this government. Last evening there was no dynamic approach taken by the Minister in his remarks to cope with the backlog of highway needs so drastically required in the province today. The construction programme of 1968-69 was disappointing on many counts.

Mr. Chairman, at this point I would like to congratulate the Queen's Printer for the new type of estimate book which the members are presented with this year. The extra blank

pages incorporated in the edition and the extended margin are certainly a wonderful improvement and they will enable the members to make notations much more readily. But, Mr. Chairman, again we must comment on the lack of detail provided in the estimates. Three pages contain the complete estimates of the department. These three pages, sir, represent $463,904,000. It is beyond my understanding how the best interests of the people of Ontario can be served in this Legislature when in only three votes we spend this total amount of money.

Furthermore, would it not be to our advantage, and to that of the people of Ontario, if two more columns were added on the estimate page giving last year's approved estimates and actual expenditures which could be used for comparison studies? Large successful business companies exercise their prerogative in showing these figures in their annual statements and audits.

Is it then the lack of success of this department which prevents the same being shown in our estimate books? Herein lies the tale of why the government has not the courage to implement the recommendations asked by the standing committee on public accounts in 1965. In 1965 it was recommended that a three-column page be drawn up in the estimates showing last year's approved figure and actual expenditure along with the proposed estimates.

The current economic trends of society necessitated a continued increase in the use of the automobile. There is a 5 per cent or more increase in the use of the automobile per year. In 1967 there were 2,637,266 automobiles on our roads which represents an increase of 126,426 vehicles. For this reason it is not surprising that The Department of Highways is the second highest-spending department of the government, and this year estimates that it will spend a grand total of $463,904,000.

In 1967 the approved estimate of the department was $405,761,000, and yet, Mr. Chairman, with all this money being spent by the department, we still have highway deficiencies. We still have not completed our Trans-Canada Highway, which had its conception in 1947—21 years to build 1,455 miles, or 72 miles per year. We have a portion of our Highway 17 in eastern Ontario labelled "death alley". We have traffic congestion in the urban areas. We have highways not up to the satisfactory level of service. We have highways in northwestern Ontario that are so pitiful, we hang our heads with shame. These are just a few of the inadequacies of our highway system. I will be dealing with more throughout my comments today.

The problem we are faced with today in The Department of Highways is the result of poor planning in the past. I must repeat, Mr. Chairman, poor planning. How else can we account for the fact that after 21 years we will not have completed the Trans-Canada Highway? At the end of 1968, 103 miles of Trans-Canada will still not be up to Trans-Canada standards. That certainly is not good.

It is true that The Department of Highways has set up many study programmes—five-year, ten-year and 20-year studies. Mr. Chairman, by the time these reports are given, they themselves are out of date. They are not current enough to deal with today's problems, let alone those of the future. In some cases where they have recognized today's problems, the government has not acted on their proposals. The workings of The Department of Highways are miles behind, when in fact they should be miles ahead. "A Plan for Ontario Highways," a study completed in 1956, states:

> There is no doubt that not only has the road building failed to keep pace with the traffic growth but that the situation has progressively deteriorated during the post-war period.

Twelve years later this statement still holds true. Both the 1956 and the 1958 studies, "Ontario Roads and Streets," state that roads built today should have the facility to carry the traffic 20 years from now. The 1958 study also says that by 1977 the traffic will be two and one-half times greater than it was in 1957. Today our roads have the facility to carry the traffic of 1957. We are 20 years behind.

> Postponements of needed construction would prolong the aggravations and the hazards of inadequate facilities and hamper economic growth.

That is from "Ontario Roads and Streets," 1958.

All we can garner from the government in this particular Department of Highways is inaction and they do not seem to care. They were given a course of action and chose to ignore it. If they did, or they do care, why is it that northern Ontario, northwestern Ontario and parts of eastern Ontario are still penalized with inadequate transportation facilities? Is not part of the reason for the lack of growth in northern Ontario the result of poor roads? Maybe part of the reason for

the predicted 10 per cent decrease in the tourist industry for 1968 is the fact that our tourists are tired and frustrated driving on our northern roads.

We have plans that are not used. Why? Herman Kahn and Anthony Wiener in their book, *The Year 2000,* list reasons why plans sometimes go astray, one of which is particularly true here and I quote:

> Criteria for decisions are often too narrow because the decision makers are parochial, partisan and self-interested, or simply not accustomed to considering the new criteria that are becoming relevant.

Wilbur Smith Associates of New Haven, Connecticut, have published the report of a survey done by United States traffic planning consultants on the need for 16,200 miles of highway network, sir, linking all the metropolitan area of Canada. This Canadian network would be part of a 128,000-mile inter-metro area covering North America. The survey states that the Canadian portion of the inter-metro area will serve more than 80 per cent of Canada's population by the year 2000. Is the government aware of this report? Hopefully they are, and hopefully they are in the process of comparing our long-range studies with this report. If not, I urge the department to do so at once. It is so important that we not be left behind, and this can so easily happen unless the government begins to think in the future.

Mr. Chairman, the task of acquiring land for highways around the Metro area in Toronto and the other large cities has become very costly. Studies are now being made in New York to utilize air space above highways. High-rise apartment buildings are now straddling New York's cross-Bronx expressway. Utilization of some of the air space over our highways in Ontario, especially in Metro, is certainly worth looking into.

In order to meet the needs of today's traffic and in order to be ready to meet the needs of traffic in the future, I ask for the following:

1. A speedup in the completion of highway construction.

2. An active programme of road building in the northern part of Ontario.

3. Acceleration in the building of four-lane highways throughout the province.

4. The elimination of the tolls on the Burlington and Garden City skyways.

5. The standardization of all signs and traffic lights and safety features that should be implemented.

6. The elimination of level grade crossings on all the freeways and secondary roads and a greater effort to eliminate railway crossings, that is level railway crossings, in co-operation with the Canadian transport commission.

7. A change in the grant structure so that municipalities and counties will not be taxed so heavily and will be able to provide the roads which are urgently needed.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for a forward programme in the construction of connecting links throughout this province. We must keep pace with the economic expansion and to do this we must speed up our efforts in this regard. I do not think that any of the members of this House will argue that I am asking too much of a department whose expenditures rise every year and which this year has the second highest expenditure in the government. What I have asked for are top priorities and I certainly hope we will see some of them implemented by the end of the year.

I have not mentioned GO transit at this time, as the member for York Centre (Mr. Deacon will be dealing with this aspect of The Department of Highways when votes 906 and 911 come before the House.

I would now like to deal with each of the recommendations I have put before the House and to prove to this House why I consider them top priority. I ask for a speedup in the completion of highway construction throughout the province. I am thinking here not only of Highway 401 and the Trans-Canada, but also Highway 17 between Ottawa and the Quebec border, Highway 8 past Thorso to Shawville, a highway that is a disgrace and a death trap, and the many more throughout southern and northern Ontario. Mr. Chairman, the year-end report of the Minister and a news release from his department said, I quote:

> During the year, 26 miles of Ontario's trans-provincial freeway, Highway 401, were placed in service. Over a 16.5-mile section from Iroquois easterly to the Aultsville sideroad, the north lanes were completed and opened to traffic in August. On the 25 miles which is being constructed on a new alignment between Gananoque and Brockville, 10 miles of this new four-lane freeway from Gananoque easterly were completed and opened in September. Grading of the remaining 15 miles is well advanced and contracts for the paving had been awarded by the end of the year.

Mr. Chairman, in March, 1962, the then Minister of Highways, the hon. Mr. Goodfellow, had this to say, and I quote:

> Questions have been raised in connection with the department's decision to pave only two lanes of Highway 401 instead of doing the four lanes at one time. In the hope of clarifying this matter once and for all, I wish to state that the department's primary concern from the beginning has been to put in service a paved surface over the full 510-mile road of Highway 401 at the earliest date. In order to meet our promise of achieving this objective in 1963, we have had to build several sections on which only two sections have been paved.

And our present Speaker of the House, when he was Minister of Highways, had this to say of 401—that it would be complete and would be "super in every respect" by 1963. Well, here it is 1968, and it is still not finished. I would have thought that inasmuch as last year was Canada's centennial, a greater effort should have been made by this department to have it completed.

I want to mention just one portion of this incomplete highway that has alarmed us all—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Innes: It is a section of Highway 401 in Leeds county that should have been completed five years ago. On October 30, 1967, the hon. Minister of Highways had this to say about the unfinished strip: "There seems to be some controversy over this highway, Mr. Chairman."

It has not been controversy, it has been deaths. This strip of highway is known as "death alley". Last year, more than 20 people lost their lives on this small portion of the 401. The Minister said that part of the reason for the delay could be placed on the shoulders of the lobbyist. While the lobbyist lobbied, people lost their lives.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): What did he mean by that?

Mr Innes: From the Windsor *Star*, October 20, 1967—a fine paper—"Death strip still on 401". And I well recall, hon. members, when I was in this House previously that the members from the western part of the province complained about the death strip in that section, and finally after much urging they got it paved. But the Windsor *Star* had this to say:

> "It is only a few years back, when an undue number of people were getting killed or injured in traffic accidents on the uncompleted section of 401 in southwestern Ontario. This was the two-lane death strip which connected the completed sections of the four-lane super highway. There still is a death strip on 401 down Brockville way. Sixteen already have been killed on this 20-mile stretch of a two-lane road. It won't become four-lane until some time next year. We hope it will be next year. It is difficult to understand this dilatory completion of 401. It was only under great pressure that it was finally completed in southwestern Ontario. There is no excuse for it not having been done long ago in eastern Ontario. The province has not been niggardly in providing the money for extra lanes on the Toronto bypass or other improvements in that area.

I am glad to see that construction is finally underway to complete 401 from Ivy Lea to Brockville. Five years too late and many deaths later, this government finally does something. "Top priority" the Minister is supposed to have said in the Kingston *Whig Standard*, October 30, 1967. But even though it is top priority, the Minister is unwilling to give a final commitment as to its completion. I hope for once when this department says "top priority" it means it and this highway will be completed in 1968.

Mr V. M. Singer (Downsview): That will be a change.

Mr. Innes: And, of course, we must mention the constant construction of Highway 401 around Metro. Will it never end? Hopefully, there will come a time when we can meet today's needs and be prepared for the future.

There appeared in the Stratford *Beacon Herald*, July 11, 1967: "Calls 401 a Farce". Now this is a lady I have a lot of regard for, Miss True Davidson, mayor of East York.

> "Highway 401 was a farce in planning," Miss True Davidson, mayor of East York, told a civic design seminar here Monday. She said the highway, originally built as a Toronto bypass, has become a glorified commuters' road. "The government would continue to spend money on widening roads and the crowds would still be unsupportable," she said. Her comments on the highway cropped up during a discussion on an appraisal of current trends in urban living, by L. N. Armstrong, executive officer of the Canadian council on urban and regional research.

Until that time, until we are brought up-to-date on the construction of 401 around Metro Toronto, this road will continue to be a hazard to motorists, and the congestion at peak periods will increase. Although I could talk all day on the construction needs of our highways and their urgent need for completion, at this time I want to mention just one of the many disgraces other than Highway 401 that we in the province of Ontario have to deal with—the completion of the Trans-Canada Highway.

As was stated in the Fort William *Times-Journal* August 23, 1967:

> The Trans-Canada is no credit to Ontario. Much of the road is, in fact, a disgrace, particularly along the northwestern Ontario stretch. The Ontario Conservatives have started off their election propaganda on a theme of "You never had it so good". Whatever truth there may have been in that slogan, however, is not apparent to the motorist arriving in Ontario from the west. He has it a lot better out there and the change becomes painfully apparent at the Manitoba border.
>
> The Ontario government with its great capacity for gimmicks, gives motorists a choice of Trans-Canada routes. There is a central Ontario route Highway 7 and 17; an Ottawa Valley and Superior route; Highway 17, and a northern route Highway 11. But none of these routes is up to the Trans-Canada standards set by the Maritimes and the west.
>
> Highway 11, the northern route of the Trans-Canada is not up to Trans-Canada standards. How long do the people of the north have to suffer? Is it not about time that we made a concentrated effort to complete this highway and give to these people what they so richly deserve? The potential is there. Northern Ontario has a great contribution to make to this province. Let's let them. And to do this, this part of Trans-Canada must be completed.

The completion of Highway 17, the Trans-Canada, leads me into my second recommendation to this department, and that is for an active programme of road-building in the northern and northwestern parts of this province. All one needs to do is to look at a road map to see the necessity for an active programme in this area. If this is indeed the province of opportunity, the northerners should have a chance to share in this opportunity.

The 1956 study stated that there is a direct relation between the level of economic activity and the volume of highway traffic. In order to get the economic activity then in northern Ontario, we must have highway volume. And the only way we are going to get highway volume is to build some roads. This is vital to the growth in this part of the province.

The Fort William *Times-Journal* on September 18, had this to say:

> Resources of the area are timber, mining and tourism. The timber companies are reluctant to expand; the mining companies pay royalties but do not open ore deposits for mining; and tourism is still in its infancy. Expansion of tourism and industry depends on a good highway which is, of course, the responsibility of the provincial government.

The expansion of population and the greater use of the automobile has resulted in the expansion of rural and urban living areas and in wider markets throughout the province. Tourism today is the province's second largest industry. And yet, this industry is bound to be hurt in areas where tourism could flourish except for the fact that the roads cannot facilitate the traffic.

Four-lane highways are needed in so many areas of the province. I will give you but one example, and this was taken from the North Bay *Nugget*, September 19, 1967:

> CHANGE TWO-BIT ROAD TO FOUR-LANE HIGHWAY
>
> The president of the North Bay and district chamber of commerce, Morley Pringle, today rapped the government for procrastination and uncertainty in its highway construction programme. Mr. Pringle issued this statement: This is the age of the super highways for faster and safer transportation of people and merchandise. In one breath, we have responsible government officials expounding the need to develop the vast industrial northland, and in the next, procrastination and uncertainty in providing the necessary traffic artery, because traffic surveys did not support the need.
>
> Surely if this was evident in 1965, it was much more so in 1967. To impose the steady increase of merchandise by truck into areas not fully, nor adequately serviced by rail and to inflict this need on a a two-bit, two-lane highway through the approaches to North Bay is difficult to understand.
>
> It is more confusing than ever to have finally attained the status of a designated

area with all the built-in potential benefits that industrial expansion can enjoy, only to have our own provincial government suggest that the time is not quite right to eliminate the two lane bottleneck. North Bay has been advertised across the Dominion and throughout the United States as the gateway to the north. We boast of our Ontario Northland Railway and headquarters in North Bay and we lustily proclaim it as our development road. Surely, it is only common sense that we must consolidate this position and provide for further northern development beyond the local threshhold by at least completing a four-lane highway into this gateway to northern horizons.

We have many more which go on to state Trans-Canada is no credit to Ontario. We have one from the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. Boyer), the vice-chairman of Hydro, and he has this to say: "Campaign by the North Bay *Nugget* for the four-lane blending of Highway 11 to North Bay shows a reasonable attitude." Then he went on to say: "Any improvement in our general area helps us all," and said "Widening of the Toronto bypass cannot help but help North Bay." He said that this applies to any improvement at the Ontario-U.S. border.

We have other tourist councils, regional tourist councils from Gravenhurst, making recommendations. We have a "Four-lane Highway 11, the golden spine of the tourist district." This is a statement made by Mayor Hugh Bishop of Gravenhurst.

"Four-laning Highway 11 would repay the north for many do-nothing years — Reeve Donald King of Widdifield township. And so it goes on, editorial after editorial.

Certainly, Mr. Chairman, Highway 400 has been a gateway to the north and no hon. member in this House can deny the growth it has engendered, not only in tourist trade, but also industrially. But, the congestion which is taking place on the two-lane sections of Highway 69 north to Sudbury and Highway 11 north to North Bay is stifling the northern growth. From time to time we hear of the word "priority." If there ever should be a crash programme of highway construction, surely this should take place now. The future for the north and its expansion can very well be determined by the speed with which Highway 11 and Highway 69 can become four lanes.

The vast growth areas of southwestern Ontario and the London, Stratford, Woodstock, Kitchener and Waterloo areas now require a more direct route to the north. The constant funnelling of traffic from the east and west to Highway 400 has added unbearable congestion to the highway system around Toronto. The saturation point is here. Action must be forthcoming immediately. Motorists from southwestern and southeastern Ontario travel along 401 to Toronto in order to make connections with 400 north. This adds further traffic to the already overtaxed system around 400. Alternate routes should be encouraged to take some of the traffic north by other highway systems which would be more direct.

These two areas are so important that perhaps a change in our fiscal policies is needed to overcome the backlog of needs and pave the way for the expansion of the north. As it was mentioned in the last clipping, I quote:

> Adequate revenues for highway building and improvements can only be realized by providing highways that will attract consistent traffic and more revenue.

Mr. Carl Wilder of the Portland cement association, when he outlined the inter-metro area highway network, told members of the Canadian construction association not to worry about the increasing costs in road building because, and I quote:

> The annual income for highway purposes during the three decades ahead likely will average about twice what it does today.

Poor highways will hinder the north—hinder the growth not only of the north but of the province as a whole. Adequate highways will increase growth—growth in tourism, in industry, in employment and in trade. We must accelerate our highway programme. There need not be a lack of capital. Adopting the programme put forward by my leader, a northern development fund would give us the opportunity to meet the needs of today and of our future in our highway system.

For many years, our party has asked for the elimination of the tolls on the Burlington and Garden City skyways. The Smith report is in agreement with us. Chapter 30, paragraph 79, page 269, reads as follows, and I quote:

> Ontario's two skyways are part of a larger road network and the decision to build them should have been taken and presumably was taken within the context of the overall Ontario road system and not simply on the ground that they would be toll financed. Once built, on whatever

> ground, we see no valid argument that tolls should be charged for their use. We, therefore, recommend that toll charges for the use of the Burlington and Garden City skyways be eliminated.

It is surely one recommendation that we will see put into effect this year.

Uniformed traffic controls and uniformed signing across this province are long overdue. Ontario should take the lead in initiating a common code in Ontario and leading a move to extend it across Canada and eventually across America. Many studies are being made these days and thousands of dollars spent for safety on our highways. Last year, it was announced there would be advanced warning signs ahead of highway construction and "slow down" signs but they have been forgotten.

The marking of highways is an intricate operation and also important. There are two primary purposes: to contribute to the safety of the motorist, and to contribute to his convenience. Inadequacy of directional signs can cause tourists to become confused or even lost. Sound can be important in traffic safety, says the Ontario safety league. Car horns, train whistles give direct warnings. Sometimes overtaking vehicles in a blind spot are heard before they are seen. More experiments should be carried out with rumble strips and singing medians on highways. These are surfaces on which tires reverberate to warn inattentive drivers when they are approaching a hazardous intersection or veering too close to the shoulder of the road. The Barrie *Examiner* on February 2, 1968, had this to say about the new highways being safer:

> Fifty thousand lives a year is beginning to be talked about as the minimum price Americans can expect to pay for the privilege of driving automobiles. That grim massacre will only be held that low through most strenuous effort, only that is, if the present rate on the highway is cut in half. The rate is only half what it was 30 years ago. It ran an all-time low at 5.2 deaths per hundred million miles in 1961, and since then has steadily been creeping upward. Even if the rate could be held constant, total deaths must go up because highway traffic is increasing by about five per cent a year.
>
> Significantly, the fatality rate on the inter-state highway system is 2.8 per hundred thousand, per hundred million vehicle miles, compared with 9.7 on the older highways. The new super highways are already saving one life for every five miles open to traffic. On the basis of experience this far, they will save 8,000 lives a year when the new network is completed.

The U.S. bureau of public roads says accidents happen to normal people driving in a normal way on normal roads. It is not a small group of chronically dangerous drivers that is responsible for most accidents. Accidents involve an entirely different group of drivers each year.

In many cases, the existing vehicle highway system makes too great a demand on the drivers. They are being asked to make judgments and decisions more quickly and more accurately than they are able to do. Since the same people are on the superhighways, as on the old roads, a lower fatality rate on the former must be due to better roads, not better drivers, the bureau concludes, and it attacks the province from two sides. It stresses the need to make the rural highways safer, and pushes for more superhighway mileage. It also calls for more research aimed at engineering greater safety into the whole transportation system, so that all drivers, not just the minority of reckless ones, are helped.

Highway signs tell the greatest story ever told, yet not many drivers take the time to read them, or know what they are all about. Everyone should drive ahead and pay strict attention to the signs. "We must bring up to date signs to aid motorists." This is what the Brampton *Times* stated in December, 1967. After the inquiry into the death trap at the intersection of Highway 7 and the Fourth Line was to be expected. But we are nonetheless, grateful for it.

Whatever the principal causes for crashes are determined to be by the inquiry, one factor seems to be insufficient warning to motorists on the Fourth Line that they are approaching a highway. There are stop signs, of course, but possibly not sufficiently impressive, or sufficiently numerous, or perhaps not placed to the best aid of the motorist. Several motorists who use the Fourth Line regularly said that they get so used to sailing along meeting virtually no traffic that the county intersection at Highway 7 comes as a shock. Cars are faster, speed limits are higher, and traffic is heavier than when many of the traffic signs were put up, and we are taking a while to catch up with the new conditions except on provincial freeways.

Here is a story from the Toronto *Telegram* of February 15, 1968: headed "Inquest Raps

401 Signs—A coroner's jury yesterday criticized the placing of highway signs on the Macdonald freeway".

The jury found that a truck was badly parked, and that the driver got out on the wrong side. It also said that the car driver entered the feeder lane by mistake. The jury recommended the placing of signs on highways to advise of feeder lanes as well as exit lanes.

From time to time, it has been brought to my attention the inconsistency of emergency telephone numbers throughout the province of Ontario. The Bell Telephone company performs a great service to the public by advertising that in case of emergency, one should simply dial 000. Their operators have been trained to handle these emergencies and calls. I maintain that it should be the duty of The Department of Highways to insist that this same service be given by the independent telephone companies in the province. After all, the motorists from whom we collect thousands of dollars in taxation surely deserve this safety service in this very wealthy province.

The soaring number of fatalities at railway crossings is of great concern to all citizens. The faster trains and the greater density of automobiles accelerates the number of tragedies each year. In 1967, there were 417 accidents; 215 were injured and 83 were killed. In other words, of the 1,109 killed in Ontario on roads and highways in 1967, almost 7 per cent were at railway crossings. Just yesterday, an executive of the CNR, speaking in Oshawa had this to say:

> "In more than one third of the accidents between trains and motor vehicles at level crossings, the vehicle has run into the train," D. V. Gander, vice president of Canadian National Railways said yesterday. "In 681 accidents at CNR crossings last year—

Now I assume that they are taking their year-end as December 31, whereas the department takes theirs as March 31:

> "In 681 accidents last year at CNR crossings, 89 persons were killed and 314 injured," he told the Oshawa Rotary club. "Ontario's accident rate is about the same as that of the nation as a whole."
>
> He cited other steps possible to make level crossings safer, emphasizing one low cost measure—compulsory stop signs. This method was tried in Beaverton where there has been six crossing accidents over a two-year period, and he said, "Over the next two years, there was only one accident. Police would be expected to enforce these mandatory stops the same way as any other mandatory stop is enforced," he said.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the fact that this has quite a bit to do with the federal transport board, but from January 1, 1966, to January 1, 1967, only a total of 11 level crossings were improved or modernized by the installation of modern automatic signals in the province. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the Minister take extra steps to co-operate with the federal board of transport commissioners in order to eliminate more of these death traps in the province of Ontario.

In my own particular county in 1967, we have five different railway crossings, and at the five, there were five fatalities; up to the moment, only one of these has had an automatic signal installed. The few remaining bridges and overpasses on non-access roads on the Queen Elizabeth Way, Highways 400 and 401 must be stepped up if we are to achieve the intended purpose of the goal of this system.

I want to speak a little bit to you about the grant system, Mr. Chairman, as was mentioned by the Smith report. The Smith report on taxation reveals great inequity in the structure of the provincial grants to the municipalities. The report advances the view that motor vehicle revenues in Ontario should finance 65 per cent to 75 per cent of the total expenditure on the overall road network, provincial or local.

With the exception of development roads, controlled-access expressways, and certain connecting links, road financing hinges on the status of the municipality, not to the relative flow of user traffic and access benefits. The report indicates that "our present municipal status is a virtually meaningless guide." In addition, it states that "whether it be county or city, the status should be classified with accordance to the flow of user benefits and access benefits."

It also went on to state that:

> The Department of Highways should prepare a scheme for all road classification in accordance with the user and local access benefits that flow from them, and assign each Ontario road and street to its appropriate class within five years of the publication of this report.

Further on in the report, it is stated that:

> Upon the completion of the road classification scheme, provincial road grants should be based on total expenditure for

> each class of road in a municipality; a percentage of provincial aid to coincide with the percentage of user benefits assigned to each class of road. And that municipalities be given the right to appeal classification of any road first to The Department of Highways and then to the Ontario municipal board which will have the right to require further studies by The Department of Highways, whose decision shall be final.

I think that this is very important, Mr. Chairman. At the moment, the decision of the Minister is final in all these aspects.

> Traditional measures accompany the introduction of the new road grants to help municipalities adjust the change in provincial payments, such measures to be gradually phased out within five years of the introduction of the new grant system.

The report very strongly criticized the Ministerial discretion which is currently being employed by this department. And I quote: "We are of the opinion that in Ontario Ministerial discretion is great—and I underline that—has been increasing, and ought to be reduced."

Mr. Chairman, this should not be condoned in this province any longer.

> Development roads are a particularly prime example of what, in our view, constitute an undue measure of Ministerial discretion. And this has been created by the inadequacies of the existing grant system.

The recommendation also states:

> That development roads be designated by the Minister on the sole criterion of population sparsity, and a list of roads so designated be tabled annually in the Legislature.

And this, in my opinion, is fully justified.

> In review, the committee recommends that: Roads designated as development roads should either be under provincial jurisdiction or, where population growth is likely, be provincially supported in such a manner that development status is phased out over a period of no more than ten years, at the end of which the road becomes an integral part of the municipal system.

But special consideration should be given to roads which are not geared to any of the formulas mentioned above.

Well, Mr. Chairman, as was indicated in the Ontario committee on taxation, there should be an unbiased approach to connecting links, development roads and bypasses. I want to give you an example of what I mean. Back a few years ago when—I do not think he is in the House—the member for Haldimand-Norfolk (Mr. Allan) was Minister of Highways and also member for Haldimand-Norfolk riding, a development road was built running north from Highway 3 to the Oxford county border. This road connected with No. 59 to the Long Point provincial park; a very significant road carrying a great deal of traffic. For many years the county of Oxford has requested that this road from the Norfolk border on up through Oxford be classified as a development road, and certainly it was receiving the same amount of traffic as was the one in Norfolk.

Mr. Nixon: A very reasonable request!

Mr. Innes: It connected with a paved road up at Rock Mills, a distance of approximately five miles. What has happened? Absolutely nothing from that time to today. But, Mr. Chairman, this gravelled road is being used most extensively in the summer months by tourists travelling to Long Point from all parts of the province. The county has finally given up trying to keep this road in shape, and they have decided to go ahead and pave it themselves this year.

Surely, sir, if ever there was need for a new approach to development roads by the formula of the relative flow of user and access benefits, this is a perfect example. Certainly this was not the criterion used in this instance.

The many advantages of bypasses around the cities and towns are countless. Several cities are enjoying these advantages now. But, Mr. Chairman, there must be a speedup in construction of these across the province to ease congestion of flow in the crowded traffic congested areas. If the 20-year highway plan has any value, it certainly should apply to bypasses which will have such an impact on some of our communities across the province. Editorials to this effect are quite common throughout the newspapers in the province.

To bring this problem more in focus, let me tell you about the proposed truck bypass in the city of Woodstock, in my riding of Oxford, and I quote from the *Sentinel-Review* of December 9, 1967:

> FOOTBALL SEASON IS OVER, BUT NOT AT QUEEN'S PARK
>
> The refusal of The Ontario Department of Highways to consider a bypass which

would take most of the heavy traffic, through truck traffic, off Dundas Street has been rightly greeted with dismay by Woodstock citizens, particularly those who live, work, or have occasion to visit the core area of our city.

I might mention that Dundas Street is the main street of the city of Woodstock.

It is doubly regrettable in that when the former MPP for this riding, Mr. Gordon W. Pittock, was nominated for election last spring, a member of The Department of Highways, who was present, announced that a bypass would be forthcoming in the foreseeable future. He even traced it through in general terms as being west of the city not far from the cement plant.

Mr B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): An employee of The Department of Highways?

Mr. Innes: I think it could have been the Minister; I am reading the editorial, but I think it could have been the Minister.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Innes: He will correct me:

With the provincial election over and Mr. Pittock defeated, Woodstock gets the back of the hand.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Innes: To continue:

The problem with new traffic in the congested downtown area has been a bone of contention for many years—

Mr. Nixon: Should have gone out with R. B. Bennett!

Mr. Innes: Continuing again:

—and has been growing steadily. When the final link of Highway 401 was opened, there was hope that some of this congestion would be eased. When traffic continued at a high level, truck firms using Dundas Street were contacted and many agreed to co-operate. When even this did not seem to help adequately, The Department of Highways was called in to make a survey.

The results of the survey made in recent years found that some 1,800 trucks use Dundas Street each day. It was claimed only one third were through trucks. This means 600 heavy trucks daily on Dundas Street or an average of between one and two per minute, day and night. We may well anticipate that as the city grows, and the large new wing of the cement plant gets in its stride, this traffic volume will increase noticeably.

Yet it is not altogether the number of trucks that are at the root of the problem. Bad as this is, there is also the question of their noise, their fumes, and the pounding they give the pavement. It is hard on the nerves of the people along Dundas Street and makes it almost impossible to carry on a conversation at certain times.

We understand some reference was made to the noise factor at a Toronto meeting—

And, by the way, I think I made that notation myself when I visited with the Minister.

—but Highways officials said that this was the responsibility of The Department of Transport, not theirs. This is a fine example of splitting hairs.

It is good to learn that the city officials and others concerned have no intention of letting this matter drop.

May we suggest that a meeting of the government officials concerned be held here when the civic administration moves to the old post office building?

That is to say, they would like you to come to Woodstock and have your meeting right on Dundas Street where you could listen to the traffic, hear the traffic, and try to carry on a conversation.

This should provide enough tangible evidence to the problem which cannot be grasped by those who sit in the quiet of Queen's Park.

In fairness, the department did suggest alternatives, one which would take vehicles along Norwich Avenue, Parkinson Road and Mill Street. Yet this would require rebuilding the road surfaces and what lies between them, and would not take account of the inconvenience of residents in those streets or the danger to children.

The city could pass a bylaw prohibiting trucks more than a certain size on Dundas Street. But this raises a question of how to reroute them to their destination. Considering all the angles, the most appropriate answer would seem to be the construction of an entirely new bypass such as the one referred to last spring. Council and others must continue to press the government until it has this, and it is the only real solution.

Mind you, this alternate route was proposed through a residential area, which included three schools, three school crossing-guard areas, and two very steep grades. It would also go along the largest park area in the city of Woodstock and along the several other inconvenient aspects, too numerous to mention. Naturally, the city turned this down 100 per cent. The department indicated this would do for ten years and then they would look at it again.

Mr. Chairman, this department simply is not planning for the future of this area. This is one of the fastest growing areas in the province, industrially and commercially; a series of highways around the city demand the truck bypass now.

If the province is really serious about decentralization surely some of the millions of dollars which are spent in the Toronto area can, and should be, diverted to areas such as Woodstock. Sooner or later it must be done. There is no time like the present. In the 20-year needs study the statement was made, "Roads are built now to serve 20 years or more." Planning must be far enough ahead of demand to reserve necessary land. Governments must plan their finances to build the right kind of facilities when they are needed.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): Mr. Chairman, in rising to speak upon the estimates of The Department of Highways for 1968-1969, I feel a certain temerity. I am not an engineer. I have not built highways or bridges. I have not had a very great opportunity to think about the problems of highway construction, highway planning, highway maintenance. I am a teacher and now a member of the provincial Legislature.

My experience with highways, until a few weeks ago, was gained simply from driving over them and from a certain amount of reading in the press dating back to the years when bridges were being paid for but not being built, and people were leaving for holidays in Florida and not returning. But I got the picture that most people of Ontario get—the picture of highways that seem to be a long time in building, that seem to be inadequate once they are completed, that seem to need rehabilitating long before the expected life that they were originally built to achieve was realized. My experience has been the experience of seeing work done, which is undone within a year or two by the elements.

All our engineering and technical skill does not seem to have enabled us to build highways which will last for 20 years, let alone the 2,000 years that the Roman highways in Europe lasted, so my background is not the background of the experts. It is the background of the user and, more recently, the background of the reader and the student. I trust, therefore, Mr. Chairman, that you will indulge me if I begin my examination of the highway construction programme for 1968-1969 using the perspective of the teacher rather than that of the professional engineer.

It was a medieval belief that the state or body politic could be likened to the body of a human being. Highways and canals as a body politic were equivalent to the veins and arteries of the human body. Just as a problem or malfunction in the human system of circulation could lead to illness or even death, it was felt that the interference of free flow of commerce over the highways and canals of the state could lead to serious economic illness in the state. This view leads to an early acceptance of the fact that highways and canals were an essential area of public responsibility and the agencies of government charged with the maintenance of economic wellbeing and health within the nation were early given the responsibility for the maintenance of good highways and good canals.

I think we can dispense with the canals as an aspect of our discussions, but I suggest there is a certain relevance to this rather quaint, medieval idea in the term of the present world. I realize that the theory as a theory is no longer regarded as a valid criterion for decision-making. It is no longer seen as a guide to life, but there is, I would suggest, a certain relevancy still. There is this relevancy, despite our tendency to regard the idea as dated, quaint, and of mere antiquarian interest. There is merit in the idea, despite our preoccupation with the kind of thinking that superseded this medieval concept. I refer to the concept of the pork barrel which has dominated politics in Canada for a number of years.

The philosophy of this kind of politics is rather simple. It was based upon the view that the government was a privileged position of power and that any means at all could be employed with which to insure the continuance of power. One of the most popular methods developed for insuring this continuance of power was to reward those areas that voted for the government and penalize those areas which voted against it.

I need only refer you, Mr. Chairman, to the capital construction programme of 1963-1964. Might I remind the chairman in the House that this was an election year. On

page 134 of this programme under Paving 209 (62) Highway No. 545, location Capreol northerly to Moose Mountain—length in miles, 13. This road was paved, the election was held, and the member was re-elected. You will note, Mr. Chairman, that the reference I have made in Capreol is northerly and I would like to refer you to Capreol southerly.

The approaches from the south to Capreol are, and have been for a number of years, in a very poor condition. It has been the contention of this government in 1966 through 1967 that no work would be done on the southerly approaches to Capreol until certain local improvement work was done in the village of Hanmer.

However, in 1967—and I again draw your attention to the fact that this was an election year—the government reversed itself, went into the town of Hanmer and rebuilt the main street. Inferior as it might be, it was rebuilt.

The election has come and gone and we, in assessing the present situation, find that the remaining five-mile stretch of highway between the village of Hanmer and the town of Capreol—a stretch of highway upon which all the necessary plans, the surveys, the estimates, and even the contract, have been prepared, according to the officials in the Sudbury area, is again not slated for 1968-1969. Is this next five miles to wait until 1971?

Just to outline the condition of this highway I will draw on certain of the facts presented to me by certain of the constituents in this area. This five-mile section of the road, at the end of which there is a population of 3,000, has been responsible, and is responsible, for a serious cost to many of the citizens of that town. I would like to explain this in a little more detail. At the present time one garage alone of the three in Capreol is installing up to 20 schock absorbers a week. These shocks are not broken at the bolt, the seals are broken. This is just one indication of just how deplorable this highway is.

Another example that could be shown is the case of a constituent who drove over this road last year and the back portion of the car dropped into a hole which was so deep that the muffler caught against the pavement tearing the muffler and the tail pipe from the car. There are many other examples that could be included here, such as tires blowing out when they hit the bumps, shocks and springs being broken. This, Mr. Chairman, is just to indicate the state to which this road has now deteriorated. Sir, I am urging this government to reconstruct this highway this year before people are killed as a result of its condition. I would like to illustrate it with a letter that I received Saturday:

Dear Sir:

In the past few years we the people of northern Ontario have been subjected to a form of amnesia from our provincial government. All affairs of this province are conducted in the southern regions. The north has but one claim to a participation of governmental activities and that is taxation. Our roads are by no means the best. They are unkept except for the patching of some potholes. As a citizen of this area I would like to comment on an experience of mine.

On Friday night, March 22, when returning from a hockey game in Sudbury, I hit a pothole in front of Chenier's store in Hanmer. My speed at that time was 30 miles per hour. A car was approaching from the opposite direction at the time of this incident. Therefore, I could not swerve to miss the hole in the highway. It blew my right rear tire and bent the rim. The inconvenience of trying to repair the damage with the estimated cost of $45 would infuriate any citizen.

I ask one question. Are we to be subjects of an arrogant government? I would assume that with the way governmental spending is blooming they could put aside some money from a pampered pet project and rebuild the road in this area.

Thanking you for your interest,

Herb Dyment.

There was another incident that took place on this highway, Mr. Chairman, to which I would like to draw to your attention. One evening as I was driving north from Sudbury to Capreol I came upon a car at the foot of a hill and the owner had the hood up and he was peering anxiously at the engine. He was obviously trying to determine why the car had come to a halt. I stopped to give what help I could and further study of the situation revealed to myself and to the unfortunate car driver that at the top of the hill which he had just come down he had hit one of the bumps and his gasoline tank had been ripped right off the car.

This is the condition, Mr. Chairman, which leads me to ask the hon. Minister of Highways to tour this section of the road with me. It is this bad. In fact, Mr. Chairman, certain well

known Tories have phoned the Minister's office directly from Capreol because the condition of this road is so deplorable; and again it is not in the plans to be done this year.

I realize that Hanmer needs a sewer and water system, but it will be 1970 before their earliest completion date. Are the people to drive over this road for another two years, when one garage alone instals 20 shocks a week in a town where there are only 3,000 people?

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Martel: Probably he did. In fact, for the hon. member across the hall, Mr. Chairman, we got more than the Liberals and the Tories combined.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): We will get even more the next time too.

Mr. Martel: And if you think you are punishing them—

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Do you want to bet?

Mr. MacDonald: It would be unfair of me to take money from such a impecunious gentleman.

Mr. Martel: This kind of accident, Mr. Chairman, is all the more startling when you reflect on the fact this is what is euphemistically referred to as a paved road.

Mr. Chairman, I could document in more detail this kind of pre-election activity. I could refer you to the situation in the town of Foleyet, in northern Ontario, where the main street for a number of years has been a quagmire in the spring and fall, and an obstacle course in the summer and winter.

Mr. G. Demers (Nickel Belt): It is being paved.

Mr. Martel: I am coming to that, if the hon. member would listen, I am coming to that point.

Mr. Demers: It was started last year.

Mr. Martel: That is right. In 1967, an election year Mr. Chairman.

I could refer you to the fact that shortly before the election, October 17, 1967, The Department of Highways moved into the town of Foleyet and began extensive reconstruction of the town's main street. They were entitled to it, it is the timing that is important here.

Mr. W. Hodgson (Yorth North): What is important is they have it paved now.

Mr. Martel: I think the hon. member to my left missed the point. If he would just listen. I could refer you as well to many cases brought to my attention by members of the New Democratic Party as well as people from ridings not represented by the New Democratic Party.

The pattern, however, Mr. Chairman, is clear. There seems to be a great burst of activity prior to each election, and immediately the election is over this activity seems to subside and the peace and calm, which seems to characterize The Department of Highways between elections, settles again for another three years.

However, I think enough has been said to suggest that when I as a highway user, and the other people of Ontario, drive upon the highways we cannot help but come to the conclusion that the philosophic motivation of the department is the motivation which I referred to earlier—the pork barrel motivation: Unto those who vote for the government is given, and from those who vote against the government it is taken away.

I would like to suggest that this philosophy is not the kind of philosophy that will encourage the economic growth and the development of the province of Ontario. It is not the kind of policy which is amenable to planning. I would further suggest that planning could well become the most critical word in all our thinking and all our discussions about highways here in Ontario.

I realize that I have no squatter's rights on the use of this particular term planning. I realize that the word planning has been used, particularly by The Department of Highways; and I have had occasion to examine some of the plans that have been advanced.

The booklet entitled "The Plan for Ontario Highways," published in 1956 by the government of Ontario and prepared by The Department of Highways, is an interesting and attractive publication. I notice that in the construction programme estimates each year for the past several years the concluding sentence in the foreword seems to be a pretty consistent, and I quote:

> It is an important part of the five-year programme planned for improvement of Ontario's vast roads network.

This five-year programme seems to have been in existence for well over 15 or 16 years. When I learned that there was a five-

year plan, albeit several years old, I attempted to get a copy of it or to learn something about it. I was advised by the Deputy Minister that this five-year plan was not available to me. There is therefore no way of determining just what the plans are or what constitutes this so-called five-year programme of plans for improvement of Ontario's vast road network. We just have to take the Minister's word for it. If this statement that there is such a plan is questioned, it is only questioned because of the haphazard appearance of road construction, road maintenance and road planning. There is no way of determining whether the existing chaos with which we are faced in Ontario is planned chaos or haphazard chaos. We cannot determine by simple examination of this five-year plan just what is being planned for and just what is being achieved. How can we possibly know if it is moving ahead according to plan when we do not even know what the plan is? Why it is top secret is beyond me. Are we up to date on our five-year plan? Are we behind on our plan? Or is it simply a case that we are planning to continue the pork barrel political attitude towards highway development and construction?

So much then, Mr. Chairman, for the fact, as I say, that The Department of Highways know the word "plan". They introduced a 20-year plan back in 1956 and they have had a five-year plan off and on for the last 15 years; and as I suggest, both of these plans seem to be more honoured in the breach than in the observance.

I must turn to my own experience and suggest that it is easier to document evidence that there is no real planning than to prove there is planning. I suggest Mr. Chairman, that the fact there is less than adequate planning can be established by an examination of many of the undertakings of this government over the past few years. We will be referring as the debate proceeds to a number of examples of such lack of planning, but I would mention in passing one particular case.

As I mentioned earlier, in 1956 there was a plan for Ontario highways produced by The Department of Highways for the Ontario government. On page 35 of that plan it was suggested that the design standard for a King's highway should be a highway of 24 feet width. Anything less than 24 feet is referred to as a tolerable condition, which represents the minimum acceptable value for highway features and determines the need for improvement. We must bear in mind that the recommendation was made 12 years ago, when the width of cars was less than it is now, when the speed of cars was less than it is now, when the number of school buses was far less than it is now and the whole pattern of traffic was less than it is now.

Now we have a situation 12 years later where the government is constructing, or purports to be constructing, a highway from Sudbury to Timmins. This highway has been designated Highway 144. A certain portion of it was paved last year, paved just in time to allow the hon. member for Nickel Belt to cut a ribbon a few days before the election.

Mr. Demers: What is wrong with that?

Mr. Martel: But the pavement, Mr. Chairman, was just 20 feet wide, four feet below standard in 1956.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): It is not up to standard; listen and you will learn something.

Mr. MacDonald: Why not standard highways for the north?

Mr. Demers: You will never sell that.

Mr. Martel: But I did. The pavement, Mr. Chairman, was just 20 feet wide and the present paving programme seems to call for a continuance of 20 feet width. In other words, this government is building a highway which was classified in 1956 as tolerable and minimum and one which would require improvement. They are building that today instead of building a highway to what they called, in 1956, the design standard of 24 feet.

Having seen portions of this highway and recognizing that, to use the term of the government, this is a tolerable width, I am prepared to suggest to this House that it would be impossible, on some of the curves, for a school bus to pass an oncoming transport truck without one or the other taking to the gravel shoulder.

Building in 1968 a highway width deemed just tolerable in 1956 and ignoring design standards established in the intervening 12 years would seem to suggest that planning is certainly not one of the strong points of the present Department of Highways.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we in this caucus are quite willing to share our views as to ways and means by which this deficiency can be remedied. We do not subscribe to the view presently advanced by an Opposition party in another place, that is that it is the

duty of the Opposition to condemn and criticize but not to offer constructive alternatives. Let me begin by suggesting some of the areas in which we feel planning is required.

In the first place, keeping in mind the analogy I drew at the beginning of my presentation, there is, Mr. Chairman, the need to divest this department entirely of all the vestiges of pork barrel politics. We must accept—as a basic fundamental concept of highway construction and maintenance—the view that the highways are essential arteries of commerce and trade; and we must plan to extend, as much as we can, the development of our resources, the extension of our industries, into those areas of the province where such development and extension are required.

Development and extension are needed, not just because there is presently no development in certain areas of this province, but because while this is true there are at the same time, in certain other areas of the province, grievous pressures being exerted on present facilities; and such pressures result in a self-destroying cycle.

A centre exists, it attracts more trade, more trade attracts more government spending for highways and other services, these expenditures result in more trade and so the cycle proceeds. But as I say, it is a self-defeating cycle. For ultimately the complexes of certain industrial areas will become so burdened and so complex that they will be strangled by their own system of highways, freeways, expressways, GO trains and so on.

The costs, many of which are intangible but are nevertheless there, will make such growth uneconomic in the long run. Farmlands which are consumed for suburbs, long-distance hauls of even the most basic food supplies, cost of transportation to workers to move from their homes in the suburbs to the plant in other suburbs; these and other uneconomic factors will make certain metropolitan industrial areas cancers rather than muscle to the body politic.

Superficially, this unplanned, unwieldy growth may seem healthy muscle; but a more careful and rational examination would suggest that it is actually a growth which is detrimental and self-destroying.

Highways that are planned would push ahead into areas where potential exists and where access alone provides the greatest handicap to the development of that potential.

When I consider the apparent present attitude I am reminded of the story of the leader of one of the factions in the French revolution who on looking out a window of his club one day onto the streets of Paris saw a group of his people going by with purpose and determination written all over their faces. He jumped up, took a closer look and said to one of his confreres in the club: "There go some of my people, I better find out where they are going so I can lead them." It seems to me that The Department of Highways of Ontario is always in the process of finding out where the people of Ontario are going and then it makes a vain, bungling and ill-considered attempt to lead them.

Another area where planning is obviously required is in the area which is broadly referred to as the rehabilitation of the existing system of highways. Now this problem is not new. In the plan for Ontario highways tabled in 1956, to which I alluded earlier there is on page 9 this statement, and I quote:

> A great deal of work must be done immediately to eliminate deficiencies that have accumulated in the past.

Aside from the fact that this is in itself quite a commentary on several years of administration by Tory and Liberal governments, I would suggest that it is evident that the deficiency still exists and that some clear-cut plan must be presented to the House for the remedial work necessary to overcome deficiencies.

What is deficient, of course, is dependent on the view of what is in the first place required, and what is required will depend upon the fundamental philosophy of the department. If that philosophy is one based upon the premise that the health of the whole depends upon the health of all its parts, then all vestiges of political patronage and such considerations must be set aside and highways must be rehabilitated so they can share the free and healthy flow of trade and commerce throughout the whole of this province.

The third area where planning is obviously required is in the area of property purchase. Looking back over the estimates for the preceding two years I see that the estimate for property purchase has gone in round figures from $14 million to $15 million to this year's $22 million. Part of the increase, of course, can be attributed to the rising cost of land and part of the increase, I hope, can be attributed to the fact that the department

is looking to the future—I hope this is the case—the department purchasing land ahead of time. If this is not the policy and if the $22 million that is to be spent on property purchase this year, as compared to the $15 million last year, simply reflects soaring land costs then the government stands condemned for the misuse of public funds.

In the days ahead, in the detailed analysis which we hope to devote to the estimates, it is our intention to find out to just what extent, sir, this increase of $7 million represents—simply an increase in the price of land and to what extent it represents planning further into the future than has been done in the past. If it emerges that the major part of the increase is made necessary by the soaring land cost, then we will exert all the pressure we can to get the government to reassess its policies of property purchase and to take such steps as may be necessary to make the kind of waste that has existed in the past unnecessary in the future.

I think in this connection of the problem of construction of Highway 401 around the city of Toronto early in 1950. This highway was constructed and subsidiary growth around the highway was permitted. Then it was found, a few years later, that it was necessary to widen this highway; to tear up the asphalt that had been put down; to tear down the houses that had grown along the shoulders of the highway; to tear down bridges that had been built to stand; and generally speaking to first undo what had been done at great cost and then to redo it at even greater cost.

Now none of us have crystal balls which will permit us to see into the future and plan for every contingency that may arise, but I do not think it is unreasonable to ask this government to make plans which will be valid for at least 20 years.

Related to this question is the expropriation of property and we shall have something to say in this connection as our examination of the estimates proceeds. It is enough to say at this point that we have long felt that far too many people have suffered hardship because they have been allowed to purchase and develop land and property which within a few years has been expropriated without warning and at a price which is not commensurate with the value of the land at that time. Our feelings have been confirmed by the enquiry into civil rights submitted recently to the government of Ontario by Mr. Justice McRuer.

These, then, are the three subdivisions of findings which this party recognizes: planning for development; planning for highway rehabilitation; and planning for property purchase which will be made necessary by the preceding two areas of planning.

Another area which we intend to look at with a considerable amount of care is the area of construction standards. It seems to us that something must be wrong with these standards if two or three years after a highway is surfaced it develops potholes which have to be patched; if a few years after a bridge on the Trans-Canada Highway is built, that highway has to be closed to traffic and rehabilitated because the steel in that bridge begins to fracture. It seems to us that the technology and science to which we have access must surely be able to provide adequate standards, to which we can insist the contractor adhere, which will ensure that work done will last for the length of time that it is reasonable to expect it to last.

We are going to devote as much effort as possible to finding out just what these standards are, who should set them and by whom and how it should be determined these standards are being met. In fact, we will be making some suggestions that will have at their heart the establishment of a standard audit committee whose job it will be to determine that all standards set by the department are met by all the contractors and are met in all the works that are undertaken by the department.

This audit committee should be separate from The Department of Highways so that we will not have the old situation of the department checking and reporting on itself.

I think of the work done a few years ago on Highway 69 north of Sudbury where the highway fill was taken from the land in front of Pioneer manor within the city because it was considered unfit for a highway project being undertaken there. But it was being hauled by trucks some three to five miles north of the city site and there, by some strange process of metamorphosis, it was seen fit to use as fill for the reconstruction or rebuilding taking place on Highway 69. If you drive on Highway 69 north at the present time, about four years later, it is even just outside of the city of Sudbury, just a mass of bumps; and this only four or five years later.

The fact of the matter is that it was not fit fill and the present condition of that highway is testimony to that fact.

I might also suggest that there are scientific works being conducted in other countries to permit roads to be made hole free and bumpless. I will just read the title and so on of a short extract from this paper. "Buried Wires Keep Russian Roads Hole Free, and Bumpless"; and "Man Defeats Nature by Halting the Capillary Action that Draws Water Up and Heaves Roads." If the department would like it, I will give this publication to them.

Now to recap what I have been saying to this point. It is the feeling of this caucus that discussion of the estimates of The Department of Highways must take place against the philosophic background which views the province as a whole rather than in terms of its parts. It is our feeling that planning on three levels has to be not just undertaken and not just spoken of, but has to be clearly announced and put before the House and put before the people of Ontario, so that the whole community can participate more reasonably in this growth process.

Before I go into more detail, a more detailed examination of certain aspects of the estimates, I would like to refer to an exchange that took place in this House, on March 16, 1964, between the hon. member for Niagara Falls (Mr. Bukator), and the then Attorney General, and now, our honoured House Speaker. The hon member for Niagara Falls said, and I quote: "Mr. Chairman, I just do not know where to start here this afternoon."

The Attorney General told him to dive in. The hon. member for Niagara went on to state that he had received the estimates late in the afternoon, and that attached to the estimates was a request that no information from these estimates be divulged before they were tabled. I am a little bit luckier than the hon. member was on that occasion. I have had the figures for five days, and I am still going to take the advice of the Attorney General and just dive in.

My first impression as I examined the document in question was one of surprise. I was surprised because I discovered that it is almost impossible, on a cursory examination at any rate, to see any difference between the books that were presented to me this year and the books that were presented to the House over the period of the last four or five years.

Employing the reason of hindsight, I now realize that I could have studied last year's estimates and tacked on roughly 5 to 10 per cent to all the figures given and I would have come pretty close to the estimate for this year. Perhaps I have stumbled on the department's method of calculating their estimates.

I continued my examination of the document, and indeed, I was torn between tears and laughter. Tears because the material in question was unimaginative and reflected so little effort to be exciting, progressive, challenging, call it what you will, laughter because it seems to me that we were all being victimized by The Department of Highways when it came to considering these estimates.

Let me illustrate what I mean. I take the highway construction programme, complete with its little memorandum not to divulge any of its material until it is tabled, and I compare it with the same document for 1967-1968, and the document for 1966-1967. I notice that on the surface at any rate, they appear to be different documents. It is true that they all have pictures on them, and the pictures in each case are pictures of highways or bridges on highways.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): No Minister's picture?

Mr. Martel: This is rather a refreshing sort of thing, because I am led to believe that if these had been tabled by the Minister of Education (Mr. Davis) they would have had, on each ocasion, his picture on the cover. Now, as I say the pictures are different, but there the difference seems to end. The foreword in all three programmes that I looked at—indeed this goes back further than just the last three years, I am just using these three by comparison—the foreword in each case differs hardly at all from one year to the next.

There is a shift in the signature from C. S. MacNaughton to George E. Gomme, but there is no shift in tone, and no shift in expression, no shift in philosophy, no variety of any kind. Indeed, there is hardly any variety in the work on major projects which it lists, but in some cases, work listed one year disappears the next, and appears the next.

I am looking at the pattern of presentation and the style of language because it seems to me that this is one indication that the department in question does lack vigour and does lack imagination. They do not need to plan, they just haul out last year's figures and increase them by 5 per cent or 10 per cent, and then table them as this year's estimates.

They couch them in the same old cliches, from which a person reading this for the first time would think that there was something

exciting and dramatic going on. When you find that the same words have been used year after year, with practically no change, you are led to the realization that this is simply an exercise in words, and not actually a presentation of a new exciting programme.

Evidence that this is the case, and evidence that these words are simply being used for their own sound and not for their meaning, can be illustrated by the reference to the various highway construction programmes before us.

For example, in the 1968-1969 programme, on page 8, paragraph 3, sir, in reference to the Macdonald-Cartier freeway, it states that work is proceeding at an accelerated rate. The programme for 1967-1968, on page 10 referring to the Macdonald-Cartier freeway states, and I quote: "Work is proceeding at an accelerated rate." Going back to the programme for 1965-1966, on page 9, and again in reference to the Macdonald-Cartier freeway, I find the expression: "Work will continue at an accelerated rate."

According to the new American Webster's Dictionary, the word accelerate means to cause to move or develop faster. Now, as the work was accelerated in 1965, and again in 1966, and accelerated again in 1967, and it is to be accelerated in 1968, it certainly suggest that highway construction would be racing ahead at a terrifying rate.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): It is time you accelerated your language a little!

Mr. Martel: The fact of the matter is that it will be constructed at about the same pace as it was this year, as it was constructed last year, and it was constructed the year before. In other words, construction is not proceeding at an accelerated rate, it is simply proceeding. The programme should state it in those terms. I am not trying to be petty in referring to this type of detail, I am simply referring to it because it symbolizes the fact that The Department of Highways lacks vigour, imagination and excitement. Under its so-called estimates, it offers a marked up rehash of the previous year's figures, which were themselves a marked up rehash of the preceding year.

Not only in the format and style, is the report practically identical from one year to the next, but it seems that The Department of Highways gets into some kind of rut in terms of what they list as major projects.

Now, admittedly if it is a major project, it can be expected to take some time to complete, but surely a day is reached when some of these major projects are brought to completion and more projects are introduced.

Let me quote again from the highway construction programme, 1966-67; 1967-68 and 1968-69. In each of these programmes, the following parallels occur. In the programme of 1966-67 it states: "Work will continue on major projects such as Highway 614, Manitouwadge Road." In the programme for 1967-68 it states: "Work in northern Ontario will continue on such major projects as Highway 614, Manitouwadge Road." And in the construction programme 1968-69, it states—and here the wording is changed somewhat—quite an imaginative sort of step: "In northern Ontario work will continue at such major projects as Highway 614, Manitouwadge Road." Also listed in each case is Highway 631, Highway 144 and Highway 101.

A further examination of the construction programme raises another question, and that is a question of detail. I am confused by what is meant by "estimated total value"—total value of what, exactly? I am referring to page 6 of the construction programme for 1968-69 and I consider, for example, the Kitchener-Waterloo expressway. It says under estimated total value, $14,300,000. In last year's estimate, it said the estimated total value was $10,714,000. In the year prior to that, the estimated total value was $4,567,000. Now, if these are cumulative figures, and if each year's estimated total value is supposed to be the previous total value, plus the expenditure for the previous year, then it would stand to reason that the estimated total value in each year would be higher than the year before. But, we do not have the situation because, for example, in 1966-67 the Welland canal tunnel had estimated total value of $28,110,000; in 1967-68, the estimated total value, Welland canal was $10,284,000, a drop of about $18 million.

I cannot comprehend just how this drop could occur, and I would appreciate the Minister shedding some light on this particular problem.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to direct my remarks to the Government of Ontario Transit. First, let me say there is commendation due to the department. The deadline of May, 1967, was met; the passenger volume was exceeded; and the service has proved to be efficient and satisfying to its users. I think the department and the people concerned with the department—especially Mr. W. T. Howard, the manager—deserve the commendation of the government.

So I introduce my remarks by offering this word of congratulation. It shows that planning advocated by this party over the past several years has demonstrated it is sound, and that services which have improved the operating efficiency of society do not in themselves have to make money. Indeed, if one studies the figures, one sees that the commuter fares as listed on page 74 of the estimates, 1968-69, amount to $2.2 million. And this falls considerably short of the total expenditures involved in GO transit maintenance and development.

I suppose that part of the success of the GO system can be attributed to the fact that the partner to the government of Ontario is the Canadian National Railways, one of the publicly-owned industries of Canada. And I am sure they welcome this extension of government into the public sphere. What I have a hard time rationalizing, is the strident defense of free-enterprise, dog-eat-dog, survival of the fittest philosophy, which is dished out across the House on the one hand, and the quiet day-by-day extension of the government of Ontario into businesses on the other.

Verily, their right hand does not seem to know what their left hand is doing. Be that as it may, the success of the venture to date suggests that further thought must be given to the extension of this system, and not just the extension in relationship to Metropolitan Toronto, but careful study must be made of other developing metropolitan areas with a view to introducing commuter transit service when it is needed, at minimum cost, by planning of routes, and the purchase of land years before it is actually needed.

In moving to the next section of the annual report for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1967, I would like to make this general request of the Minister of this department. I realize that the request was made last year by the hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville (Mr. B. Newman) when be passed on to the chairman the recommendations on the report of the standing committee on public accounts on June 10, 1965, as reported in *Hansard* on March 1, 1966.

The hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville at that time suggested, Mr. Chairman, that there was a need for a more logical method of presentation of data. Following, as I have said, the report of the standing committee on public accounts, he urged that the presentation be made in this fashion:

(a) Approved estimates for the last completed fiscal year; (b) Actual expenditure for the last completed fiscal year; and (c) The approved estimate for the current fiscal year.

He made other recommendations at that time which I think are worthy of being repeated and being urged upon the government at this time. These included the very fact that the estimates and accounts of the province should show more detailed classification of what is now called "maintenance" so that the cost of purchase of office equipment, and the purchase of supplies, and other categories of expenditures, should be immediately apparent.

We also wish to follow the policy of providing greater detail of expenditure in the estimates in account by increasing the number of individual votes, with particular reference to The Department of Highways. I would like to take this a step further and suggest that a reasonable pattern be set out and maintained between the estimates as they are tabled; the annual report as it is tabled; and the construction programme and other materials such as this. It may seem to be a rather small point, but given the pressure that we all live under, and the volume of detail that has to be assimilated, examined, and on which judgment must be passed, such a rationalization of presentation would be a great help in facilitating the whole process.

While I am on his subject of rationalization, in terms of presentation of data, I would suggest that more attention be given to the presentation of such data in terms of ratios which can be looked at, and which will have some meaning almost immediately. For example, I think there must be some reasonable ratio which can be established between the mileage of the highways in an area, and the maintenance dollar value expended on these highways.

A ratio of so many dollars per hundred miles make a lot more sense to the examiner than the present system of stating that $256,300 was expended for maintenance in the Chatham district whereas $342,182 was expended on maintenance in the London district. These figures really mean nothing unless they are related to the number of miles of highway maintained; unless they are related in some way or other to the volume of traffic that passes over the highways in question.

Mr. Chairman, these are the broad outlines with which we intend to work over in the next little while and how we will attack the estimates. Before I finish up, I want to correct

a couple of things that have gone on in the House, a couple of statements. And I make reference, dealing with my own area at the present time, to a question which I asked on March 13, 1968, at which time I questioned the man-made fog on Highway 17 west between Copper Cliff and Sudbury.

The answer I received certainly did not answer the question which I asked. I asked what was being done to alleviate the man-made fog, and the Minister went on and I quote:

> The answer is that in late 1965, work was completed, resulting in this section of highway being reconstructed to four lanes and a median. Also included in this was illumination. The above corrective measures have greatly improved conditions as indicated by the following statistics:
>
> For the year 1964 to 1965 inclusive, the accident rate, based on million vehicle miles of travel, decreased from 5.3 in 1964 to 1.8 in 1967. The frequency of accidents has been cut in half during the same period and the same applies to the number of personal injuries. In 1967, four rear-end collisions were reported as against 15 in 1964 and 23 in 1965.

Mr. Chairman, the number of accidents in 1960 was 21—regardless of whether they were tail-end or head-on or whatever you want to call them; in 1961 it was 18; in 1962 it was 18; in 1963—21; in 1964—26; in 1965—34; in 1966—9; and this accounts for the big drop.

However, in 1967, when I received these figures on January 8, there had been 21 accidents in 1967 and I understand that just this past winter The Department of Highways lost a vehicle in that vicinity—a 1966 to 1967 station wagon.

This situation is not being remedied as the hon. Minister so glibly reported. Certainly the conditions have improved, but the fog is there, and it is a man-made fog. I want to report on another accident, Mr. Chairman. On January 12, 1968, ten cars were in three accidents in fog near Copper Cliff—this is all within about 20 minutes—even though the police were around with flares and so on. These conditions do exist and the accidents still happen, and when you consider that 10,000 men use this highway daily, and when you consider the great amount of money that can go into some of these great edifices down around Toronto here, I do not think it is asking too much of The Department of Highways to pipe in that whole section if necessary, to ensure the safety of those men. Three accidents involving ten cars were reported during heavy fog this morning on Highway 17 near Balsam Street, Copper Cliff. All cars were travelling east at about 8:30 a.m. Damage totalled $3,235 and one driver received minor injuries. Five cars were involved in one accident, three cars involved in a second, and two cars involved in a third, all within a matter of half an hour.

I do not think we can ignore this situation any longer. The people in that area, the unions, the mayor of Sudbury, a whole host of people, have been asking this government to do something to alleviate this problem for years and it has not moved. When we attempted to obtain the figures of the accident rate this was denied to the union representatives and I would like to know why. I have the letter stating "no" and I quote:

> This is to acknowledge your letter of December 11, 1967, in which you requested the statistics regarding traffic accidents which have occurred during the past ten years at the above-noted location. I have discussed your request with the senior officials in The Department of Highways and they have advised me that this information cannot be released to the general public by this office.

If you are not ashamed of the accident rate that is occurring there, why are we so afraid to produce these and give them out? I am hoping that the hon. Minister of Highways will consider this request to remedy this terrible problem immediately.

I could go on also to relate other highways in just my own area and about which I have contacted the Minister on numerous occasions, and about which he has received numerous requests from the unions, mayors, reeves, the whole gamut. I can talk of Highway 541A and 541; I can talk of Highway 69, where last week they threatened to close it up with a barricade of cars because it is so bad. I ask the Minister, as a representative from that area, to give that area some consideration to remedy these very serious road problems in that vicinity. Give it some of the priority and let us forget one prime project down here, some pet project that does not need it. Let us place priority where it is necessary.

Hon. G. E. Gomme (Minister of Highways). I had some difficulty in hearing the hon. member for Sudbury East until the member for York South got up and opened his microphone. I think from the parts that I did catch, he is going to ask many questions during the estimates, and we probably can cover the things which I did hear about.

Mr Nixon: Mr. Chairman, is the Minister going to make any comments at all before calling the first vote?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: I was not, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: The Minister has intimated that he will attempt to answer the questions on each vote as we go down the list of votes. I think we can sort out the questions and apply them to the proper votes as we go along.

Mr Nixon: Mr. Chairman, if that is the case, I would like to make just a brief comment on the first vote that has to do with the policies for which the Minister is responsible. The speakers we have heard already this afternoon have been talking about the implications in the Smith committee report for this particular department which are important and far-reaching. They have been critical of certain responsibilities that have been taken over by the Minister of Highways and his predecessor with regards to certain types of highway financing and there have been a number of definite recommendations that have been brought forward in the comments from the member for Oxford and perhaps the member for Sudbury East as well, though I did not hear all of his remarks.

It seems to me that this would be a proper time when the Minister might explain to the House how he is going to react, as far as policy is concerned, to the important recommendations made in the report. The report is well over six months old. I would think that his advisors have had a chance to read it carefully and digest it, to make recommendations as to how the changes that might very well have been affected before these estimates were put before us, will be brought about in the very near future. I think this is a matter of importance, and I would like to hear the Minister's comments.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Chairman, in answer to the hon. leader of the Opposition, we have examined these parts of the Smith report which you referred to, and we have prepared recommendations which we are going to present to the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. MacNaughton) and those examining the report so that they can be instituted or they at least will see our views of the situation. But I think it is a fact that this year, for the current budget that we are talking about, we will have to continue with the assistance to municipalities and these other things that we have had in the past and have laid out in our present plans.

Mr. Nixon: If I might pursue this a bit, sir, the Provincial Treasurer, in my view, has great responsibilities in this regard too, and yet he has what might be called a conflict of interest. Having just come from the department that my hon. friend now administers, he really responds in much the same way as the Minister of Highways would, and I think particularly of the recommendation pertaining to development roads, which I know are indicated later in the figures before us, but which are one of the recommendations of the Smith report that I believe should be implemented in the very near future. The report indicates —and this is just an example of the policies associated with the Smith report recommendations, Mr. Chairman—that there is entirely too much discretion in the hands of the Minister himself and there have been many instances that have been put before this House in this session and in years gone by where this situation has been shown.

I very well remember a circumstance when the Minister's immediate predecessor authorized a development road for what I would say were the crassest electioneering purposes. Mind you, the road is a great one. I and a few others call it the Nixon road, although it was recommended on behalf of another's request. But there is chapter and verse that you can see across this province where the discretion of the Minister, whether the incumbent or any of his predecessors, has been really very difficult to justify. Here is an area of high policy in which this department should move to remedy the shortcomings that have been experienced through this administration.

Mr. Chairman: The estimates of The Department of Highways, page 72, under ordinary expenditures and general administration.

On vote 901:

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask a question of the Minister regarding the basic policy of financing of the department.

In my own personal affairs I tend to like to adhere to the present policy of the department, of pay as you go. The money is appropriated and you build the highways out of existing funds. Personally I do not feel that should be the method in all cases in our province and I relate this back to the conception of Highway 401 and my interest at that time in the building of this route. I just wondered what the savings attached there to the people of our province would have been if this government, and the advisors to the government, had adopted the policy of issuing, say, transportation bonds,

in conjunction with the whole transportation policy in order to expedite the full completion of this particular highway.

I just wonder, at the convenience of his officials, if the Minister could maybe take the total of the actual cost of Highway 401 to date, with possibly a projected figure of some 20 years ago, when this road was first conceived, as to what the original estimates would have been. Certainly the cost of land would have been much lower at that time; the interest rates on the money, and the benefits that would have accrued to our many municipalities along the line, would have been felt years ago instead of just being felt now.

Mr. Chairman: May I point out to the member that I do not believe this would come under vote 901. Perhaps it is a capital item under 907, you are speaking of Highway 401.

Mr. Paterson: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I feel that the salaries of the officials of this department are related to the policies of the department, although I do feel that, in the broader concept, this is a policy of government, and it is not just shaped by the officials of the hon. Minister's department. I am sure they must be quite frustrated to find the lack of finances available to them to carry on projects of great substance and importance. Would the Minister like to comment at all on this proposition?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: In reply to the hon. member, I know what is done in other jurisdictions, but as he pointed out it was not what we wanted to do in Ontario. I am sure we could not give him off-hand what the savings might be had these particular roads been built under the plan which you state. But we will take that question and certainly try to get an answer for him as close as possible.

Mr. Innes: Mr. Chairman, this is related to the same type of financing. Is the Minister aware that the New York transport plan did, in fact, borrow $2.5 billion for this type of a transportation bond in November?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Yes, but I will try to explain that this system we have been using is a matter of government policy, and it has been the policy to use a pay-as-you-go method.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Chairman, I was going to ask the hon. Minister if he could give to us, in the House today, the subsidies for the various types of roads in the department.

Mr. Chairman: Section 904 deals with municipal subsidies.

Mr. B. Newman: It is a general policy, Mr. Chairman. It is not only municipal.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: I think, Mr. Chairman, 904 and 907 look after subsidies. I believe it has a breakdown.

Mr. B. Newman: Surely, Mr. Chairman, the Minister can give a reply right now and clear the air. Does he not know?

Mr. Chairman: I do not think, if I may say so to the member, that we should go jumping around from one vote to the other. Perhaps we should pursue a programme dealing with each vote as we come to it, and bring up the questions under the proper vote.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Chairman, it is a matter of policy in here, and there have been recommendations from various municipalities that the subsidy given them be increased substantially because of the increased flow of traffic, and the difficulty for municipalities to meet just the general costs in the municipality. I think the Minister should be able to give us these answers at the present time.

Mr. Chairman: Would the Minister want to deal with this at this point?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Chairman, I will have the answers when we get to the vote under subsidies. I think, to try to create some order, I should give it to the member then.

Mr. Chairman: Perhaps the member would not mind bringing it up then?

Mr. B. Newman: Yes, I will take it as such. It just surprises me that the Minister of Highways would not even know the subsidies that are being given for the various types of construction in a department that he should know everything about.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: That statement is not right. I said that I would give those, but I thought that you wanted to follow the pattern that I would give them under subsidies.

Mr. B. Newman: All he had to do, Mr. Chairman, is prove it to us right now.

I have another question here, Mr. Chairman, and that concerns item seven, on the St. Clair parkway commission in the first

vote, 901. It was back some 30 years ago—in fact I would say 38 years ago—that the idea of a St. Clair parkway commission, or a Blue Water highway, had been under consideration by the Conservative government of the day.

To date, the department has spent $195,000 according to the estimates, or will be spending $195,000—according to the estimates provided to us. I would like to ask the Minister how far the plan has proceeded with the development of the parkway and if there are any plans whatsoever for the extension of the parkway all the way through to the city of Windsor, so that we could have the parkway right in the Windsor area, skirting the shores of Lake St. Clair, going up into the St. Clair River area and then, as it is here, ending up at the city of Sarnia?

I know the Minister would like to extend it up farther, but I am only asking really from Amherstberg, to accommodate the member for Essex South, and going all the way to Sarnia.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. member knows The St. Clair Parkway Commission Act was brought in in 1966 and it takes in the city of Chatham, the city of Sarnia, the county of Lambton and the county of Kent. These are the four municipalities involved with department assistance.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Chairman, I know that. The thing that disturbs me is that the department has all types of plans for the future, and surely in the plans for the future there must be something that would include the county of Essex. I would like to know from the Minister if, in his plans, he has the county of Essex included and how far in the future can we expect the plans to be announced?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Chairman, I think the member realizes that the motivation for the creation of this commission came from the municipalities involved, and that is how it was set up. It was not a government-sponsored piece of legislation without them asking for it. And I am sure that there will be any amount of consideration given to any further advancement of that plan.

Mr. B. Newman: May I ask the Minister then if the department has such a designation of a road as a scenic route?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: No, we have not, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. B. Newamn: May I suggest then to the Minister that he so designate some routes, or some roads, as scenic routes and consider a special subsidy for them. And I refer, specifically, to the Riverside Drive in the city of Windsor; and Highway 18 going up in Amherstberg, because the community from which I come, bordering the large metropolis of Detroit, finds that Riverside Drive is used extensively by the tourists coming into the community.

The wear and tear on the road is by far greater than it would be on a normal type of road, and some type of consideration should be given by the department to maybe designating the road as a scenic route, and thus qualify it for extra financial assistance from this department.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: We will consider that.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Chairman, I would like to call to the attention of the Minister an event which happened today which will have a profound influence on the night-time use of his highway system.

As the Minister knows—and I want to make a suggestion to him—the one-eyed monster is one of the problems we have in night driving, where one headlight goes out, and the person approaching that headlight does not know whether it is a motrocycle, or whether it is a car, or what the position of that car may be on the road. Now the solution which has been announced today is so simple one wonders why this has not been thought about long ago. A company has come up with an extra filament in the sealed-beam headlight and the filament will glow after the headlight goes out. It only draws a half an amp of power, and it will last almost indefinitely. So that when a light does fail the filament will glow and the light can still be seen, even though it is not a good headlight, up to about 500 feet, and so the person approaching that car knows exactly what the position of the car is on the road.

Mr. Chairman: Is this vote 901?

Mr. Young: Well this is the main office vote, Mr. Chairman. I point out to the Minister, that it seems to me this is a very great development in that problem on the highways. I think this device has no patent on any manufacturer, and the hon. Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Randall) might be interested in this—any manufacturer can get into the business. It is now being manufactured in Bramalea, and will be on the market shortly. I have asked the com-

pany to make these lights available to the Minister, the Prime Minister, and the hon. Minister of Transport, so that they can use them in their own cars—or in government cars —to test them.

I simply ask that the Minister look into this from the point of view that government cars might be equipped as their lights fail with this new type, and an examination of the whole thing might be undertaken to see whether or not this does solve this fundamental problem on the highway. This may be a break-through in this whole matter of the one-eyed monster, Mr. Chairman, and I would ask that the Minister's department take a close look at the situation.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): Mr. Chairman, I have a couple of questions I would like to ask the Minister dealing with vote 901, under section 7, grants, the Ontario good roads association and the Canadian good roads association.

Last year the grant for the Ontario good roads association was $2,000, and this has not changed, it is still $2,000 this year. But the grant for the Canadian good roads association has increased from $5,000 to $15,000. Could the Minister explain to the House, and especially to the new members who might not be aware of the situation, just exactly what benefits we receive from the Canadian good roads association, why their grant was increased from $5,000 to $15,000 and whether or not the Minister was approached by the Ontario good roads association for an increase in their grant.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Chairman, the reason for the increase was the research projects that the Canadian good roads association is undertaking for us and with us. That is why this amount of money is more than it was last year.

Mr. R. H. Knight (Port Arthur): Mr. Chairman, I am interested in item 5 under vote 901, which indicates the department proposes an expenditure of $200,000 for what is termed "road publicity." I am wondering what kind of road publicity the department is involved in that would reach an extent of $200,000, and why, indeed, this is not appropriated under the estimates of the department which the government has for the business of disseminating information. It would seem to me that, whatever publicity is done for the government should be done through The Department of Tourism and Information.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Chairman, the road publicity vote is made up of advertising the displays at county fairs and major exhibitions, and then the photography section. There are also certain publications such as the *DHO News*, and the road bulletins, and the northern road maps and the roads-to-recreation maps and such pieces of information as that.

Mr. Knight: I see the Minister of Tourism and Information is in the House, I wonder if he would have any opinion on this matter; whether, since the Minister has referred to publicity at fairs and so forth, this should not come under The Department of Tourism and Information.

Mr. Chairman: No, we are dealing with The Department of Highway estimates, vote 901, and the Minister has explained what the $200,000 appropriation is for. I do not think we should involve the Minister of Tourism and Information at this time.

Mr. Knight: Well, I am objecting to this expenditure. I feel that if it is the business of promotion then it should come under The Department of Tourism and Information and not the individual department.

Mr. Chairman: The Minister has explained it.

Hon. J. A. C. Auld (Minister of Tourism and Information): Mr. Chairman, I will answer I think the department is doing an excellent job in their field and I think they should continue.

Mr. Chairman: Does the member for Port Arthur have another question? The member for Sarnia?

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): Mr. Chairman, in connection with the item brought up by the hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville about the St. Clair parkway commission, I have several questions and comments in connection with that.

First of all, Mr. Chairman, I would be very much interested in knowing what the grant was last year to this commission. I am interested in noting that the sum of $195,000 is anticipated being expended this year by your department, and I am interested, sir, in knowing what control the Minister has over the expenditures. He mentioned in reply to the hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville that the establishment of this commission was initiated originally by the municipalities themselves.

I suggest, with respect, that there was some degree of initiation by my predecessor in office and the hon. member for Lambton

in connection with this. I recall sitting in on a session—I was then on the city council of the city of Sarnia—when the Minister's predecessor came and painted a rather rosy picture. And I must bring to your attention that those people responsible for municipal expenditures in that area felt that they were getting into something of a similar kind in the St. Lawrence parkway, and the Niagara parkway.

It was not made entirely clear at that time that a great deal of the expenditure in connection with this, if not a majority of the expenditure, would be a municipal responsibility.

I am also interested, Mr. Chairman, in bringing to your attention what has happened thus far. As I understand the intention of this commission, of which my predecessor in this office is a member, it is to establish and beautify a parkway adjacent to the St. Clair River, and to service the tourist industry as a result. Now this commission since its inception has done the following: It has acquired very little land; they have conceived the idea, Mr. Chairman, of a chemical valley museum; they have also conceived the idea at the Baldoon settlement of a golf club there, but there has been no beautification thus far. And I suggest with respect to you as follows.

There was a division on March 18 at the meeting of the Sarnia city council in connection with the expenditure to be made by the city of Sarnia with respect to this commission. And this division exemplifies, sir, the fact that the people are tremendously malcontent in connection with this; we want to get on with it. The hon. member for Lambton and my predecessor in office, and your predecessor in office, are to be complimented in connection with the conception of this idea; the idea is to beautify that highway, and nothing is being done about that.

I know the chairman of the commission quite well and I respect him, but we are going to have to have a little more vigour with respect to this entire concept. And I am interested in knowing, sir, what control you have in connection of the expenditure of $195,000 so that you can assure members of this House that it is not going to be expended at this time for the building of a chemical valley museum which is not necessary.

We have millions of dollars worth of chemical valley capital for the tourists to see. We do not need a museum at this time. And I would suggest also, that we do not need a nine-hole golf course owned by the parkway commission at this point. These concepts are all right in the future. What we want to see is a beautiful highway adjacent to the St. Clair River.

My main question, and I am sorry to be so long, is what assurance can you give us that the expenditure of $195,000 will be within the ambit of your departmental control, and will it have the benefit of your deputy and your entire department in seeing that this beautification programme is undertaken and undertaken quickly.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Chairman, I do not have the budget of the St. Clair parkway commission here, but I am sure it is available. They come to us with their requests and we examine them, and I think the hon. member knows that participating municipalities and the department will each contribute 50 per cent towards the expenditures. But for capital development park projects, approved by the department, the municipalities contribute 25 per cent, and we, 75 per cent.

Now it is on the joint use of both of these, that the amount of $195,000 is reached, but they present a budget for this, and I think it is quite safe to say that there is no money in there for a golf course.

Mr. Bullbrook: This is what I am interested in if I might continue, Mr. Chairman. I am interested in the degree of control, and perhaps the Deputy Minister can help us here. As much as I respect these people, it is my opinion, and I am entitled to it, that the intended purpose of the establishment of this commission is to beautify that highway, and beautify that area. Now, 25 years from now, if we have adequate funds, let us build a chemical valley museum and let us build a golf course, at the Baldoon settlement, but I am very much interested for the welfare of the area and to carry out what I consider to be the obvious intent of this worthwhile project, that we start acquiring some land. If necessary we start beautifying the highway itself.

I do not want these people to have the right, frankly, to spend part of my $195,000, and yours, to build a chemical valley museum. I think, Mr. Chairman, you will agree this is contrary to what you originally intended.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, on this matter—

Mr. Chairman: I would remind the member I have a list of speakers and I am calling them in turn; if you do not mind!

The Minister has a question before him; does he wish to reply to that?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: I might inform the hon. member that our contribution to them is the same as to a municipality that presents a budget to us and we pay our share of it on that basis. As I say, I have not got their particular budget before me, but I am sure we can get you a copy of it.

Mr. Bullbrook: Well, Mr. Chairman, it is not my purpose to embarrass, believe me, and I do not think you can make an analogy between, for example, a connecting link subsidy and this type of commission activity. I think you know what the intent of the payment of funds for a connecting link and you do have control of it. But really, I am interested in your response to the essence of my question: Are you concerned, sir, with the expenditure of this $195,000; are you concerned that it is now going to perhaps go into a chemical valley museum?

As much as this might benefit the area 20 years from now, am I not correct in assuming that the intent and purpose and prime object of this is to beautify the highway?

Mr. Chairman: Does the member for Scarborough West have a question on the same point?

Mr. Lewis: Yes, on this precise point, because I think the member for Sarnia raises something rather important. If the Minister does not have the budget of the commission before him can be undertake to produce the budget for the House tomorrow during his estimates so that in fact one can see those items for which the money is to be expended; and then the member will have his answer. And it should appropriately be done in this estimate, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: I can assure the hon. members, Mr. Chairman, whether we have their exact budget we will at least have the figures from which we worked in arriving at this figure on which we gave them the grant, and we will have those for you tomorrow.

Mr. Bullbrook: I am sorry, Mr. Chairman, but this still does not answer the question; and I do not really think, with respect to my hon. friend, that I need the budget today.

I am asking a question: Do you have any control, sir, as to the expenditures of these funds? I take it the answer is no. Am I assuming correctly, that the answer is no? Once the $195,000 is appropriated to their budget they spend it as they wish. Am I correct in assuming this?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: No, I would say the hon. member is not correct, because the municipalities have control from the membership that they have on the commission, and they must approve a project. Now I do not know anything about this chemical valley museum whether that is in this year's programme or not or anything about that. But the municipalities which contribute have representatives on the commission and they take the amount of money they are able to produce, and then we see which part of it is ordinary and which part is capital and we arrive at the amount of money that we contribute. I think the municipalities themselves, through their representatives, have control on the expenditure we are talking about.

Mr. Bullbrook: It becomes a two way street, because this is the point of confusion. this is the essence of what I am trying to get at: Can municipalities feel otherwise? This is the whole matter that was brought up before Sarnia city council, that the municipalities feel otherwise themselves.

Now perhaps, I should not belabour it further, since tomorrow you will have available for us the St. Clair parkway commission budget, which I believe has already been approved by your department. We can then look into the propriety of their expenditures, and your attitude with respect to the propriety of those expenditures.

Mr. F. A. Burr (Sandwich-Riverside): Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister stated that the Canadian good roads association budget is being increased from $5,000 to $15,000 because of research projects; I believe because of a research project. Well, we are going to pass $5.5 million for research in the Minister's own department; what is this particular research that is going to cost $10,000?

Mr. L. C. Henderson (Lambton): Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Chairman: There is a question before the Minister.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Chairman, these are joint research projects, and one of the things that I do know is involved are traffic signs that would be used across the country, and this type of thing. I cannot give you the exact details, but I can get those for the member.

Mr. Young: May I ask—

Mr. Chairman: The member for Lambton; was it on the same point?

Mr. Henderson: Mr. Chairman, with regard to the St. Clair parkway commission, the hon. member for Sarnia made the statement and I did not catch whether he said council or councils. I am associated with the Lambton county council which pays a great amount to his local obligation and I have talked to them about—

Mr. Bullbrook: Did you say you were associated with them?

Mr. Henderson: With the Lambton county council! I said I have spoken to the Lambton county council—

Mr. Singer: You said you are associated with them.

Mr. Henderson: Well, all right, then I will correct my statement. I have spoken to the Lambton county council regarding the St. Clair parkway and the Lambton county council is very happy with the actions of the St. Clair parkway commission. I have heard some grumbling out of the city of Sarnia; however, we expect that.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Algoma had a question.

Mr. Bullbrook: This type of comment deserves no reply. I heard this yesterday in private bills, this very type of comment.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please! The member for Algoma-Manitoulin had a question on this same point.

Mr. S. Farquhar (Algoma-Manitoulin): Mr. Chairman, just in case some of the new members are not completely clear on the procedure here, I wonder if I could ask you, and for my own edification too, I gather that it is procedure that within a vote we can wander around among the items. Is that right?

Mr. Chairman: May I say that if the members do not wander too far and move around too much, we will take it by each individual vote; if they wander too far, we will take it item for item.

Mr. Farquhar: I just had a small question at this point. It has to do with item number 6, which is sundry awards. In trying to dig a little information up I have noticed that back in last year's *Hansard* it was fairly well established that these awards refer to staff suggestions. Am I right?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: That is right, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Farquhar: In this connection, I would like to ask a few questions.

For instance, what is the award for each suggestion? Five thousand dollars, Mr. Chairman, is quite a lot of money for awards in one year. Industry, for instance, or business, does not lay out awards above possibly in the amounts somewhere between $5 or $100. This is a lot for suggestions and would it not be worthwhile thinking that, for instance, only the suggestions that were used might be subject to awards. I would like to have an answer to that.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Chairman, I might tell the hon. member that only the suggestions that are used are paid for. Some of the things that came in last year were new "MEN AT WORK" signs that would not blow over; and a new design of a heavy equipment tire changer; and safety belts in forestry lighting buckets; and litter bags handed out at the service centres. This was the type of thing which the staff did. I may say that the amount spent last year was $3,416.

Mr. Lewis: You gave a reward for litter bags at service centres? It would be very interesting, for instance, to know how many suggestions you did get from your staff; or at least how many suggestions that you got that were actually used.

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent): Mr. Chairman, under this vote would you discuss the road study that was set up by your department in the counties? Did this come under this vote?

Mr. Chairman: I think that comes under a different vote. Possibly 904.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Chairman, that comes under item 908, section 6.

Mr. Chairman: It is 908. The member for Rainy River?

Mr. T. P. Reid: Mr. Chairman: when I asked my previous question the hon. Minister did not reply. Could he inform us whether the Ontario good roads association approached the department for an increase in their grant this year?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Not this year, Mr. Chairman, but I believe that it was doubled last year when they did approach us.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Sandwich-Riverside. The member for Wentworth; the other member had been on his feet before.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Fine, thank you. Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to belabour the matter of the St. Clair parkway commission, but I do think that it is unfortunate that we should be asked to deal with an increase of two thirds, and that the Minister should arrive in the House without the necessary information as to what this money is going to be spent on. I should certainly hope that we would not arrive at such a vote today before we have an opportunity of finding out what this two thirds addition is going to be used for.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Chairman, this is no different from any municipal government or county government coming in for a subsidy. The budget that they present is really their own, as made up by the people who live in the area, and are represented on this commission. The commission just came into being in 1966, and I believe that the amount spent last year—that we gave them—was about $65,000, and this is an increase of that amount because they are going to do more of the things that they want to do.

Mr. Lewis: They are expanding their golf course.

Mr. Deans: This kind of a statement is ridiculous. If this commission comes back next year with the same kind of increase, are we just going to say that they are going to do more of the things that they did last year? We just cannot do this.

Mr. Paterson: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask of the Minister, relating back to subsection 1, on policy, what the department's policy is—if they have one, in fact—in relation to supplying transportation or facilities to the May islands in our province? As the Minister is quite aware, I do have a problem in my own area.

The member for Kingston (Mr. Apps) has spoken on the excellent ferry service in his area, and I realize that this comes up under vote 904 specifically, and I will not dwell on that at this point. Also the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Gilbertson) has a problem in relation to a 900-foot channel separating his fair island of St. Joseph and the mainland.

The Minister is fully conversant with my particular problem with the island some 15 miles out on the lake.

I would ask of the Minister what is the policy, should there just be municipal roads on that island? If the policy has altered whatsoever, should there be a provincial highway on the island? Should the roadways be an international link on the island, or a connecting link to a further highway? And secondly, at the convenience of the Minister's staff, I would appreciate some detailed knowledge of all islands that are receiving assistance in their transportation problems and the amount thereof.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: This is under 904, Mr. Chairman, and we will come to that then.

Mr. Young: There are a couple of items the Minister mentioned that I would appreciate a bit of further light on. He mentioned that there was a prize offered for the design of litter bags in service stations. What kind of an award would be granted in this instance.?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: This is the award that was given to the person in the department who designed it, and they were given out at service stations, not for service stations. I do not have the amount of that as to the details, but it would be small, something like $10 or $15.

Mr. Young: The other matter, Mr. Chairman, is that the Minister mentioned that under that vote, there was some activity in the development of symbol signs. I am not sure that this comes under this vote, but it was raised here by the minister. I think that some of us have been feeling very strongly that we should have symbol signs across the board, and across the nation.

There has been a great deal of investigation here, I know, on the part of this government, and on the part of other governments, and I would appreciate, and the House would appreciate knowing, just what progress there is. It is important that we standardize signs and the symbol signs would be the logical ones to adopt continent-wide.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Chairman, when I mentioned this, it was in regard to the research that is done in conjunction with the Canadian good roads association, that is where that came in.

Mr. Young: Could the Minister tell us whether any progress is being made, or whether there is any timetable or anything of that nature?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: I think that the hon. member realizes that there is progress being

made. I do not know how I could answer you, when you ask of the degree.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Downsview.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could tell us how large his legal department is this year?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Thirty people, sir.

Mr. Singer: Thirty people? And of the $2,843,000, how much of that would be spent on the legal department salaries, right in number one of 901?

Hon Mr. Gomme: Mr. Chairman, I have not got that broken down, I just have—

Mr. Singer: Well, approximately? Thirty times $10,000?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: I can get that figure for you.

Mr. Singer: Can the Minister give me the figure of how much he spent in outside legal help this year?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: This is a figure that we do not have, we would have to search for that, but we can do it.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I would have thought that the Minister would have been prepared to answer this because this is a subject that I have referred to at some substantial length every year that the estimates have been here and the public accounts. Certainly the Deputy—I see he is scratching his head there—the Deputy has heard me on this subject in public accounts.

I think it is most pertinent, because looking through the public accounts here for the year ending December 31, 1967—that takes us a year behind—I have not picked them all out but just under the 'A's, there is the firm of Arnup, Foulds, Weir, Boeckh, Morris and Robinson and they got $7,057.73. An outstanding firm, that is, they do good work, but I have not had a chance, nor do I think I am going to bother to go through all these and get figures that are a year old.

I would like the Minister to tell us in the year, from March 31, 1967 until the end of the year, of March 31, 1968, how much he spent in addition to this legal staff of 30? And I would like to know why—I would suspect there is a substantial amount—in addition to a legal staff of 30 he has to go outside the department? And I think those figures should be produced before this vote goes through.

Having said that much, Mr. Chairman, I would like to know what thought, if any, the Minister has given to the recommendations by Mr. McRuer that all of the legal work done for the government of Ontario be centred in The Department of the Attorney General?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: I might say in the first instance we do not have 30 lawyers in the department.

Mr. Singer: Give me the breakdown—I was just using your figures.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: I mean that is one thing. Then I may say that in regard to the McRuer report we are examining it to see what we think should be done.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I think there should be some policy, because on the public accounts committee, I think it was a year and a half ago, quite an issue was made of this and quite an issue was made about the thought that, with a large legal staff, and I would think next to the Attorney General's department, you have the largest legal department in government, that you should at least be able to do all your own work.

I would suspect—I have no figures at all here and as the figures in this public accounts book are a year old—I would suspect that your department has gotten bigger over the last 12 months and you have farmed out more outside work. I think those figures should be here and it would seem to me, as well, Mr. Chairman, that the time is long overdue—not only because of McRuer but because of the suggestions that we have been putting forward for a long time, that this department, especially, because it has the largest legal department outside The Attorney General's Department, should be looking to some kind of consolidation.

I would hope, sir, that before this vote is through, we will have these figures here and the Minister will present them to us. Because I would like to know not only how much was spent in outside legal work, but what it was for. I think with those figures we can begin to intelligently discuss these estimates that are before us, and without them we cannot.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to allude to a matter which was raised by the member for Rainy River and also the member for Sandwich-Riverside in relation to this grant to the Canadian good roads association. Apparently,

the increase is the result of research which is being done. I took it from what the Minister said that he was not quite sure what type of research was being undertaken by the good roads association.

I had the pleasure to spend part of an afternoon at the good roads association convention this year, and I noticed that there was a presentation given at that time on research that was being conducted, and I can think of one or two items at the moment. I think one of them was the breakaway pole where a car runs off the road and hits a pole and the butt of that pole actually breaks away. It results in very little damage to the car and no injury to the occupant. The other one had to deal with, or dealt with, guard rails and the fact that from a safety standpoint, two cables on guard rails are much safer than one cable. I am just wondering if this is the type of research which is being conducted by the good roads association and if it is—

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Might I ask, was this meeting the Ontario good roads association or Canadian good roads association? Was it here in Toronto?

Mr. Gaunt: It was the Canadian good roads association, I think. It was in Toronto this year.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: That would be Ontario good roads association and this could be a paper presented by some outside authority, maybe even ourselves.

Mr. Gaunt: Oh, I see. All right, we cannot establish the organization which was actually doing the research, but that really is not my point anyway. I wanted to ask the Minister if, in fact, this type of research is being given consideration by the department, and if so, is there any programme to change, for instance, the guard rail on the highways across the province.

That is to say, are we going to put two cables on our guard rails rather than have the one which is presently on? Similarly, on the new roads which we are constructing, are we going to build, or insist on building, this new type of pole which has an obvious safety factor over and above what we are using and have used for a good number of years.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Chairman, we are doing research on that and I think the member remembers last night I spoke about the programme that took place out in Fingal where they are testing the guard rails. This is a continuing programme with us.

Mr. Gaunt: Another matter which I want to raise in this connection, Mr. Chairman, has to do with the planting of trees along the highway. I have often thought that the planting of trees, while a very good thing from the scenic point of view, has obvious dangers attached to it. I know there are stretches of highway across this province where, if one were to go off the road, it would be impossible to miss a tree.

I can think of quite a number of areas, even in my own locality, where this is so and I am just wondering what, aside from the beauty attached to them, the department has, in years gone by, and seems to continue to plant these trees so close to the road.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: I think the member realizes that in a lot of areas we cannot cut them down. Public opinion is against us and we do not plant them close to the road if at all possible. We just do not do that.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): I move that the committee rise and report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report progress and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we would like to deal with the supplementary estimates as the first order of business and the Lieutenant-Governor will attend on the Legislature quite early in the afternoon to give Royal assent to certain bills. Thereafter, we will proceed with the estimates of The Department of Highways.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 6:05 o'clock, p.m.



Legislature of Ontario Debates

No. 40

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

First Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Thursday, March 28, 1968

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1968

5

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Thursday, March 28, 1968

Royal assent to certain bills, the Lieutenant-Governor 1331

Report of the forestry study unit, 1967, Mr. Brunelle 1331

Tenth report, standing committee on private bills, Mr. Carton 1332

Blind Workmen's Compensation Act, bill to amend, Mr. Bales, first reading 1332

Highway Traffic Act, bill to amend, Mr. Young, first reading 1333

Questions to Mr. Robarts re committee on extension of teaching in French, Mr. MacDonald 1333

Question to Mr. Dymond re OMSIP, Mr. Deans 1333

Questions to Mr. Haskett re reflectorized licence plates, Mr. Burr 1333

Question to Mr. Dymond re air pollution, Mr. Haggerty 1333

Questions to Mr. Gomme re tunnel construction, Mr. Haggerty 1334

Question to Mr. Gomme re landscaping, Mr. Jackson 1335

Questions to Mr. Welch re social dancing in cocktail lounges, Mr. Bullbrook 1335

Question to Mr. Simonett re gasoline transports on provincial highways, Mr. Ruston 1335

Question to Mr. Simonett re water pollution in Lake Erie, Mr. Bukator 1336

Questions to Mr. Simonett re water pollution in the Great Lakes, Mr. Sargent 1336

Questions to Mr. Randall re the Ontario housing corporation, Mr. Trotter 1337

Supplementary estimates, ordinary expenditure, Mr. MacNaughton 1338

Supplementary estimates, Department of Energy and Resources Management, Mr. Simonett 1338

Supplementary estimates, Department of Health, Mr. Dymond 1338

Supplementary estimates, Department of Tourism and Information, Mr. Auld 1338

Supplementary estimates, Department of Energy and Resources Management, Mr. Simonett 1341

Estimates, Department of Highways, Mr. Gomme, continued 1347

Recess, 6 o'clock 1367

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, MARCH 28, 1968

The House met at 2:30 o'clock p.m.

Prayers.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, His Honour is standing by, prepared to give assent to certain bills. With your permission, I would leave my place and bring him in.

The Honourable, the Lieutenant-Governor of Ontario entered the chamber of the legislative assembly and took his seat upon the Throne.

Hon. W. Earl Rowe (Lieutenant-Governor): Pray be seated.

Mr. Speaker: May it please Your Honour, the legislative assembly of the province of Ontario has, at its present sittings thereof, passed several bills to which, in the name of and on behalf of the said legislative assembly, I respectfully request Your Honour's assent.

Assistant Clerk of the House: The following are the titles of the bills to which Your Honour's assent is prayed:

Bill 1, An Act to amend The Perpetuities Act, 1966.

Bill 2, An Act to amend The County Judges Act.

Bill 4, An Act to amend The Wages Act.

Bill 5, An Act to amend The Religious Institutions Act.

Bill 8, An Act to amend The Prearranged Funeral Services Act, 1961-1962.

Bill 9, An Act to amend The Minors' Protection Act.

Bill 13, An Act to amend The Ontario Housing Corporation Act, 1964.

Bill 46, An Act to amend The Family Benefits Act, 1966.

Bill 47, An Act to amend The General Welfare Assistance Act.

Bill 48, An Act to amend The Vocational Rehabilitation Services Act, 1966.

To these Acts the Royal assent was announced by the clerk of the legislative assembly in the following words:

Clerk of the House: In Her Majesty's name, the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor doth assent to these bills.

The Honourable, the Lieutenant-Governor was pleased to retire from the chamber.

Mr. Speaker: We are always pleased to have visitors to the Legislature and today we welcome, as guests in the east gallery, Stewarttown senior public school, Stewarttown; in the west gallery, Edgewood public school, Scarborough and in both galleries, students from Holy Rosary separate school, Toronto.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Hon. R. Brunelle (Minister of Lands and Forests): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to table the report of the forestry study unit, along with a condensation of this report. Copies of the main report are filed in the legislative library. Supplies of the condensed report are available to the senior attendants, for those who wish to review this report.

Re: Report of the Forestry Study Unit, 1967

A forestry study unit was formed on September 1, 1964. Its purpose was to investigate the forest resources of the province of Ontario and to make recommendations to ensure continued progress in utilization with a view to their fullest development. This work, which is the first major review of forestry in Ontario since the Kennedy Royal commission in 1947, was carried out under the direction of Mr. J. A. Brodie, who had been associated with The Department of Lands and Forests since 1923 and was chief of the timber branch from 1956 to 1964.

The forestry study unit studied in depth the forestry practices of both Ontario and Scandinavia. Public meetings were held at 17 locations throughout the province and during the period of the study, more than 45 briefs were received and a great many consultations held with operators, forestry groups, industrial groups and associations. For detailed technical studies, the forestry study unit made use of outside consultants.

The report of the forestry study unit was completed in June, 1967, and upon receipt of the report it was thoroughly studied by department staff and the attached condensation of the report was prepared. This condensation summarizes the recommendations of the forestry study unit and consolidates the tables which appear in the report.

As director of the forestry study unit, Mr. Brodie has attempted to point the way to a solution of a wide number of problems, many of which will require co-operation on the part of the various interests concerned to make his proposals work out successfully. Many of the recommendations have already been implemented and some of the others can be readily accepted. Others, however, require further study in order to clarify how they may be accomplished.

The government is ever mindful of the impressive strength of Ontario's forest-based industries and of their remarkable aggregate contribution to our province's economy. Including woods workers, this industry group provides about 85,000 jobs and pays well over $350 million in salaries and wages. The products shipped by Ontario's forest industries account for more than 8 per cent of the total value of all goods produced in the province. Expressed another way, each 100 cubic feet of wood used represents a contribution of about $120 to the gross provincial product. As great as this contribution is, Ontario's forests are capable of providing an even greater contribution to our province's economy. One of Ontario's most pressing forestry needs is to make use of all the wood our forests are capable of growing. I have discussed this problem with the presidents of many of Ontario's larger forest industries and have indicated to them that adjustments in timber licences will undoubtedly have to be made in order to make extra wood available to those industries having plans to use available volumes of all species.

The condensation will be made available to the public at a price of $1.50. A limited number of copies of the full report are available at $10, but due to the shortness of supply, it will be necessary to restrict the sale to those persons who wish to study the report in detail.

Mr. G. R. Carton from the standing committee on private bills, presented the committee's 10th report which was read as follows and adopted:

The committee begs to report the following bills with certain amendments:

Bill Pr8, An Act respecting the city of Hamilton.

Bill Pr22, An Act respecting the city of London.

Bill Pr23, An Act respecting the township of Vaughan.

Bill Pr30, An Act respecting the city of Kitchener.

Bill Pr42, An Act respecting the city of Ottawa.

Your committee would recommend that the following bill be not reported.

Bill Pr7, An Act respecting the city of Kingston.

Your committee would recommend that the fees, less the penalties and the actual cost of printing from the cost of transcribing the evidence taken before the estates commissioners, be remitted on Bill Pr1, An Act respecting the United Church-Evangelical United Brethren Church.

Mr. Speaker: Presenting reports.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

THE BLIND WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION ACT

Hon. D. A. Bales (Minister of Labour) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Blind Workmen's Compensation Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Speaker, this bill will transfer the administration of The Blind Workmen's Compensation Act from The Treasury Department to The Department of Labour.

The Blind Workmen's Compensation Act has been on the statute books for many years. Basically it is designed to promote the continued employment of persons blinded by industrial accidents by relieving employers of a portion of the cost of compensation.

Administratively the workmen's compensation board processes a compensation claim involving a workman who has been blinded as it would any other claim coming before it. However, where the cost of compensation exceeds $50, it will be paid out of the public purse rather than out of the compensation board accident fund and the direct cost to industry is thereby reduced.

THE HIGHWAY TRAFFIC ACT

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Highway Traffic Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Young: Mr. Speaker, this bill parallels the American legislation which requires that car manufacturers must notify the Minister when safety defects emerge in cars which are manufactured and in the hands of the public.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister.

Earlier statements by the government indicated that the committee established to make recommendations on the extension of the teaching in French in our secondary school system would be reporting about mid-March. Can the Prime Minister indicate now when we can expect this committee to provide us with guidance?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, I believe it has been publicized in the press that there is a preliminary report from that committee which has been received by the government and is presently under consideration. I am unable to say when the final report will be here, but we propose to introduce legislation dealing with this matter during the present session. At that time we will have the report and there will be complete opportunity for discussion of the whole matter.

Mr. MacDonald: If the Prime Minister will permit, may I ask whether or not members of the Legislature will be able to get copies of both the interim and the final reports of that committee?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I would say, Mr. Speaker, that at the moment it is not our intention to make public the interim report. Frankly, I am not just certain when the final report will be along. But it will be here in time for us to close that session. I assume, at least to some extent, the decision will be based on the findings of the committee. When we have that report, that decision will be made.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Health.

In view of the deluge of letters received by myself and other members of the Legislature, requesting extension of OMSIP coverage to include chiropractic services, could the Minister inform the House if amendments to The Medical Services Insurance Act, 1965, will be introduced during this session of the Legislature, providing for chiropractic services?

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, it is not proposed to introduce such legislation at this session of the Legislature.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Sandwich-Riverside.

Mr. F. Burr (Sandwich-Riverside): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Transport.

In view of the glowing reports on the use of reflectorized licence plates in various states and countries, is the Minister now willing to reconsider his decision against the use of reflectorized plates in Ontario?

Mr. Speaker: The Minister of Transport has had a question directed to him by the member for Sandwich-Riverside.

Hon. I. Haskett (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, on January 4, 1968, I announced Ontario's decision not to introduce reflectorized licence plates in the foreseeable future. At that time, I issued the following statement, and I quote:

> An exhaustive analysis by The Department of Transport during the past year has found that reflectorized plates would be unlikely to have any significant value in averting accidents. Conflicting reports on results from reflectorized plates in other provinces and in the United States were studied as part of the department's analysis. Claims of effective results were found to be inconclusive.
>
> In Ontario, only 0.56 per cent of accidents were of a type that could conceivably be affected by reflectorized plates such as night-time collisions involving parked cars. Many of these were due to causes that had no relation to reflectorization, such as vehicle failures and certain driver actions. Others were as likely to be avoided by the existing rear-end reflectors required by The Highway Traffic Act.
>
> While the number of accidents that might be averted by reflectorized plates is open to question, the analysis found that it could not be more than a fraction of one-half of one per cent. The cost of reflectorizing plates in Ontario would be about $1 million annually.
>
> It certainly would not be responsible or sensible to allocate a large sum of money

for a purpose of such limited and questionable benefit. Other highway safety programmes such as those we have now involving drivers and vehicles are much more in the public interest.

Mr. Speaker, nothing has occurred since, which would indicate to me that this decision should be reversed.

Mr. Burr: Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the Minister.

How does the Minister explain the fact that all the major safety associations and police associations in North America have endorsed this principle, and the fact that in 14 countries in the world, these are being used with good results?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Speaker, I would say that the member's information is erroneous.

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Health.

In view of the statement in the Welland *Tribune* of March 26, that drivers and children are suffering from poor visibility and gagging in the city of Port Colborne because of fumes from the Welland chemical plant:

1. Has the advisory board of the air pollution control of Ontario established a policy programme of inspection?

2. When will the board implement its programme?

3. Would the fumes, inhaled over a period of five years or more cause fibrosis of the lungs?

4. What other effect has the inhalation of high concentration fumes on men employed in the plant area?

5. What effect have the chemical fumes on the health of residents in this contaminated air shed?

6. What effect have the chemical fumes on real property?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, because of the very obvious need for a good deal of research data and information, searching of the literature to answer the specific questions, I would ask that they be put on the order paper.

However, to give a general answer, I might point out I have not seen this in the Welland newspaper. However, my colleague from the riding of Welland, strangely enough, on February 27 wrote me a somewhat similar question by way of private letter, and I think I should quote this as I can tell you what answer I gave to him:

> As I told you yesterday there is a great deal of worry and concern down in my area about air pollution and the effects it is having on the health of our people. You have likely heard about the great amount of smoke and smog we have in and around the Welland area. There are all kinds of rumours abroad that this causes serious diseases of the lungs.
>
> I wonder if your department could give me any help in this matter so that I can either assure the people that their fears are groundless or that your department is doing something about it?
>
> Yours very truly,
> Ellis P. Morningstar, MPP.

I wrote to the member telling him that we had some awareness of the problem in that area, but that, since we had only taken over responsibility for air pollution January 1, 1968, certain studies were necessary to assess the extent of the problem, and that it was our understanding that the city of Welland had already commissioned some study, which, if it were not in progress, would likely be in progress very shortly.

I further told the hon. member that at the present time I am not in a position to tell him anything more definite because there is a good deal of controversy as to the effects of smoke and smog on this kind of disease.

Mr. Haggerty: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Highways.

In view of the joint announcement from Ottawa and Queen's Park that an agreement to construct two new Welland canal tunnels under a revised federal-provincial cost sharing formula in the city of Welland,

1. Will the Minister inform the House what steps have been taken to construct a tunnel at Port Colborne?

2. Has The Department of Highways accepted the recommendation for a site as suggested in the traffic report of Smith and Damson?

3. Under The Expropriation Procedures Act have any plans for property rights been filed in the registry office of Welland county?

4. Has the Minister of Highways, the federal Minister of Transport and the St. Lawrence seaway authority arrived at a cost-sharing agreement?

5. Will the Minister indicate the commencement and the completion dates of the construction of a tunnel at Port Colborne?

Hon. G. E. Gomme (Minister of Highways): Mr. Speaker, in answer to the question:

1. The agreement referred to in the question provides cost-sharing arrangements between the federal authority and the province for the construction of the two tunnels referred to, and other crossings of the canal when they are undertaken. The timing of the construction of the tunnels is dictated by the new canal construction, part of which has been approved by the federal government and the balance of which is under consideration. There is no major change in the canal alignment at Port Colborne, so there is not the same urgency at this location. However, when it is constructed in the future, it will be under the same cost-sharing agreement.

2. The answer is "yes".

3. By "under The Expropriation Procedures Act", I assume you are referring to property in connection with the canal tunnel. If so, nothing has been filed in the registry office under The Expropriation Procedures Act in connection with the tunnels announced in the Welland area. Of course property has been acquired in this manner for the Thorold tunnel and the plans are now nearing completion.

4. Yes, through approval of both Treasury boards.

5. The dates of the commencement and the completion of the construction of a tunnel at Port Colborne have not been set.

Mr. D. Jackson (Timiskaming): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Highways.

Will the Minister instruct his department to clean up and landscape the area bordering the gravel pit at the intersection of Highway 11B and the Bass Lake road, in the Cobalt area, in order that the natural beauty of a tourist area will not be spoiled?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Speaker, yes, every attempt will be made to improve this area.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): Mr. Speaker, I had given notice of a question to the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Wishart) and with your permission I would like to withdraw it, sir.

I have a question for the hon. Provincial Secretary.

Having understanding that the liquor control board of Ontario has legislative entitlement to exercise discretion to permit social dancing in certain cocktail lounges, would the Minister advise as follows:

1. Is my understanding of the discretion correct?

2. Have any applications been made as yet for the exercise of such discretion?

3. Has such discretion yet been exercised in favour of an applicant?

Hon. R. S. Welch (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, I assume the hon. member has reference to regulations 38, 39 and 40 under The Liquor Licence Act of the province and if in fact I have assumed correctly, I would draw particular attention to regulation number 40.

If this is the area in which the question is being asked, then the answer to all three questions would be "yes", in that context.

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member made reference to a question, but I could not hear him clearly. Did I understand the question was withdrawn?

Mr. Bullbrook: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Thank you.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Energy and Resources Management.

Is it the intention of the hon. Minister to approve the use of gasoline transports on provincial highways carrying over 11,000 gallons of gasoline, and if so, is this not a very dangerous practice to allow such vehicles on our highways?

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Mr. Speaker, in answer to the first part of the question, we have not been asked to approve gasoline transports on provincial highways carrying over 11,000 gallons of gasoline. However, if vehicles transporting gasoline should be so constructed that singly or in tandem they are capable of carrying this quantity, we would accept them, provided they conform to the safety requirements of the approved specifications.

In answer to the second part, we do not consider gasoline transports of this capacity to be more hazardous than those currently licensed, provided they also meet the regulations relating to traffic control.

Mr. Speaker, I have some questions that were asked of me when I was away in the early part of the week, and with your permission, I would like to answer them now.

There was a question from the hon. member for Niagara Falls.

Mr. Speaker: I thought he might ask the question.

Mr. G. Bukator (Niagara Falls): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I did not ask the question yet.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Oh, fine. I am sorry, I thought he had.

Mr. Bukator: I did not realize that my influence was that great in this House. I will ask the question first.

What specific research programme has the Ontario water resources commission instituted to combat nutrient additions to Lake Erie through municipal sewage treatment plants?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Speaker, several projects have been undertaken by the Ontario water resources commission to determine means of removing nutrients from the discharges of municipal sewage treatment plants. Biological agents, chemicals and process modifications are being tried. The division of research is conducting studies on the modification or intensification of existing treatment processes through the use of model treatment units.

Close liaison is being maintained with nutrient research projects in Detroit, Michigan; San Antonio, Texas; Lake Tahoe, Oklahoma; the University of Minnesota and elsewhere, where significant work is being done.

Mr. Speaker: If the member for Grey-Bruce would ask his question now of the Minister, then perhaps the answer might be forthcoming.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The question to the Minister of Energy and Resources Management is: According to the *New York Times* reports of March 17, 1968, a four-state lake pollution conference, composed of representatives of Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin and Ohio, approved the spending of hundreds of millions of dollars, if not billions of dollars, of public and private funds to save Lake Michigan from hopeless pollution.

The question is: (1) Was the province of Ontario represented, and if not, why not? (2) What positive programme of such magnitude is under way for Lake Huron, Lake Erie, and Lake Ontario? and (3) If not, why not?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Speaker, the conference referred to was a public hearing called by the federal water pollution control administration of the United States Department of the Interior. The province of Ontario cannot officially participate in a hearing of this kind. The Ontario water resources commission received an invitation to attend as observers but, because of the pressure of commission programmes currently being developed, this was not possible. However, staff of the Ontario water resources commission have attended similar hearings in the past as observers.

In the second part of the question, the answer is that the province of Ontario undertook an active programme of pollution abatement of the Great Lakes and tributary basins as early as 1957 with the formation of the Ontario water resources commission. Since then, about $1 billion has been spent on municipal treatment facilities, $958 million from 1957 to 1967, and a further $123 million on industrial waste treatment, with OWRC approval.

Our record has not been matched by our American friends sharing the Great Lakes. Despite their current effort to correct this situation, they are faced with a larger backlog of construction and more waste output. Since we have a stake in their programmes, we have participated with them through the international joint commission in tracing trans-boundary movement of pollution. The Ontario water resources commission has also intensified its Great Lakes survey programme to monitor changes in water quality and determine any need of pollution control requirements to protect and, when necessary, improve the water quality.

Mr. Sargent: Will the hon. Minister accept a supplementary question? You did not tell us why you did not attend.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Speaker, I told the hon. member that the commission was busy. We can only go and sit in on the meeting; we do not take any part in the meeting. After all, I feel that we should work for some of our people in Ontario—

Mr. Sargent: What is more important in your department than that?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: —and we would like to get the projects moving here.

Mr Sargent: What is more important than that?

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr Simonett: Mr. Speaker, there are many things more important than that, because there is a conference going on on pollution every day of the year, and we must keep some of our people in the province.

I have an answer—and I think this was asked of me last Friday by the member for Sarnia (Mr. Bullbrook)—to the last part of a question that he put on the order paper. The answer: it is the view of the Ontario Hydro, which is shared by my department, that the best interests of the people of Ontario are served by continuing the existing arrangement with AECL under provisions that will allow for the contracting out of work as the programme develops.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Grey-Bruce has three questions of the Prime Minister which have been in my office for a week now, and perhaps he would—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, it runs in my mind that these questions were—I can check them up—I think they were, in fact, asked and answered.

An hon. member: Run them through—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: They can be run through again if he likes.

Mr Sargent: You can proceed if you like to. You did not tell us about Expo Habitat.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, that question was put on the order paper and it is on the order paper now. As soon as I have detailed answers I will table them.

Mr. Sargent: This year?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Yes, I tabled some answers yesterday or the day before. If the information comes through to my office, I will make it available to the House; we have nothing to hide.

Mr. Speaker: The member for High Park has a question?

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): I would like very much to ask my question, sir, but the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions (Mr. Grossman) is not here.

Mr. Speaker: I beg your pardon? The Minister of Economics and Development has an answer for a question?

Hon. S. J. Randall (Minister of Economics and Development): Mr. Speaker, this is the answer to a three-part question from the hon. member for Parkdale (Mr. Trotter), and I answered part of this question earlier in the week. I would just like to say again that the Ontario housing corporation, like any other land developer, must purchase land on a competitive basis. We therefore believe it is in the best interests of the corporation in assembling land at the lowest cost, to neither telegraph our intentions in advance nor disclose purchase price when arrangements are completed. To do so increases the possibility of OHC having to pay higher prices, and publicizing the prices paid could disturb final negotiations underway in other parts of Ontario.

The answer to the second question: The agreement under which the Ontario housing corporation purchased a total of 402 serviced lots from Campeau Construction Company Limited, contained a provision for Campeau Construction Company Limited to lease up to a maximum of 50 per cent of the lots for disposal under the HOME plan on a controlled end-price basis. By this means, OHC provided for immediate construction, subject to mortgage money being available on these lots by one of the largest builders in Ottawa.

And the answer to the third question: other than the understanding with Campeau Construction Company Limited, no other arrangements were made for the disposal of lots prior to the time lots were made available to the public. However, the fact that HOME lots were to be made availab'e in Ottawa was publicized some weeks earlier and staff of OHC were on the site to deal with interested builders and potential homeowners.

Mr. P. J. Yakabuski (Renfrew South): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I would like to bring to the attention of this House a very wonderful and memorable occasion. I just learned, coming down the corridor a few moments ago, that today the hon. member for Prince Edward-Lennox, Norris Whitney, is celebrating his 60th birthday.

We all know that Mr. Whitnev has served the riding of Prince Edward-Lennox for some 17 years, being elected in that famous "Frost-sweep" general election of November, 1951, and has remained here in this Legislature ever since, representing very well the interests of Prince Edward-Lennox.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The 22nd order; the House in committee of supply, Mr. A. E. Reuter in the chair.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES, ORDINARY EXPENDITURE

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Provincial Treasurer) Mr. Chairman, by way of a brief introduction, I might note that the supplementary estimates for the fiscal year 1967-1968 total $8,749,900 and encompass only three departments of government: The Department of Energy and Resources Management is requesting $349,900; The Department of Health, $7,900,000; and The Department of Tourism and Information, $500,000, and these votes themselves will be dealt with by the Ministers of the departments involved as usual.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY AND RESOURCES MANAGEMENT

One vote 612:

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Chairman, on vote 612, would the Minister advise as to what the losses on the rail operation were; what the profits on the telephone communication operation were; and what the profit or loss on any other branches of operations of the commission were, and how he arrived at the net figure of the loss of $349,900?

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Mr. Speaker, I might say that I do not have a breakdown with me of the loss on the rail operation and the profit on the communications. I would be very happy to get that for the member but I would have to get it from the office in North Bay. This loss on total operations of $349,803 in 1966 compared with a deficit in 1965 of $1,194,357. I might say that in the year that we have just finished we have a profit of $427,000, but as far as a breakdown on the different operations, I do not have one with me, but I will be pleased to get it for you.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, perhaps with the permission of the Minister, the chairman of Ontario Northland transportation commission, the member for Parry Sound, would answer the question.

Mr. A. Johnston (Parry Sound): Mr. Chairman, I regret that I no not have it here, I have it upstairs in my desk. With the indulgence of the House, I could get it in a very few minutes if you feel that you should have it today.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, perhaps we could deal with the other votes and hold this one up until we have this information?

Mr. Chairman: Yes, perhaps the member would get the information, and we will proceed to vote 812 of The Department of Health.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH

On vote 812:

Mr. R. F. Nixon: (Leader of the Opposition): Oh, Mr. Chairman, as far as the health grant is concerned, the special grants to public hospitals were authorized under what particular programme?

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Mr. Chairman, this is the programme whereby a $75-per-bed capital grant is given, and has been given for some years now, to each hospital bed in operation during the year. This is to help the hospitals defray capital expenditure debts, which doubles depreciation on buildings for which there has not been approved or adequate approved grants, certain types of sophisticated equipment which has not been considered absolutely essential, but believed by the staff to be essential for their operations.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, I am not clear why the special allotment would be needed, surely the Minister could have predicted this in his regular budgetary requirements covering the present fiscal year.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Well, Mr. Chairman, we cannot predict. We have been giving this grant ever since 1959, and we retain it in the supplementary estimates in the hope that one day we will be able to drop it, but we do not believe that this is the time to drop it.

Mr. Nixon: And the second item?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: The second item is a special grant, one-third instalment. It is the second of three instalments of $3,500,000, a total of $10.5 million given to Sick Children's hospital for the research and teaching functions especially.

Vote 812 agreed to.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF TOURISM AND INFORMATION

On vote 2110:

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, perhaps the Minister was going to say something about it before I rose, but this heritage foundation is of course, of wide interest across the province. I well remember the supporters of the government, the private members, raising this as an important issue, particularly for centennial year, and for the future, because up until that time, we had not had a fund from which monies could be used to maintain historic sites.

Apparently we have got into this business to the extent of $500,000 of money already promised, and this item is to cover it. Perhaps the Minister could give us a bit more detail as to how the money has been used since we are asked to approve it after its expenditure?

Hon. J. A. C. Auld (Minister of Tourism and Information): Well, Mr. Chairman, no money has been expended as yet. The leader of the Opposition will recall the bill was proclaimed about two months ago. The foundation has had about three meetings where they have been dealing with a great many requests and suggestions. They are presently using the staff of the department of records and archives. The staff consists of one; the part-time services of one of the members of the department.

The intention is not to build a large staff for the trust, since they will use the professional services of the archaelogical and historic sites advisory board, and the architectural conservancy of the province, and various groups like that. These funds—the $500,000—are to be placed as $50,000 in their current fund, and $450,000 in the reserve fund, the interest from which can be used to further the foundation.

It is the expectation, and it would appear to be an accurate one, that there will be a great many public contributions to the trust, to their funds, either to the current fund, or to the capital fund, and I think that this has had a real boost from the action of the Minister of Finance for Canada who has an amendment before the House at the present time which will allow gifts to the Crown, in the right of the provinces to be tax exempt, as they have been for years as far as the Dominion government is concerned.

The leader of the Opposition will recall, too, that the Minister of Indian and Northern Affairs, has indicated that his department would be prepared to share 50-50 with the foundation in the acquisition and restoration of structures which are in the province, and which are of national importance, so there will be at least $100,000 available for that kind of thing in the coming fiscal year.

Mr. Nixon: The purpose of the supplementary estimate as it is headed, is to meet the requirements of the fiscal year ending March 31, 1968, which is this coming Sunday. If you have not really made commitments for the $500,000 I cannot for the life of me see why you are asking us to vote it.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Chairman, perhaps I was not clear enough. These funds are, in effect, seed money. The province is putting $450,000 into the capital fund so that the interest will be available for current services for the foundation. The indications are that the fund will then accept donations from the public and will be in business. It may be that this Legislature will be asked about funds for the foundation at some future time, but if—

Mr. Nixon: But it is not in the other estimate.

Hon. Mr. Auld: No, there is nothing in the forthcoming estimate.

Mr. Chairman: Is there any further discussion about 2110?

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): As the Minister says, he has the money in hand, and he has not spent any of it. I accept his word for it, except to say that I trust that it is invested at the current high interest rate that prevails.

Then I really want to wonder out loud, Mr. Chairman, why the Treasury board would make this order of a grant of money to the Minister when they know, or they ought to have known at the time that they made it, that the House would meet very soon, and the Minister's estimates would come under review here.

As the leader of the Opposition has demonstrated, that gratuitous act on the part of the Treasury board is further aggravated by the fact that one looks at the estimates of the Minister and there is no mention of the Ontario heritage foundation.

Presumably members preparing to debate the Minister's estimates—at least some of them have made some preparations to discuss the Ontario heritage foundation—are deprived of the opportunity by default on a Thursday afternoon when the Provincial Treasurer comes in here and proposes these estimates be adopted. Then he leaves without any explanation as chairman of the Treasury board—I assume that he is chairman—and not making himself available to tell us why the

Treasury board made the grant of a tidy sum in this fashion. Or why the Minister upon question to him, if it were directed—and I would have directed a question had he stayed—why, when the Minister came to the Treasury board he was not told: "Put it in your estimates and it will be granted in the usual manner in the House."

Instead we have this, behind-the-scenes, almost under-the-table, concession to The Department of Tourism and Information of a grant of money without the benefit of review of Parliament. After all, that is the fundamental principle that we are discussing here, the right of Parliament to review this grant?

Then the whole problem is compounded to the extreme when we are told that the Minister has the money in the bank. Though a multiplicity of requests has been received from all over the province from interested people, he has not seen fit to spend it. I must say, having listened to him answer the leader of the Opposition, he demonstrated something less than a complete willingness to review the activities of this foundation at this time.

So, I for one, can say that I would be most reluctant to grant public monies of the province in this fashion. No not grant them at all, be asked to give endorsement *ex post facto*—retroactively—of a grant of public monies that has been made. I must say that I do not know enough about it at this point. I do not know enough about the Ontario heritage foundation, though it has an extremely worthy title, to be able to say that I could, responsibly, on behalf of the people of Sudbury, be a party to endorsing $500,000 in the Minister's hands, in the bank, or in some trust company, wherever he has it at the present time.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Chairman, I thought I had made it clear that the funds had not yet been handed over to the trust because they have not yet been voted. The purpose of the supplementary estimates is to vote funds and we are presently reviewing this very matter.

I can only say that I presume that the hon. Provincial Treasurer preferred to vote the funds out of the current year rather than the up-coming year. For this reason it is being done as supplementary estimates rather than in main estimates subsequently.

But I can assure the hon. member that no funds, have, as yet, been expended. As I explained, the board has received a great many suggestions and enquiries. I understand some offers of structures are presently being considered, but, at the present time they have, of course, no funds so they have been unable to purchase or acquire any.

Mr. Sopha: One moment, do you have the funds?

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): There was one comment made by the hon. member for Sudbury.

First of all, the accounting, I am quite certain, is, at the present time, nothing more than a book entry. In other words, the Provincial Treasurer will not have allocated these funds from the sums of money that the government has on hand at all times.

In other words, as far as interest is concerned, no doubt this $500,000 is earning interest at this moment in the general funds of the province. This is really a book entry here, and the money will not be advanced to the foundation itself. Now, I am speaking generally of government practice. It will not be advanced until required.

In other words, The Treasury Department keeps under its control to the largest extent possible, all sums of money that are not required immediately by any department, even though it may have been voted in the estimates of last year. That is the first point I would like to make. The Provincial Treasurer and The Treasury Department maintain as complete a control as possible over what is called cash flow, in order that we may manage the money of the province in an expeditious fashion and obtain the greatest interest income that is possible.

Secondly, there was another comment made that I would like to correct. Just because there may be no money voted in the estimates of the hon. Minister's department, it does not mean that this House cannot examine the operation of the Ontario heritage foundation during the estimates even though there may not be an actual dollar to be voted. We take a very broad view of what is discussed during estimates and the operation of the department, in any facet whatsoever; whether it involves an expenditure of money or not is open for examination at that time.

Mr. Nixon: Then we must assume that this is for the convenience of the Provincial Treasurer, or at least his accountants, and that it is voted now for the 1967-1968 year which finishes three days from now so that the Budget for the coming year will not be $252.5 million in deficit and that is the only explanation for putting it before us now!

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Chairman, to my mind, it is the only explanation that there is. There is the question of time, if one thinks about it. The bill establishing the foundation was passed in the last session but was not proclaimed until two or three months ago.

The intervening months were used to set up the organization, to find out who would serve on it and to create the foundation itself. When that preliminary work was done in the present fiscal year the appointments were made to the heritage foundation itself. It is functioning, as the Minister pointed out, with a very small staff, presently with the members of the department itself; now it is just getting under way. And these things happened to come just at this precise moment.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, I presume the Minister has made an announcement about those who are involved in the trust itself. Am I to understand him that the changes in the federal Income Tax Act will permit citizens of this province to make gifts to the heritage trust that would come under a different tax situation which formerly favoured gifts only at the federal level. Is that right?

Vote 2110 agreed to.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY AND RESOURCES MANAGEMENT

(Continued)

Mr. Chairman: The Minister now perhaps has the necessary information for the member for Parry Sound, on vote 612.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I have the figures that the hon. member asked for.

Our loss on the rail operation in 1966 was $2,415,735. The profit on the communications operation for the same year was $1,964,705. Miscellaneous profits, that includes buses and our hotel operations and boats, approximately $100,000 and the deficit, $389,000.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I want to make the simple point that the revenue from the communication operation on the Ontario Northland transportation commission, which comes from the toll system should, in fact, result in a reduction in the rates to subscribers in the area served by Northern Telephone Co. and other such companies by the agreement between the Ontario Northland transportation commission and principally the Northern Telephone Co.

Rather than have the government use the money and the profit which is derived from that operation, for the purpose of underwriting the loss of the rail operation, it would seem to be only proper that the government, if it is having a rail operation, should bear the cost of that operation by itself through a separate accounting rather than have the telephone users in the area served by the commission's system bear the cost of subsidizing the rail operation. Of course, this would apply whether it turned out that the rail operation lost money, as it did in 1966, or made a profit, or lost less money in this year, or would make more money in a future year. But the subscriber should have the benefit of the profit which is made in order to have the benefit of a reduction in the rates.

I, Mr. Chairman, having made the point, I believe, I would certainly appreciate it if the Minister would comment on it.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: The Ontario communications system has nothing to do with rate setting as far as telephone long distance charges are concerned. I think that the hon. member knows that that is set by the federal board of transportation. They approve all rates and, of course, we, I think, have very few subscribers. We are just forwarders from the subscribers. I doubt if we have but very few subscribers—and just in one area—who actually subscribe to us for telephone.

Now you take the money and set it up in communications and vote monies to carry the deficit in the railroad. We have the money, we cannot do anything with it, so the figures are always there. Any time the member wants to know what we are making on communications, what we are losing on rail, he can get the figures from the chairman of the commission or from me at any time. Sometimes it would mean we would have to get in touch with North Bay, but I think there is not much use in setting up a profit in one department and carrying it, and getting funds voted to us from the government to carry a deficit on the rail operation.

And I would think that in order to give the type of service that we are in the north, we do not hope to make money on rail operations. In order to do that, we would have to close down a lot of the smaller stations—some of the spur lines—and it is not the government's wish to do that. It is a development railway; we hope to keep it that way and, of course, it comes in very useful at times especially when you have heavy equipment and heavy shipments that are coming out of northern Ontario.

I might say that I was up there this week and had the opportunity of riding down with the first ore train out of Sherman Mines at Timagami. That mine has started production now and we expect a train load daily which will help our position this year.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, the Minister knows that I am quite well aware of the fact that the Northland transportation has few, if any, subscribers; that the Northland transportation commission runs a long distance toll operation; that there is an agreement between the Northland transportation commission and Northern Telephone Co. for the sharing of the revenues derived from that system.

Now it is also perfectly clear—the Minister knows this as well as everyone else—that the board of transport commissioners sets the toll rates that can be charged. There is nothing whatsoever to prevent the Northland transportation commission going to the board of transport commissioners at Ottawa and asking for a reduction in the tolls charged on their system. The, in my view, improper acquisition by the Bell Telephone Co.—I say improper from the point of view of the government of Ontario in allowing the Bell Telephone system to buy the Northern Telephone Company without any intervention by this government—makes it very complicated.

The fact of the matter is that the Northland transportation commission, if it accepts my basic proposition, can certainly arrange for a reduction in the tolls to be charged. This could ensure to the benefit of the persons who are the subscribers of the Northern Telephone Co., but who bear in their bills the costs part of which go towards this profit on the communications system and the Minister has, of course, referred to the rail operation as being a matter of government policy to be operated at a loss.

Unless we have—not on this vote but at the proper time—an explanation of what the government policy is, we certainly do not agree with the proposition that a rail operation for the purpose of exporting the raw resources of this country should be subsidized by this government.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I might say that the hon. member has not spoken to the members for northern Ontario, because every time I go up there we are taken to task because we are not subsidizing the rail line more and lowering freight rates.

I would think that when he is discussing telephone charges in northern Ontario—and I have compared the charges up there—in comparison with any place else in Ontario or Canada, he will find they are equal or lower, but I think we have to be consistent across the board. If we are going to subsidize communications in northern Ontario we have to look at eastern and western Ontario. We had better go across the board, and I would think, sir, that if you check with some of the members that represent northern Ontario they would not like us to raise the freight rates high enough to carry the deficit on the ONR and to give them the service that we are giving them at this point.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make two simple points. Nobody suggested for a moment that you should increase the freight rates. The question was whether or not the government should directly subsidize them.

Now, following the explanation of government policy at the proper time in this Legislature we can decide whether the policy is a wise one. As for the subscribers using the telephone system in that part of Ontario served by the Northland transportation commission—we have to look at the rates charged in other parts of the province—that suggestion is quite wrong because what we are simply saying is: Why should the profit made by the subscribers to the telephone system be a part of the subsidy of the rail operation which is a penalty to them? If the government wants to subsidize by additional amounts, that is their privilege if they can satisfy the House as to what their policy is on it.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I might say that the government's policy is to operate under the system we are operating under. We plan on doing it that way. Perhaps we are efficient in our communications and are able to make a profit, and I hope this is so. We have put in a lot of new equipment—we have a lot of capital monies spent up there.

This is the policy of the government and this is what we intend to do as far as communications are concerned. The deficit on the rail shipment—if we need it to give service up there we are willing to do that and that will have to be by a vote after the year is finished.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Thunder Bay.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Mr. Chairman, I would like to have the hon. Minister explain to me to what extent the Ontario government subsidizes the rail operation. I understand the freight rate is set and controlled by the board of transport commissioners but to what extent does the provincial government subsidize the rail operation for the Ontario Northland Railway, and do they in effect subsidize the shipment of raw material out of northern Ontario, or do they subsidize the shipment of manufactured goods into northern Ontario? I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that it would be an incentive to have the raw material that is mined in that area manufactured or processed in that area if we did not subsidize the movement of the raw material out. I would like to ask the Minister to what extent the provincial government does subsidize the rail operation.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I might say that we do not directly subsidize a shipper or a receiver. We do, where we are moving natural resources such as minerals, and wood products, give special rates—I would think they would be special rates, or the negotiated rates. We do try to give the best rates that we can in order for them to ship from that area and compete with other areas where they might be shipping by water or other methods. The only way we subsidize is by a vote. We operate the railroad and communication system for a year; there is no money voted for subsidization in that vote. But after the year is completed and the books are closed and audited, whatever the deficit is at that time, that is why we ask for a supplementary estimate.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Essex South.

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): Mr. Chairman, I would like to establish—through you to the Minister—whether the number of accidents that occurred on the Ontario Northland Railway in the past year contributed substantially to their loss in earnings and in fact were the creation of this loss in operational budget.

Could the Minister enlighten me as to how many accidents there were on this railway, and as to whether the railway carries insurance both on its equipment and on the loads that it carries to determine whether the financial loss in this regard was sufficient to create this loss?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I think we are getting very broad when we are asked how many accidents we had in 1966. I think perhaps, if we look back through *Hansard*, I have given the number of accidents in that year and the cost of those accidents. I think when you are in any transportation business you must get ready to have the odd accident; and all these accidents cost money.

Most of our accidents on the ONR—outside of one; we had one head-on in the last four years—I do not know how you get away from these things, they happen and then after people have been killed we can never find out what the real answer is. Most of our accidents over the past three years, though, have been broken wheels, broken axles, and most of it on foreign equipment, that is equipment that is coming in over our lines to be loaded. We did not carry insurance in the early years and I believe we have an insurance policy now with a "deductible", which is quite heavy, but most of those smaller accidents we carry ourselves.

Mr. Paterson: On the equipment, or on the merchandise carried, or both?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Equipment and merchandise.

Mr. Paterson: I would like to ask for the further purposes of clarification on the loss of operations, did the subsidiary—I believe it is Star Transport—in fact make a profit and the rail operations lose money, or did both operations lose money?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, we are not discussing Star Transport. That is a separate company, and I might say that we have made money every year since we bought out Star Transport.

Mr. Paterson: Is that particular—

Hon. Mr. Simonett: It is not in here at all.

Mr. Paterson: Not in this estimate? We will raise that later.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: No, not at all.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): You stated that the subsidy was to the raw material, but is not this the problem that is facing northern Ontario—the reason we do not have any development of the raw material at its source? And would it not be better if this government were to provide a subsidy to finish the material coming south? Thus we would have the development of the raw material where it is mined? If we are

going to subsidize, would it not be better at that level to subsidize rather than on the raw material?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, this has nothing to do with this vote. I might say that with the mines that have been in operation up there in the last few years—we have the Adams iron mine, we have Texas Gulf, who are shipping material, in fact that is the one you have reference to. You would like a refinery in Timmins. We have said from the beginning that when and if they made a decision, we would give them a rate either way that they could compete in any area in the province. I said this in Timmins not over two months ago, that transportation has no bearing on locating a smelter in Timmins, because we can take care of the rate to compete with any place that they might locate in Ontario, unless it be by boat shipping, and of course we cannot compete with water shipping.

Mr. R. H. Knight (Port Arthur): Mr. Chairman, we are all quite aware of the added cost of gasoline and other oil products in the northern part of the province and the increased cost in other goods because of the transportation cost. I wondered whether the commission has ever given consideration to getting into the business of transporting these products in a way that will equalize the cost factor, inasmuch as it is a publicly-owned facility, or whether the commission would be willing to investigate this possibility?

I would like to have the Minister's remarks on this.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, there is very little movement of oil or gas products by rail today. As you know, gas and oil move by pipeline and tank truck and we have very little to do with transporting any gasolines or oils on the Ontario Northland Railway. And you could not compete with pipeline movement and truck.

Mr. Knight: I did have in mind, Mr. Chairman, the piggyback service that the railways seem to be getting into more and more. Inasmuch as the Minister mentioned oil tank trucks.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Again we have problems there because we cannot move a trailer piggyback out of Toronto as fast as it can go by highway. Now if you are talking about long distances, the train is efficient, but a tank truck leaving here this evening could be delivered in Timmins in about eight or nine hours, whereas by rail piggyback it takes so many hours to get it there that it is not efficient and people do not want it.

Mr. Knight: I take it then from the answer the hon. Minister has given, that the commission has seriously investigated this possibility?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: We definitely have. In fact we wanted our own transport to try it out and the shipper said: "No, we want it to come direct, we want the material, but we do not want it to be tied up on the railroad." As you know, we have to depend on another shipper, the Canadian National Railways, from North Bay to Toronto. So things can get sidetracked and we get into a lot of problems.

Mr. D. Jackson (Timiskaming): Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that from time to time the GO system and the CNR have used ONR locomotives. Will the Minister tell us how much revenue has been realized from this, and whether that revenue covers the cost?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I would have to get that figure. I know we are getting $250 a day for locomotives, but I do not know how many days they have been used. But again that has no bearing on this vote. We are talking about 1966.

Mr. Jackson: Mr. Chairman, I believe it has, but I believe that they were being operated at a loss to the ONR and that we are actually subsidizing the GO system and the CNR.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I happened to be talking about this particular thing not later than the day before yesterday, with officials and engineers of the CNR and of the ONR. I understand that if we could rent the 39 engines that we have in service for that money every day, we could come up with a nice profit next year for the railway.

Mr. Jackson: Mr. Chairman, will the Minister table the figures for me?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I will be very happy to get you the figures, yes. I do not know when they started. I know they are operating every day. I will be very pleased to get you the figures.

Mr. Sopha: May I ask the Minister through you, Mr. Chairman, if the ONR still owns the mining lands in the vicinity of Cobalt,

and if so, is any disposition of them planned in view of the high market for silver at the present time?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I understand we still own them and there has been nothing done about disposing of them at the present time.

Mr. Sopha: Well, does he intend to do anything?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I would have to discuss this with the commission. As you know, I do not enter into the day-to-day operation of the ONR. We have a commission and I have found them to have done a very good job since I have been associated with them. They have never at any time discussed lands with me, or the sale of lands in that area, unless it be for a special purpose.

But I will be very happy at the first meeting that I attend with the commission, which I expect will be next Monday, to bring up that item on the agenda and see what is in their minds.

Mr. H. Worton (Wellington South): Mr. Chairman, the Minister mentioned that he had three or four companies that he was handling contracts for in regard to the carrying of raw materials. How long are these contracts for? Are they renewed or are they on a 90-year lease, or how?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member has reference to the mines, I think all agreements are different. In most of the agreements we have entered into in the past few years, where we have had to build spur lines, we have entered into an agreement with an escalator clause which takes care of our increase in operating costs and, of course, we know the cost of the spur, the cost of the cars, the cost of the equipment we are furnishing. I believe some of these are renewed every five years, some every ten.

Mr. Worton: No long-term, 90-year leases of cheap transportation?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: No.

Mr. Stokes: Mr. Chairman, I would like some kind of assurance from the Minister if possible, that he could make it known to operations such as Texas Gulf Sulphur that they will not be subsidized out of the public treasury to export material in its raw state from northern Ontario. I think that the hon. member for Sudbury East made it quite plain that one of the reasons for the lack of development and expansion in the north was because this government was much too ready to assist these operators in subsidizing raw material from the north.

Now if this government is genuinely interested in the kind of economic development that is needed, and if they say they are going to assist in northern Ontario, I think we should be given that kind of assurance that subsidies of that nature, in the export of raw material from there, will not be subsidized out of the public treasury.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I might say, Mr. Chairman, with reference to Texas Gulf, it is far from subsidization by this government now. I might say that their ore shipment is very profitable and it is much more profitable shipping the ore than perhaps after the refinery is in. It will be a higher rate for refined metals, but we will not have the quantities to haul. So this is a very successful operation for us right now, hauling their ore.

We are taking some to be refined at Noranda and bringing out the finished product, and then, of course, we take it down to where we terminate at North Bay and we trans-ship from there. We have no problem there, but if you speak about subsidizing these, we are not talking about subsidizing an industry, we are talking about giving them a rate that would appeal to them to go in the north.

I might say that before the Sherman iron mine opened, one thing on which it hinged was whether we were going to have a rate that they could compete—that they could open a mine in Tigagami to compete in ore-getting from other sources. You have to watch these things very closely and I might say of this iron mine in Timagami, the people are very happy there. There are about 300 people employed in Timagami at this time, plus the extra employment that we have had since the inception of the railroad. Again as you know, 90 per cent of this iron is being milled and manufactured in Hamilton, Ontario. So this makes a very nice operation in Ontario and adds a lot to the economy in northern Ontario as well as in Ontario as a whole.

I think you are well aware that for every job that it represents in extracting the ore, it means about five jobs in processing it somewhere else.

Mr. Stokes: That is in Hamilton, right in Ontario.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: That is in Hamilton, but I am concerned about northern Ontario. I think this government should be concerned about the well-being of northern Ontario too, and I do not think that we should aggravate

the situation further by subsidizing the export of—whether it be forest industries products or mined ore from the north—at the expense of the people in northern Ontario.

Mr. Chairman: Is vote 612 carried?

Mr. Jackson: Well, no. The Minister has stated that they are not subsidizing this movement of ore, but if the preferential rate does not cover the cost of moving the ore, is this in effect not a subsidy?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, we are not subsidizing, as a government, any movement of ore or wood products out of northern Ontario. We are operating branch lines into areas where it does not pay to have a railroad. I think you know some of them representing that area—Elk Lake is one. We are operating stations up there to give to people service that does not pay. Again, it has been our policy—in the hope that something will start next year or the year after—to keep these spur lines there, and to keep stations there where actually they do not pay, but they are giving service to people who are in a very sparsely settled area in some cases.

Mr. Martel: The problem though, Mr. Chairman, is that the difference—and here is where the subsidy, whether we call it a subsidy or not, hurts the north. The difference to ship finished goods to northern Ontario is so much greater than the raw materials coming south. Now if we were to sort of balance this shipment north and south, you would have secondary industry developing in the north, because they would not ship tons and tons and tons of waste material southward. They would develop it at the source and we could give them a preferred rate there.

Mr. Sopha: I would like to ask the Minister how the liquor control board of Ontario, which is presided over by a fellow Minister in much the same way as he presides over the Ontario Northland Railway—how he feels, in respect of transportation costs, that the liquor control board of Ontario can determine that all the area north and west of the French River shall have added to the cost of a case of beer the transportation costs which I think is 28 cents a case.

Yet the transportation costs are not added if the beer is shipped from Toronto to Cornwall, which my friend, the hon. Minister, told me was 245 miles. The costs are not added to the shipment of a price of a case of beer if it is shipped to Windsor, and that is 235 miles; but they are added if it is shipped to North Bay, which is 225 miles, they are added if it is shipped to Sudbury, 250 miles. Where is the rationality?

This is a publicly owned railway. We are dealing with a commodity sold by a publicly owned agency. Where can be found any basis in justice for this discrimination?

Yet, if you reverse the thing, if the liquor control board is asked to carry a case of Doran's Northern for you—than which there is no finer in Toronto—then it would sell for $4.79 in Toronto after it is hauled from Sudbury, or over your railway. Let us not get on the CNR and the CPR—if it is hauled from their brewery in Timmins it is $4.79 in Toronto. But you buy a case of Carlings in Timmins—it is made in Toronto—for $5.05, in Cornwall for $4.79, and in Windsor for $4.79.

Before you tell us about your railway and its policy in this regard—we have enveloped the government in all elements of this transaction that I have cited, so we do not really have to be subjected to the "jazz" that we get from the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs about interfering with prices, it is not relevant in this at all because the government fixes the price.

But before we hear from you I want to tell the Minister and anyone else who is listening through you, Mr. Chairman, that I am getting sick and tired of being a citizen of this province and being discriminated against because of where I live. So far as humanly possible, citizens of this province whether they live in Armstrong or Foleyet or Chesterville or Duntroon or St. Mary's, ought to be treated equally and evenly. But I ask and I would like to hear your explanation.

I asked the Provincial Secretary, who is a great authority on alcoholic beverages and their quality as he demonstrated here in his speech, and he cited me a section of a statute passed in 1927 he said. Surely the people in Sudbury are entitled, and Timmins and Foleyet and Nipigon are entitled, to a better explanation than that of this discrimination.

It comes down to this railway really, which could very well say through the Minister, that in order to make the price even they will so adjust their freight rates that there will be no discrimination because of transportation charges for beer from the brewers. where it is made—down here—up into the northern part of the province. I would really like to hear from you on that score.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. member should direct his question to someone else.

I might say first that we do not haul the beer going to northern Ontario. As you know, mostly all beer and ales are moved by truck today.

Mr. Sopha: Star Transport?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: No, we are not hauling by Star Transport. Nevertheless, it has no bearing on the price of beer. You could take the opposite. I understand that liquor is not any dearer in Timmins than it is in Toronto, and I have not heard the people in Toronto complaining so I guess perhaps one offsets the other. I would think it would cost more to transport a case of liquor to Timmins than it would to transport it to Toronto. Nevertheless, we have nothing to do with this because we are transporting very little liquor and, I understand, no beer or ales at all at the present time.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: The hon. member for Sudbury might be interested to know that since he raised this question some weeks ago I have asked the chairman of the liquor control board to give me a complete explanation of the entire pricing policy, and how these so-called anomalies come to exist. In due course, if I find anything that I consider might be of interest, I will be happy to share it with him.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Sudbury East.

Mr. Martel: Will the Minister tell me if this railroad hauls any gasoline?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I think I just answered that question. We haul very little gasoline. We might if it was, I suppose, to a mining company or some remote spot, and I would think if we got beyond Fraserdale. If they wanted gasoline in Moosonee, we might have to haul it up there, but wherever there is a highway you will find that most of that is truck-delivered.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Timiskaming.

Mr. Jackson: Would the Prime Minister look into the difference in rates for goods and commodities shipped into the north as he will with the beer shipments?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Chairman, I can only say that we have a continuing review going on, as you know. Many of those rates are not set by this government and we have no control over them. They are set by agencies of the federal government, but there have been certain studies carried out in The Department of Economics and Development and these are continuing.

Vote 612 agreed to.

This completes the supplementary estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1968.

ESTIMATES, THE DEPARTMENT OF HIGHWAYS
(Continued)

On vote 901:

Mr. Chairman: Yesterday afternoon while we were discussing vote 901 there were certain questions raised and I believe the Minister was going to undertake to provide some answers to some of those questions. Perhaps they are available at this time?

Hon. G. E. Gomme (Minister of Highways): Yes. In answer to a question from the member for Yorkview (Mr. Young) regarding headlight failure, and the new type of headlight. We had a man, Mr. Cook, attend the demonstration of the new development headlight put on for Tung-Sol International Corporation by Presentation Canada Limited at the Royal York yesterday.

This new headlight, which will be on the market in April, is similar in size and shape to present headlights. It has an additional low-output filament in the bulb which burns continuously at all times the light is on. This ensures that when the regular filament burns out there is still enough light within the headlight to make the headlight quite clear, although it does not give the headlight sufficient light.

The actual lights were demonstrated, and movies shown of the operation of these headlights. The extra cost is expected to be about 55 cents per light, and as this protection is only needed on two lamps, this would cost about one dollar per vehicle if these lamps were used.

General reaction at the demonstration of this product was good, and the manufacturer stated that negotiations were going on with the car manufacturer. It was expected that these lamps would come out as standard equipment in 1969 cars.

In answer to questions, the following points were clarified. Tung-Sol corporation has not patented this lamp, and they stated that no doubt all lamp manufacturers would make a lamp of this type before too long. They also stated that the lamp when used with

the main filament burned out would not meet the legal requirements. They further stated that they only plan to manufacture this type as a headlight, not as a tail light. The corporation is supplying each representative with four headlights, and when these are received, we will try them out on our units.

Then, I had a question from the hon. member for Sarnia about the St. Clair Parkway commission budget, and I think that his main concern was our control over their expenditure.

I have this broken down, and the general administration and maintenance for the year for the commission is $92,405. We pay 50 per cent subsidy on that, of $46,203.

Then the capital works, as presented by them. There were four parts that they wanted to do work on, and purchase property on. They are the Guthrie park, $40,000, Baby Point park, $127,650, Play Creek, $2,500, and DHO parks, $2,500. This makes a total of $172,650, of which we pay 75 per cent being $129,487.

Now, the total estimated budget by the commission is $265,055, and the subsidy estimated is $175,690. To meet the above, and allow for changes and contingencies, the department is asking approval of a vote of $195,000.

I would like to point to the member that the control that we have is exactly the same with the municipalities when they present their budget. I mentioned the amount of Baby Point park, $127,650; it is mainly made up of the purchase of property, and I think that he will understand why I am not free to disclose the names of the property holders.

The Guthrie park is $40,000, and these are the two main figures and they cannot use this money for any other purpose, only this as designated. The only thing that might happen is the same as happens sometimes with the municipalities when they might want to transfer a few of their funds from capital for maintenance. If the commission came to us, for instance, and said, "Our expenses at Baby Point park are $147,000, thus we will only spend $420,000 at Guthrie park, it would make the total the same, and then we would give permission for that.

I would also like to tell the hon. member that no municipality have asked us to get out of the plan which was set up under the Act. Then we have a—

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): Could I direct a question through you, Mr. Chairman? Or perhaps a comment in this connection. I very much appreciate the answer that has been given to me. Frankly, Mr. Chairman, this solves my problems.

In connection with your last comment that no municipality has taken objection or asked for a withdrawal, it would require, I take it, a legislative enactment—I understand that they are compelled under the statute to participate financially in connection with this. Am I not right, Mr. Chairman?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Yes, that is right.

Mr. Bullbrook: What I was concerned with yesterday — and I think that you have answered this—is the question of control by you, and the benefit of the involvement of your department. I will not belabour it again. I for one—and I think that you will agree—do not want to see museums built at this time. This is exactly what I want to see done, the acquisition of land, and the beautification of the highway, thank you for your answers.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: The next question was from the hon. member for Sandwich-Riverside (Mr. Burr), asking about what the Canadian good roads association does in the matter of research.

The Canadian good roads association, through its many technical committees, provides a valuable forum in which highway engineers from al parts of Canada can pool their experience of engineering, and administrative problems. Some committees have set themselves specific goals, which have involved co-operative research by the provinces, and have resulted in technical reports, or technical manuals. Examples are as follows:

"The Canadian good roads association's report on American standard road test." This report was based on a very intensive analysis of the multi-million dollar road experiment carried out in Illinois, and it is designed to help Canadian engineers to make the maximum possible use of the result.

And, "A guide to the design of flexible and rigid pavements in Canada," based on an extensive research project in which all provinces participated.

And the "Manual of uniform traffic devices for Canada," developed by CGRA committed to expedite the adoption of standard devices in Canada.

And the "Manual of geometric design standards for Canadian roads," developed by CGRA committees to promote the adoption of uniform standards across Canada.

Current activities of this type are exemplified by the special task force engaged in the investigation of river scour at bridges, and the transportation planning manual. In addition to these activities, which are of direct and obvious value to the department, the CGRA provides direct services which are of great value. Examples of these are the technical information service, which gives any engineer quick access to published information and research in progress on any highway subject. This service is provided in collaboration with the highway research board in Washington, and organization for economic co-operation and development in cars.

The CGRA was instrumental in securing a revision in the way in which the Dominion bureau of statistics prepares statistics on roads and streets. It also evolved a highway price index, and publishes an annual summary of Canadian highway expenditures. Each of the activities mentioned here are given as examples of many other similar endeavours of the associations which have not only enabled this department to benefit from the co-operative nature of the association's work, but also to help some of the other provinces by making results of their broader experience more readily available to them.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Niagara Falls.

Mr. G. Bukator (Niagara Falls): Mr. Chairman, one has to go back a bit—I am speaking on the administration portion of this vote—one has to go back in history a little while to make my question of the Minister.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Chairman, if I might request the member; I have three or four more answers from yesterday that I would like to give.

Mr. Bukator: Oh yes. I am willing to wait.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: The hon. member for Algoma-Manitoulin (Mr. Farquhar) asked about the awards and how many suggestions we received, and how many were accepted.

We had 1,514 suggestions and there were 94 accepted.

We had a question from the hon. member for Yorkview in regard to the standardization of symbol signs.

The "Manual of uniform traffic controls." —and I might say this was also sponsored by CGRA—Control devices for Canada," dated May, 1966, uses symbols rather than words to convey the message where practical. Some sign messages, particularly those of informational signs, cannot be conveyed adequately by symbols. This manual is in general use across Canada, either as a guide or, in at least one province, as the official policy on signs and traffic control devices.

In Ontario, we have adopted 11 of the new symbol signs and on May 8, 1967, the maintenance engineer for the department issued instructions that these signs were to be phased into our new system on a gradual basis. This is now being done and the new signs are gradually starting to make their appearance. I have here a copy of the actual instructions.

We had a request from the hon. member for Downsview (Mr. Singer) asking about our legal branch. This was hurriedly done for his benefit: the salaries we pay in the legal branch are $104,000; the insurance and claim section, $71,000; making a total of $175,000. We had legal fees paid to outside firms of $8,200; legal fees re property acquisition, $101,000; making a total for 1967-1968 up to the present time, as close as we could get it, of $109,200.

I want the members to know that in this figure are fees paid to lawyers all over the province for work which is done in the acquisition of property. These, Mr. Chairman, are the answers I was able to have.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Niagara Falls.

Mr. Bukator: Mr. Chairman, I hope that because I interject a little politics at this point I am not going to be political about this matter—in 1934, a man by the name of Hepburn was elected. At that time they decided to build the Queen Elizabeth Way —the King's highway at that time I think they called it—from Niagara Falls to Toronto.

In the process, they built what is known as the carillon bell tower; it is a tall structure in front of the Brock hotel. On one occasion I was there with two Ministers—we were discussing some of the problems of the province—and we were invited into the bell tower. I found three lovely apartments in that unit. Now recently, the whole approach to the bridge has been reconstructed. Old stores have been made into new ones, and I was wondering if these apartments are in use; if they are, who is using them and what for?

I am sure there are a lot of people, many members in the Legislature here, who would

like to know something about buildings that the government owns—there is one there; I know the apartments are quite nice. I do not know whether they are used or not and I do not have any other way of finding out unless I ask this Minister. Having said that, I do not think that on this vote, Mr. Chairman—thorugh you to the Minister—we can deal with the stores and the rental of them. I would like to touch on that subject when the time comes. But under administration, I would like to know about the apartments in the bell tower and if they are used for any purpose.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Chairman, I am advised that these are not ours, and I can assure the hon. member that I have never seen them or ever been in them.

Mr. Bukator: Very good! Then may I pursue this a bit further. Because of the reconstruction of that area, the bus terminal immediately adjoining the bell tower was taken out, there was just a road in between. The portion that was made into a parking area—and a restaurant below—does that come under the administration of The Department of Highways?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Yes.

Mr. Bukator: We have a road in between —and I tell you, for one who has lived in that area for 50 years or more, I ought to know but I do not. And I do not know of a better place to get that information than here. If I were to inquire then of that particular set of apartments, should I ask the Niagara Falls bridge commission, I believe that is the name of it? Is the Minister on that commission by any chance?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Chairman, I am not.

Mr. Bukator: I would like to clear this point in my own mind; have there ever been members of The Department of Highways or in this Minister's position—there is no harm in the member being a member of that commission? I was just wondering whether you have been in touch with it. The former Minister might mention it, the Provincial Treasurer, was he ever acquainted with this arrangement then, through the Chairman to the Provincial Treasurer?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, I am sorry, I have just returned to my seat. Can the hon. member fill me in a little more?

Mr. Bukator: Yes, I would be happy to. The Department of Highways works hand in hand with the bridge commission because the project there, the property at the Rainbow bridge, jointly belongs to The Department of Highways and is under the administration of the bridge commission and The Department of Highways. I was wondering whether the former Minister of Highways was a member of the bridge commission, in his capacity as the Minister of Highways?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, the answer is "yes". And I still am.

Mr. Bukator: A member of the bridge commission?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: That is right.

Mr. Bukator: Then, maybe—no, I think we will touch on that one when we come to the estimates. I will follow up on this one when the right vote comes up.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 901, the member for Timiskaming.

Mr. D. Jackson (Timiskaming): Mr. Chairman, we have an expenditure of $498,000 for collection of bridge tolls. Could the Minister tell me how much money is collected?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: The revenue from the Burlington skyway was $1,019,482 and the revenue from the Garden City skyway was $680,245, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Waterloo North.

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): Mr. Chairman, continuing this, I see that the revenue for 1968 has declined somewhat from 1967; but the operating expenses for 1967 being respectively $261,000 and $189,000 and profit shown for the two bridges was $1,334,000.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to know, are there debentures on these bridges? If not, what is the final determination of this money of excess revenue over expenses in collecting the tolls? Does it go into general tax levies of the province? Or are there debentures on these bridges that are being paid off?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Chairman, there are no debentures on this. The money goes into the consolidated revenue fund of the province.

Mr. Good: Mr. Chairman, in light of the fact that this money goes into consolidated

revenue and there are no debentures on the bridges themselves, the people using the bridges then are being asked to pay an extra tax to the general revenues of the province. In the light of this, I would like to ask a question on which the Smith report is in agreement with us. In chapter 30, paragraph 79 on page 269 of volume 3, a part reads as follows, and I quote:

> Ontario's two skyways are part of a larger road network and the decision to build them should have been taken and presumably was taken within the context of the overall Ontario roads system and not simply on the ground that they would be toll-financed. Once built on whatever grounds, we see no valid argument that a toll should be charged for their use. We, therefore, recommend—

and I am quoting from the Smith report,

> —that toll charges for the use of the Burlington and Garden City skyways be eliminated.

This matter was also brought up in the main speech of the hon. member for Welland South (Mr. Haggerty).

Now, my question is this. Is The Department of Highways considering this matter in its present estimates this year?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out to the member that there is an alternate free route for people to use. They do not have to use this facility, but in answer to his question, I pointed out yesterday that we are making our recommendations as to the disposition of this along with the rest of the items of the Smith report that affect us, and this will go the Provincial Treasurer for examination.

Mr. Good: Mr. Chairman, one further question. In view of the fact that the revenue has decreased on the bridge, how do you account for increased budgeting per cost of collecting tolls?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Salaries take care of the main increase, and the decrease in revenue came about, you remember, because the Burlington bridge was half closed part of the summer last year. We lost some customers and, to be quite truthful, some of them did not come back.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Sudbury East. Is the member for Waterloo North now finished?

Mr. Martel: Mr. Chairman, this is an overall question regarding the whole of the budget.

I took the trouble to total the travelling costs to the department and they, for one year, neighboured around $2.5 million in expenses. Does this include hotel accommodation and so on and meals, or just actual expenses in transportation?

It seems to me to be an awful high cost for one province this size, $2.5 million for travelling expenses for one department.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Chairman, we have not got those tallied as you have sir. If you will leave that with us we will get that done and get you a breakdown of what it consists of. You took it from all votes I take it?

Mr. Martel: Yes, I took it from all the votes.

Mr. Chairman: The member for York Centre.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): Mr. Chairman, I notice that the increase projected in the operating expenses of the bridges is over 10 per cent. Is it expected that the increase in tolls will be over 10 per cent?

We have unusually high collection operating costs here in this revenue—in the operation of these bridges—25 per cent of the total cost. It certainly does make one wonder that if wages and salaries are going to keep on going up and we are not going to have substantial increase in revenue, what the point is in continuing to have tolls on these bridges? We are just maintaining an office to keep some people employed who are not doing a useful job.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: I think, Mr. Chairman, that I have already answered that twice—that it is under consideration with the rest of the items from the Smith report.

Mr. Deacon: But are you expecting a 10 per cent increase in the tolls this year?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Chairman, we are not expecting to raise the tolls this year.

Mr. Deacon: I am sorry. The toll revenue, not the tolls themselves—the toll revenue.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Chairman, we do expect the use of it to go up. Is that the answer to your question?

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Chairman, is he forecasting a 10 per cent increase in toll revenue, not the tolls themselves, in other words, a 10

per cent increase in traffic which would cause this increase in expenses?

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Do you not know the answer to anything?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Chairman, I do not think I can answer the member's question exactly. We expect the revenue from tolls to rise, but I think if you will bear with us you will see the—well I do not know just how to say it—you will see some changes in the overall picture.

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Chairman, the point I want to make is that in almost any operation of any business you have to make a forecast of what your expected revenue is or your income is going to be. I thought that perhaps the Minister would know in this case. When he is budgeting for a certain increase in expense, he certainly would be knowing what increase in revenues he is expecting.

Mr. Chairman: I think the Minister has explained that. He explained that the major part of the increase was increased salaries and the expenditures are fixed, based on the salaries and the other expenses. I think he explained that previously:

The member for Welland South has a question?

The member for Grey-Bruce.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, in the publicity section, publicity $200,000, last year he spent $100,000 with one firm. Are you married to this firm? Why do you not split the goods up? Does the Minister know the answer to that?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: I am advised, Mr. Chairman, that we have continued with the same company that produced the development of those maps we used last year.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, what about this in-service training $107,000? What does that mean—$107,000 in-service training?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: This consists of the cost of providing courses at The Department of Highways training schools, including the living expenses of field staffs, salaries and expenses of groups — junior engineers who undergo an eight-month training programme in special phases of highway engineering.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Wentworth.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Through you, Mr. Chairman, what were the actual expenditures last year in the collection of bridge tolls?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Chairman, that item is $478,000.

Mr. J. L. Brown (Beaches-Woodbine): On the in-service training programme, is this a particular course that can only be conducted by The Department of Highways? Would there be merit in including such instruction in community colleges or other educational institutions?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Chairman, I understand that this can only be done in The Department of Highways, because the engineers so concerned get training in all different types of work throughout the provinces at our own different branches.

Mr. Brown: Mr. Chairman, could you tell me how many such trainees you have in a year?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Chairman, we have not got the figures for which you ask, but we have a pamphlet in the department that gives a breakdown of all the training. I will be glad to get one and send it to the member.

Mr. L. A. Braithwaite (Etobicoke): Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister a question or two with reference to the expropriation of Highway 27 and the Queen Elizabeth Way.

Mr. Chairman, apparently it will not be long before the Sherway development and an associated housing development occurs and apparently there is going to be need for widening of Highway 27 and widening of the Queen Elizabeth Way.

Last year, during this Minister's estimates, I inquired about the practices used by his agents, the agents of the department, with reference to expropriation. In particular I mentioned the area and the neighbourhood of Inverdon Road and Highway 27, Etobicoke. I pointed out, at that time, Mr. Chairman, the fact that this Minister's department —or agents of his department—were going about the whole question of expropriation in a most undemocratic way.

We have the initial report of Mr. Justice McRuer and I am wondering if the Minister, at this time, will tell this House whether any of the suggestions put forward with reference to expropriation by this report have been, or will be, incorporated into the method of operation of his department in the necessary expropriation for highways?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Chairman, might I point out to the hon. member that that is under vote 909 and I will be glad to answer them.

Mr. Braithwaite: Thank you, sir, I will ask that again.

Mr. Brown: In the workmen's compensation figure, what is the rate at which it is paid?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Chairman, the workmen's compensation board handles our claims and adjusts them and we pay the amount that is awarded. We do not actually pay an amount to the board for coverage, but we pay what is adjusted by them.

Mr. Brown: Would it be possible to have a breakdown of these costs? Is it possible to get that kind of information, a line-to-line breakdown of the costs?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Could the member elaborate on what he means by a breakdown?

Mr. Brown: I would like to be able to analyze the figure under workmen's compensation. I cannot do it if you do not have a rate, and if you do it by each award.

Mr. Chairman: Does the member suggest that he wants a list of each individual workman of The Department of Highways who received an award from the compensation board?

Mr. Brown: I would like under 901, workmen's compensation—which I understand is handled not by rate paid to the workmen's compensation board, as it is commonly done, but is handled by paying a direct award set by the compensation board—I would like the details of this information.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Chairman, do I get this right, that the hon. member wants the name and the claim of every workman injured?

Mr. Brown: I have no way of knowing what this figure means unless there is some basis for determining how it was achieved.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: We will try to get some figure for the member.

Mr. Brown: I am not interested in the names.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: But I think it will be very difficult and will take some time, but we will try to get something for you.

Mr. Brown: Will the Minister table that information?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, I would suggest to the hon. member, if I may, that he put a question in detail on the order paper and the workmen's compensation board will provide the information in due course. It will take some time.

Mr. Brown: Mr. Chairman, I am interested in this particular question as it relates to The Department of Highways and to this particular branch of The Department of Highways.

Mr. Chairman: I think that it has been explained quite clearly the method by which this amount has been paid to the compensation board. The claims are handled in the normal manner through the board and while the information—the breakdown—can be obtained, I would think, and I concur with the Provincial Treasurer, that this could be provided much more easily by the workmen's compensation board themselves rather than The Department of Highways.

Mr. Brown: Is it my understanding, Mr. Chairman, that the workmen's compensation board will be permitted to provide this information specifically as it relates to this figure in this estimate?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, it could be done in terms of a question to the Minister of Labour who reports to the House on the workmen's compensation board.

A question on the order paper would produce that information in due course in complete detail, I believe.

Mr. Chairman: I wish to point out, too, to the member that this figure in item 8 of vote 901 is a estimate for the year ending March, 1969, so that there are no details of this figure.

If the member wishes details of the amounts appearing in the public accounts, that is a different thing.

Mr. Brown: This is precisely why the question arose, because I would like to know the basis on which this particular sum of money was estimated and included. If there is no rate at which it is done, then how is it done?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Chairman, now I can answer the member that question. Of course, it is by past experience. In 1967 the

amount was $296,644 and in 1966, it was $263,697. Is this the type of information that—

Mr. Brown: I am also interested in why it is not done by rate and why it is done in this particular fashion. I would like the information for 1967 and 1966.

Mr. Chairman: I understand the Minister said it was done by the rates of the compensation board and The Department of Highways pay the amount over to the board. Is this not correct, Mr. Minister?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Chairman, the board adjudicates all claims and sends us a detailed bill, I suppose, once a month or something like that. We pay the amount that they give as an award.

Mr. Brown: Mr. Chairman, is there a policy for this? Is there a reason behind this policy? What is the thinking on this?

Mr. E. P. Morningstar (Welland): Mr. Chairman, as I see it, it is just like an employer, like an industry or anybody else. When the compensation board makes awards they must be paid, whether it is Department of Highways, the seaway authority or Page Hersey Tubes, whoever it might be.

Mr. D. M. De Monte (Dovercourt): Mr. Chairman, I would suggest with respect if there is any difference between the rates set down by the board for normal employers and the rate requested of The Highways Department, it should be disclosed to us.

An hon. member: I do not think the Minister knows.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Do I take it, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. member is going to ask the compensation board to provide that information?

Mr. Chairman: As I understand it, the question simply is, what is the basis pertaining to awards to employees of The Department of Highways through the compensation board? Is there a different rate structure? It is my understanding that they are all treated in the same manner as any ordinary workmen's compensation claims, and that this amount represents the amount paid by the board to injured workmen, and in return paid back to the board by The Department of Highways.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Chairman, it is the same rate structure and the workmen receive the same advantage.

Mr. Chairman: Absolutely no difference from an ordinary workmen's compensation claim.

Mr. Sargent: We have got to have the Chairman answer the question—

Mr. Brown: It was my understanding that the safety performance of a particular company would affect the rate, and there is some relevance to the question in terms of safety standards of the department.

Mr. Chairman: The board uses the available information and the statistics in connection with workmen on highways. They establish the rate structure applicable to this type of work and it is similar to any other work of the same nature.

Mr. Sargent: You are taking him off the hook.

Mr. Chairman: Does this information satisfy the member?

Mr. Brown: I do not feel that I have gotten the basis on this figure.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: There is no need for a rate, because the board only adjudicates the claims, determines the liability of the department—whichever department of government it is—and they pay the claims in total, so that there is no rate assessment required. As a matter of fact, this method is pursued even to the extent that the workmen's compensation board adjudicates claims for the federal government in the same manner.

Mr. Brown: Mr. Chairman, is this a special policy for departments of government, quite distinct and different from the policy laid down for other companies?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes.

Mr. Brown: Then, is it possible to get specific information on the practice over a period of, say, the year 1966 or the year 1967, and how that works out? I would like to make a comparison between what happens to an ordinary company and what happens to a department of government in this area.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, that is the point at which I suggest: Put your question on the order paper and I think you can get the information.

Mr. Chairman: Would this be agreeable to the member?

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Chairman, just for a point of clarification. On

this point, does the department now ask the workmen's compensation board to take care of the claim, and then does the department pay the board the amount of monies, or does the department pay directly to the employee the amount of money for the claim?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Chairman, we pay the board.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 901, the member for Thunder Bay.

Mr. Stokes: Mr. Chairman, I would like to have some advice as to whether it would be appropriate in this particular estimate to ask about departmental policy with regard to payment to employees. Would it be under this number in the estimates?

Mr. Chairman: Will the member please explain his question again?

Mr. Stokes: I have had quite a few complaints from employees of The Department of Highways in our area, in particular as it refers to the rate structure and the policy of this department with regard to the work conditions of the employees of the department.

I have some correspondence here that I have had with the Minister. To relate it to a specific incident, it refers to a heavy equipment operator in northern Ontario and he was one of the best—and there was some difficulty with regard to severance pay in the department.

I have an affidavit from the gentleman in question, stating that he was assured by his supervisor that it was not necessary to give a certain notice in time before he severed relations with the department. Now, I understand that it is department policy that they will not pay overtime to an employee, that they will grant him time off at the department's convenience at a later date. After having been given this assurance, he sought employment elsewhere and the department owed him 188 hours for overtime worked. He was told that it was department policy that they would not pay overtime and because he had not given the department sufficient notice that the department had no responsibility to pay him for work done. Consequently we have been trying for two years to convince The Department of Highways that they have a responsibility and a moral obligation, and, I suggest, maybe even a legal obligation, to pay employees for work done and service rendered to the department.

The Minister has taken cover in something that has been negotiated, presumably by the civil service association. I do not know how I would have to impress upon the Minister that he has a responsibility to pay an employee for 188 hours of time worked. He had worked for the department for 11 years. He saw an opportunity to better himself and get employment elsewhere. He was given assurance by his supervisor that he would not have to give notice of severing relationship with the department. For some two years now we have been in negotiations with the Minister, or the civil service association, to see that this man gets paid for the 188 hours of work that is rightfully his.

I was just wondering, on what grounds does the Minister think that he can get out from under paying a former employee of his department for 188 hours that he actually worked in the service of this province?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Chairman, I am familiar with this case; the hon. member wrote to me about it. He refers to the affidavit, saying that the supervisor promised that he would be paid for it, and I have the district engineer's word that the supervisor is prepared to sign a similar declaration refuting that point. As I pointed out to you in the letter, the man left the service, and there was no way under the Act that then he could be paid. This is what I tried to tell you. Now, I do not know, I guess I was not successful.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, last year, the Minister will recall, I asked about the policy so far as purchase of fleets of trucks and cars for the department is concerned. I have checked, Mr. Chairman, with Ford and General Motors as far as their policy was concerned and my submission to the House at that time was that party politics are involved insofar as—

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. I believe this comes under another vote—vote 905.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Vote 905 is right, sir.

Mr. Chairman: Would the member bring that out when we are discussing 905?

Mr. Sargent: Is not this pretty general here now?

Mr. Chairman: No, it is specifically mentioned under vote 905.

Mr. Sargent: I do not see that.

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): It will still be true then.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Parkdale.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister, through you, his general hiring policies for labour—I believe this comes under this vote. For example, I believe there are the type of employees with the department that are permanent, some temporary, and then there is casual labour. The Highways Department, over a period of years, may hire the same people just for a short time each year, because the work on the highways goes by the season, and sometimes by the needs of roads in certain areas. I would like to make a few remarks on this, Mr. Chairman, but before I do so, I would just like to inquire from the Minister what types of labour do you have. Do you have the three types—permanent, temporary and then casual?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Yes, Mr. Chairman, we have them all.

Mr. Chairman: Let us keep this in order now. Shall we finish with the member for Parkdale? Are you finished?

Mr. Trotter: No, I am not finished, I am just starting.

Mr. Stokes: I was not finished either, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. Stokes: No, but he recognized the member for Grey-Bruce before I was finished dealing with my item with—

Mr. Chairman: Do you wish to put a further question to the Minister in connection with the original question?

Mr. Stokes: Yes, I do, in view of his question. I wonder if the Minister thinks he needs a special Act of Parliament to pay employees in his department for time worked? I am just wondering how he can deny this man the right to pay for time worked. It is not that he did not work—he actually worked for this department. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that this department has a moral obligation to pay this man for 188 hours of his life that he gave to The Department of Highways of the province of Ontario.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Chairman, as I pointed out to the member, there is no way that this can be done under the civil service.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Then find a way!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, can I ask the Minister a question on this very point?

Mr. Chairman: Order! Does the member for Thunder Bay wish to put any further questions?

Mr. Stokes: Yes, I want to know what authority he feels that he has to have in order to pay an employee of his department for time worked?

Mr. J. Renwick: What is the answer?

Mr. Stokes: What authority does he have to have?

Mr. Chairman: I think what the member might feel he has to have is irrelevant. He says there is no authority. The member for Yorkview.

Mr. J. Renwick: When is he going to bring in a statute?

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman: further to this, could I ask the Minister a question? Supposing that this gentleman, instead of leaving the job as of this particular date, had said to his supervisor, "188 hours from now, I am going to quit the department." Then he could have been paid, I understand, for the time that he did not work; that is, he could have been on holidays and paid for the 188 hours. He could have drawn his pay? Is that right?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: That is correct, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Young: Well then, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that in this province this matter should be made absolutely and crystal clear to the employees, because I have had this same problem in my own riding where people have separated from jobs, expecting to be paid for overtime, and because of this technicality, not getting paid.

It would seem to me that something ought to be done in the realm of communication, so that employees who work overtime can be told that this is the case. If a person has overtime—this man had 188 hours when he put his resignation into the department—at that point it should have been pointed out to him that he had 188 hours still to come. He could loaf if he wanted to, take time off in lieu of the overtime worked.

That is the point where this should have been pointed out to him. The fact that the department let him go without informing

him of his rights is a violation of human rights, and a violation of the rights of this specific employee. Mr. Chairman, I urge through you upon the Minister, and upon any other Ministers of this government who may be in the same position that—

Mr. Sargent: It is time that we had a new Minister.

Mr. Young: —communications be improved so that this knowledge is conveyed to the people who are separating from employment. Surely a method can be worked out? Surely when people put in resignations, at that point a check should be made as to whether they are owed for overtime work. At that point they should be advised that the resignation should not date from that particular time, but as of a certain time in the future that would cover the overtime that they have worked, so that payment, in that sense, can be made to them.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Yes, Mr. Chairman, if it was done that way it could be. I would like to point out to the hon. member that there was a grievance taken to the public service grievance board on this very matter. It was grievance No. 320, 1965, and it was on exactly this matter. It was upheld by the board.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Parkdale.

Mr. Trotter: I would like to get back to this matter, Mr. Chairman, of the types of labour. There are permanent, there are the temporary, and the casual. When it comes down to temporary and casual workers, perhaps for my enlightenment and the enlightenment of the House, you could tell me the difference?

Secondly, do temporary and casual workers have any pension rights through the province of Ontario, and more particularly The Department of Highways? I will have more to say about this later, Mr. Chairman, but I would like to have that answered.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: We do not have the complete information of that, but we will bring it in to you, it is all there.

Mr. Trotter: I would like to make a few remarks on this, because this has been a sore point throughout the government for a number of years. In some cases, the situation has been improved.

Where a person has been a temporary employee for six months, I believe in many cases, they have then been made permanent employees. But the system in The Department of Highways, of hiring casual labour and then sometimes calling them temporary, has been open to a tremendous amount of abuse.

There are reasons for having casual labour. On ocasions you go into a district, and you are putting through a road. You are only going to need that labour for a certain length of time, and I can understand hiring labour for the short term.

But there are certain areas in the province of Ontario, and I will give you an example —the Minden-Haliburton area—where there always seems to be road work going on of some kind. And every year, the same people are hired as casual labour. There are some who have been casual labour for a quarter of a century, with very little in the way of pension rights or any retirement benefits at all, working for the same department in their normal busy season for 25 years.

This is an abuse of the individual who is employed by the government.

I hope there has been some change as a result of the Canada pension plan. This is why I ask that question. I was wondering if now, through the Canada pension plan, there was some way of giving these people some part of a retirement fund. I do not know if it exists, and perhaps the Minister can find out for me? But there is serious abuse in our hiring casual labour in certain areas in Ontario, because of the repetition in hiring the same casual labour. The department knows that there is going to be work every year.

I again use the Haliburton area, Mr. Chairman, as an example because I think I happen to know something about it. I remember going up there a few years ago, and I was shocked at the way these methods are abused, and abused politically because if you are not a friend of the government and if you do not keep your mouth shut, you have a very difficult time of getting the most menial work on the highways of the province of Ontario.

You can get into an area. There is some local man in charge of hiring and you cannot get a job unless he says so. He is the local czar.

It is hard to believe that a feudal system really exists in The Department of Highways, in 1968, in the province of Ontario. It has been going on for years, and it is going on now, and it is a type of system that should be stopped.

I am saying that if you are going to have this type of labour pool, you should establish a system where they know in the local area what people are available, and they should have pension rights and they should have retirement rights. We should get rid of this business of the revolving door system in calling people who have been employees for years and years, calling them casual labour.

The other thing is that particularly in the rural areas, it is just political patronage, and it stinks to high heaven. It is time the Minister cleaned it up.

Now, this is a new, a relatively new Minister, and he can say that he is completely innocent, and that he did not know that it existed. But if he comes from Lanark, he knows the score, and it is just wrong that this system goes on.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: I do.

Mr. Trotter: Well, if Lanark is so pure, try Minden, try any of these areas and ask any of these members who happen to be opposed to the government. They know that if a person is of another political persuasion than the government, and they want to work, and get on highway work, they just keep their mouths shut. There is no democracy in many of these areas where the only cash income for a good many families throughout Ontario is the casual work that they get from The Department of Highways.

The Department of Highways and The Department of Lands and Forests are really big things in many areas throughout Ontario. They are the main source of income, and some of us in the city of Toronto may not realize that until we get around and have the opportunity to inquire into the question.

I tell you that one summer a few years ago I travelled 1,500 miles just inquiring into that particular situation and it is still as bad as ever. Despite all the tenders and this and that, what we have got? It has improved in contract situations from what it was 20 years ago, but the labour situation on our highways stinks and it is time that we cleaned it up.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Chairman, I am glad the hon. member brought up the fact of political patronage on our highways. For ten years I have been in this House as one who suffered under that very thing and I did not ever say anything because I do not believe in it. I do not want to have anything to do with it. But let me tell you this, back in 1934 when it was impossible to get anything to do, after completing my education—

Mr. Trotter: That does not make it right.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Trotter: This is 1968 and what they did back in 1934—it is utterly ridiculous to be coming here and spending hundreds of millions of dollars—

Hon. Mr. Gomme: I did not interfere when you were speaking. Let me say what I want to. Why do you not let me say it?

Mr. Trotter: You should be ashamed of yourself!

Hon. Mr. Gomme: In 1934, Mr. Chairman—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Why do you not let me say what I want to say? I will tell you what I believe. But you do not want to hear it. When it was absolutely impossible to get any type of work at all. I had a job, just as you refer to, and I want to tell the hon. member that there was an election on a certain day and the next day at noon I was through, because there was a change in the government of this province. I suffered under that and never have I believed that anything should be done like that.

Mr. Trotter: Clean up your own department. Clean it up.

Mr. B. Newman: Look what they did for you!

Hon. Mr. Gomme: I would like to point out to the member who referred to some of these types of political appointments that he can come down to Lanark and he can look at the things. We appointed a man just within the last two months, Crown attorney—a very good position—and that man was a former member of the Liberal association of Lanark county.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Chairman, may I ask a question?

An hon. member: You have to okay it.

Mr. Trotter: As you know so much about it and you are so interested, why can you not tell me the difference between a temporary and a casual worker? Why can you not tell me what type of pensions they get? If you know so much about it, how can a man be a casual worker for 25 years for The Department of Highways and get absolutely nothing when it comes to a pension? I do not think you are interested one whit and do not try to kid me or the public in general.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: In the second place, I might point out to the hon. member that he was completely out of order because this does not come under The Department of Highways.

Mr. Trotter: You are not hiring casually? Of course it comes under your department. You are hiring workers.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Appointments are made by a committee of the local Tory riding association.

Mr. Trotter: Absolutely. He is a little czar but still you are responsible. Do not tell me that the employees on your roads are not hired by you. Certainly you must know that. What is this for—what are the estimates for?

Mr. Brown: Mr. Chairman, could I ask a question of the Minister? Is it possible, is information available that would make it possible to have a cost analysis of the maintenance of roads in the province of Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: I wonder if the hon. member could clear that point?

Mr. Brown: What I would like to know is how much does it cost in various parts of the province to maintain the same section of road—say one mile of road for 12 months? Does it vary from district to district and does it vary from time to time? Does it make a difference if there happens to be an election coming for instance?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: We have some figures but certainly, Mr. Chairman, it makes no difference if there is an election coming.

Mr. Chairman: Let us hear the answer of the Minister, please.

An hon. member: He hit a sensitive nerve.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Cochrane South.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Trotter: I did not hear the answer, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): Mr. Chairman, earlier in the session the hon. Minister of Highways reported that there were certain irregularities in the Timmins area of the New Liskeard division and this triggered off an investigation into the use of heavy rental equipment in that part of the province. Now I wonder if he might give us an idea of the nature of these irregularities, how the investigation is proceeding, and when we will have an opportunity to hear the results of that investigation?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Chairman, I said at the time I gave the report that it was in the hands of the CIB and I cannot give you any further report. I also told the House that when we did have it I would give it and I will do that.

Mr. Ferrier: Mr. Chairman, you are not able to give us the nature of the irregularities that triggered that investigation; would it prejudice the investigation?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: This is right, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Dovercourt.

Mr. De Monte: Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister, in reply to a question from the hon. member for Downsview, stated that there was $101,000 paid for legal fees. May I ask if that was purely for land acquisition or if those legal fees involve other legal work?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Chairman, when I gave that report I had it broken down. Legal fees, $8,200, and legal fees re property acquisition, $101,000.

Mr. De Monte: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the total amount of the land acquisition in the year that this fee was spent?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: It was budgeted at $15 million but you understand we are not through the year yet. These figures were the most up to date that I could get.

Mr. De Monte: $15 million?

Mr. Stokes: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister would give this House the assurance that he is taking steps to ensure that the irregularities that have been uncovered in the Timimns area will not be allowed to continue and he will take steps to see that they do not occur in other parts of the province.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Chairman, I think I gave that undertaking to the House when I reported it as soon as I did and we have methods.

Mr. Stokes: You have taken those steps?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Yes. We always had methods for investigation and this is the way this one came about.

Mr. Chairman: Is there anything further under vote 901?

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Chairman, I am sorry I missed those figures that the Minister brought in in answer to my question earlier this afternoon. They are very interesting. I think they are far in excess of what they should be.

When I asked the Minister yesterday what he thought about Mr. McRuer's recommendations in regard to the use of outside lawyers at all, he said the matter was under review. But it comes to my memory now that the public accounts committee, in its report last year, made exactly the same recommendation. I think it was recommendation number 4. I was looking at it last night.

So, the Minister's excuse that he has McRuer under review really does not hold water because he has had not only the criticisms in the House but he has had the unanimous recommendation of a committee of this House; the committee on which there is a majority of Conservative members.

One would have thought that by now the Minister would have had a chance to contemplate this to a full extent, and to have arrived at a decision.

Would the Minister enlighten us a bit more on that?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Chairman, I pointed out when I was giving the figures to the House that this was for all the legal fees across the province. I doubt very much that it would be too handy to have somebody from the Attorney General's office go out all across the province. This the overall picture. Of course, as I said yesterday to the hon. member that the McRuer report will be dealt with through The Attorney General's Department and we will give our recommendations at that time.

Mr. Singer: With great respect, Mr. Chairman, this is not the answer.

The answer to the recommendation of the public accounts committee, the answer to the repeated criticisms that have been leveled in this House for better than nine years now, by my colleague from Sudbury and myself, the answer to the unanimous recommendation of the public accounts committee, the answer to the recommendation of McRuer, are all the same. And, certainly what I am looking for from the Minister is when are you going to move? At the moment, the Minister says that it is all over the province. Surely we could not expect the Attorney-General to do something or other.

What bothers me, Mr. Chairman, is that no matter how many committees study matters; no matter how many times members make recommendations; no matter how many times experts recommend; we get the same sort of reply from the front benches of the government.

Here is a positive case. Here is a small legal empire built up in The Department of Highways, 30-strong, in competition with all the other branches—a good patronage arm. Make no mistake that it is not a good patronage arm, because as you look down the list of people who got the $101,000, you can judge where the political loyalties lie by the extent of the dollars that they got.

The way to bring that back into control, Mr. Chairman, is to accept the recommendations that have been made over the years.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, I must admit it never ceases to annoy me, in driving over the King's highways, to see the signs that designate new work under construction, or that has begun, in which we are informed that by the generosity of the Minister, the thon. George Gomme and Prime Minister, the hon. John P. Robarts, that this particular work is being undertaken. Naturally, I always think back to these debates in the House, where it is not because of generosity, but after the careful investigation and the vote of this Legislature, that the tax funds are made available to the development of the highways system in all parts of the province. Of course, it has been the custom through a number of highways Ministers, and even two or three Prime Ministers, to self-advertise themselves in this way. I really feel it is a very crass use of public funds in this connection.

In travelling through the United States, I suppose I would have to say to you, Mr. Chairman, that I have noticed that some governors in the more backward jurisdictions do the same thing, but in the progressive areas they will often put the information up that this is the tax dollar at work and on this particular project a certain sum is being made available.

I know that my view on this is not going to change the Minister's preoccupation with seeing his name up on those big blue boards, but we do have, in the first vote, section 5 on roads publicity. The Minister, when he was asked about this previously, said that this had to do with maps and things like this. But, I would like to ask him if there is

someone on his staff, or perhaps some group of people, detailed to see to it that publicity associated with the government's decisions and the Minister's activities are put out to the media. In other words, does he have a specific press relations officer that has the responsibility of advertising The Department of Highways?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Chairman, the answer is no.

Mr. Nixon: Then I think you had better give us a little more detail on the $200,000. How much do you spend on these road maps?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Chairman, the money that it cost to go to county fairs was $20,000.

Mr. Nixon: How much?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: $20,000. The major exhibitions was $15,000 and then photogoraphy: motion pictures, $25,000, still pictures $6,000, supplies $7,000, miscellaneous $5,000. Then we have the publication, the DHO *News*, $20,000; the road bulletin, $6,000; book cover, $7,000; northern road maps, $35,000; roads to recreation maps, $40,000; and illustrated story books $7,000.

Mr. Nixon: What about the regular road maps?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: They are under another vote.

Mr. Nixon: Can you give me the information on the regular road maps?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: That is under vote 905 Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, I do not suppose you can tell me anything more specific about those signs. Would they come under the vote for regular highways signing?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Chairman, those would come out of construction. They are just put up where the contracts are.

Mr. Nixon: They are put up first and taken down last.

Mr. Braithwaite: Mr. Chairman, following the same line of questioning. I have always believed that the government of Ontario is composed of a Conservative Party, the members of the government and the official Opposition. We have all seen, Mr. Chairman, these signs and these maps, and I am wondering if the Minister has ever considered putting beside the name of the Prime Minister, the name of the Leader of the Opposition and on these signs I know my hon.—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Braithwaite: I know my hon. leader, Mr. Chairman, I know that he is too modest—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Braithwaite: —he is too modest to suggest this, but I want to say that if it is fair game to have the Prime Minister's name there, why should not the hon. name of Robert F. Nixon be there?

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, I feel called upon to comment on that before the interjections by hon. members.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Nixon: Before the Minister makes his remarks—and I feel sure that it would be up to me to decide, even though the Minister were willing or anxious to do this, and I deny him that right. I would say, however, that his signs would be improved if he had his name, and his friend's name either taken off entirely or inscribed in very small type put on there—some information that is of some use to the travelling public and taxpayer.

Mr. Sargent: In invisible ink.

Mr. De Monte: I am wondering, Mr. Chairman, since the people of Ontario pay for these roads, why do we not just put on there "built by the people of Ontario?"

Mr. Bukator: Also, when you wind up in that area, "We are now coming into the riding of the hon. member for Niagara Falls," and then put that name on also, or whatever the riding happens to be.

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Minister of Municipal Affairs): There is no construction there.

Mr. Bukator: That way, people can tell whether a riding is getting enough through its member or not. If they are deprived, then naturally they can come to you, the Minister, and ask why did they not get more road work done.

Getting back to 1934, the point that the Minister touched on and this great Prime Minister, Mr. Hepburn—

Hon. Mr. McNaughton: Scintillating debates!

Mr. Bukator: —took over this province in the depth of the depression and put the show on the road and we began then to

get prosperity. Let me tell you something else.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Bukator: You prefer not to remember those days, sitting on that side!

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): I sure do.

Mr. Bukator: And then the Liberals took over.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: And they fired all the Tories.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bukator: And, back to the debate. Back to the debate.

In 1934, the depression was at its very depth. This great man, Hepburn, took over the province and he really did begin—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bukator: Absolutely, according to what the Minister said, just to put the record straight, it appears that he had one of these jobs that the Conservatives provided for him until the Liberals took over and fired him the very next day.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: That is not right, sir. We just recognize the great ability to do the work they ask.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bukator: Having said that, just recently I received a letter from a constituent of mine—I wanted that on the record, too, and I covered the microphone.

I received a letter from a constituent of mine. I did not want to bring this up in the House and I do not think we ought to, in individual cases. However, these individuals have no other recourse than to go to their members.

The member of my constituency came to me and outlined his problem. I suggested that he write me a letter which I in turn forwarded to the Minister. You cannot go much higher than that. Why was this man laid off in district 4, from sanding roads, snow ploughing, with a moment's notice? I stand to be corrected on the man's name, but I will tell you the man's name was Pugh. He was discharged from his job of driving a small truck within the last two months, without a week's notice, without a moment's notice.

He was told that the following day he did not have to come to work. I thought if this is happening in this day and age, nothing has changed since 1934; only other people are there to fire men without notice. This man was laid off. He spoke to his foreman and the foreman said, "We find no fault in your work. We have instructions to lay you off."

The very next day, a junior to him, who had been working for the department for three years, was on the job doing his work for him.

Mr. Nixon: That is modern administration.

Mr. Bukator: And this happened within the last few months.

I do not think I should belabour this point, but I expect this Minister to tell me in a letter in response to the one that I wrote him—and he could reply to it—to tell me why The Department of Highways, or any other government body—if they are doing that, in this day and age—why would they fire a man who worked for three years, replace him with a man who worked a shorter length of time than that—about two, I would say—without notice and without at least a week's pay to notify him that he was through, to find another job.

Now if this happened to this Minister in 1934, it is happening to people in this province right today.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bukator: I realize, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister of Highways cannot keep his finger on the pulse of this large department that spends $450 million. But I can say this, Mr. Chairman, up to this point we are only dealing with about $4 million of that immense amount of money; and we are not getting answers to our questions. They are coming a little better than they did yesterday, and I can assure you that most ought not to get by us as members of the Opposition until we have our answers.

Getting back to by friend Mr. Pugh; I will expect from this Minister a reply to my letter telling me why he was laid off without notice, or even a week's pay. This is a fair request. Many of you in this House, members on the government side of the House, no doubt have had some similar problems to deal with and no doubt you have taken them up with your Minister. But if the reply to my letter is no better as far as you are concerned, you are not getting the fair treatment that you ought to from your own Minister. This is something

that this government ought not to do to people in this day and age.

Having said that, we have many problems to contend with here. On this particular vote I realize we can cover a whole area of problems and so I have strayed away from the individual vote that we will come to later, but I do not believe that any Minister should get up and say this happened to me back in 1934 when you are doing it in this day and age and people are not being treated the way they should.

Mr. MacDonald: I have been fascinated at the furore and enthusiasm with which the guardians of the pork barrel spring to the battle when somebody challenges their right to exercise the pork barrel. When, for example, it was suggested that you should cease putting the names of the Prime Minister and the Minister on all of these signs automatically on the other side of the House, there were at least eight or ten members, including two or three Cabinet Ministers who protested: no, no. The guardians of the pork barrel were there to guard the pork barrel. This is the whole approach.

I was interested, for example, in the Minister when he rose and said that he hated this system, that it hurt him, that he was the victim of it. He does not hate the system. He hates it when it is used by the Liberals and the Tories are the victims, and the Liberals hate it when it is used by the Tories and they are the victims. But you thrive on the system.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, I have documented in this House how people who wanted to get jobs at Port Arthur could get them on the highways only if they were hired and recommended by the employment committee of the local Tory party. I have documented in this House, how in Lanark, when a position was about to come open—they were so flagrant about Toryism, they handle them in a very flagrant fashion in Lanark—they even published the report of the meeting of the Tory association in which they submitted their recommendation to fill the position three weeks before the position became vacant—in that instance, in the liquor store. I have documented—though I have forgotten the exact details—of the Tory association operating in Timiskaming, with regard to the appointment of a sheriff. This is the way you operate the pork barrel.

But let us come back to The Department of Highways, Mr. Chairman. The Department of Highways is the outdoor relief department of the Ontario Tory party. The public purse is used—sure in part to meet the needs of the public in building highways, and the needs, in many instances, of the most economically depressed areas, to provide a little marginal income to the most depressed families—but it is the outdoor relief department of the Ontario Tory party. That is what The Department of Highways is being traditionally used for and it is to a considerable extent still.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Sudbury East.

Mr. Martel: Mr. Chairman, I would like to question just on The Department of Highways magazine, and I will make reference and come back to this magazine just by an illustration, if I might. I understand there is $20,000 spent for DHO. Is this right?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: That is right.

Mr. Martel: At the teachers' convention last week, I questioned the teachers, 25 of them, on the magazine called *Dimension* that is sent out by The Department of Education. One person read it out of 25 and he read it when he went to the john.

I think we are spending all kinds of money and I would like the Minister to inquire how many people are reading DHO. Take a survey to see if this book is serving its function. If it is, fine, but with *Dimension* it certainly is not, and I, as a teacher, know, because nine on my staff for a year never read it once.

Mr. N. L. Olde (Middlesex South): How do you know?

Mr. Martel: I have forgotten more than you will ever know.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. Martel: It is a matter of knowledge.

Mr. Chairman: Order! Is vote 901 carried?

Vote 901 agreed to.

On vote 902:

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Chairman, item 4 of vote 902 back two years ago was $465,000. Last year it was $775,000. This year it is $953,000. Will the Minister explain the

sudden rise in the request for funds under item 4?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: This is because we have had to buy newer and more heavily powered equipment.

Mr. B. Newman: You are not buying it at all. You are only renting it.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: That is right.

Mr. B. Newman: You said "buy," and that is why I am questioning it.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: I am sorry.

Mr. H. Peacock (Windsor West): Mr. Chairman, a question on item 4, and that is on the evaluation of the electronic computing equipment which The Department of Highways is renting. Was consideration given to its hook-up or its link with the computer equipment used by the Provincial Treasurer? Was there an evaluation, a comprehensive one, that included the systems and application of this computer in The Department of Highways to functions that might or might not be carried out in the computer centre of the Provincial Treasurer?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: The answer to that is "yes". I might tell the members that this equipment is used to provide service without charge to other departments, such as Agriculture and Food; Attorney General; the Ontario Provincial Police; The Department of Civil Service; The Department of Economics and Development; The Department of Energy and Resources Management; The Department of Labour; The Department of Lands and Forests; The Department of Municipal Affairs; the Royal commission inquiry into labour disputes; and The Department of Transport.

Mr. Peacock: Perhaps this question ought to be raised on public accounts, but you can rule on that, Mr. Chairman. Under what order or rule does the Department of Highways provide this service to all the other departments? Is the total cost of the service to the other departments reflected in this amount in item 4 of the vote, or does the department charge the other departments for the computer time and the programmer's time that is used?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: This service is provided without charge to the other departments.

Mr. T. Reid (Scarborough East): Mr. Chairman, just following up what the previous member stated, I would like to quote from the annual report for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1967, of The Department of Highways of Ontario, about the electronic computing branch, as a prelude to my question. On page 20, there is a statement that consultation is also extended to other departments of the government and the electronic computing branch is officially recognized as the engineering and scientific computer installation of the government.

This is very nice and one likes to know this type of centralization is taking place. On page 21, as the hon. Minister has noted, Mr. Chairman, the services are provided by his department to The Department of Civil Service, Department of Labour, and so on; in total, according to this report, seven other departments of the government.

The Minister has stated that these services are provided without charge, I gather, to the other departments of government. In going through the estimates for the other departments I find in the seven departments he notes his department provides services to, there are the following additional estimates which we shall be asked to approve in the months ahead.

For example, he says that his department provides services to The Department of Civil Service, and when we look at The Department of Civil Service we find that what he says is true.

And then we follow through on the other ones; we hit The Department of Labour, for example, Mr. Chairman, and here we find duplication. In The Department of Labour, when we get to vote 1009, we will be asked to approve $356,500 for assistance in data processing. What explains this type of duplication? If the Minister of Highways does not charge for his services to The Department of Labour, and if his computer centre is recognized as the engineering and scientific computer installation for the government, why are we being asked to approve over a third of a million dollars later on?

We get into The Department of Lands and Forests and we find that he does indeed provide these services. But then we hit The Department of Agriculture and Food and in The Department of Agriculture and Food, under the finance and administration division, under accounts which will be part of vote 102, we find an additional $28,500. How can he say in his report that he is responsible for the centralized computer installation for the government?

Then we hit The Department of the Attorney General and we find that in part of vote

211 coming up in the months ahead, we will be asked to approve $103,000 or more. Again, for rental of equipment, data processing, data processing maintenance, data processing salaries. If, as the Minister of Highways states in his annual report, his department is the central agency for computer installation for the government, why are we going to be asked later on to approve for duplicate services? Then we hit The Department of—

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Mr. Chairman, there is something I would like to point out to the hon. member—

Mr. T. Reid: I would like to continue.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: —there is a difference between computer operations and data processing.

Mr. T. Reid: I have not finished my question to the Minister.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. T. Reid: When we hit The Department of Energy and Resources Management, we find the Minister says that his department looks after these services. But when we get to The Department of Energy and Resources Management, vote 607, we are going to be asked to approve another $245,000 for data processing.

What I want to know is how can this Minister state in his ninth annual report that he is responsible for such data processing in this government—I have not even mentioned The Treasury Department—and to give the impression that this government is somehow efficient in its management via centralized data processing and computer services? I would suggest that if this government is interested in centralizing services that they go about it in the right way; that they stop trying to pull the wool over our eyes—

An hon. member: Hear, hear.

Mr. T. Reid: —and ask us later on, after we have approved this particular estimate, to approve almost $1 million more in data processing services in other departments. I do not think you have done your cost benefit analysis.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order please!

Mr. Singer: An awful lot of you are angry over there if there is nothing in that point.

Mr. Chairman: Will the members please let the Minister reply.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Chairman, I do not think I once said that we did all of the work; I said that we did serve these other departments and I can give the member the breakdown of the type of work which we do for every department. I am sure they have equipment for their accounts and so on themselves; ours is more the scientific end of it. If you would like me to give you that list of the work which we do for them, I can furnish it to you.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, I would greatly appreciate receiving that list.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Would you care to have me read it or shall I send it to you?

Mr. T. Reid: No, I would appreciate reeciving it. But the point that I would like to ask the Minister, is this.

Perhaps the Minister could give the members of this House his opinion, his views, on whether there should be a centralized data centre bank for government records, data processing and so forth. In other words, would the Minister in the Cabinet recommend to the Prime Minister of this province, that we set up a centralized data bank and data processing. Take it out of your department, get centralization and get better value for the processing you want done.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: I might point out to the hon. member that this is beind studied now by the government. But I think we have gone a long way in providing this service for all these other departments along the system that you talk about. But, as I say, it is actively being reviewed.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 902, the member for Grey-Bruce.

Mr. Sargent: About $2 million is what we are talking about in the rentals, it is a recurring factor every year and I would like the Minister to tell me, for $2 million more expense than we had before you had this equipment, how many people did you let go to make up this saving?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. member is not quite right. It is $953,000 rental of equipment; the rest is salaries and travelling expenses and maintenance. And I may say we have kept our staff about normal over the years.

Mr. Sargent: What does it do, this computer system?

Mr. Chairman: Anything further on vote 902?

Mr. Sargent: No, I want to know the answer to this.

Mr. Chairman: The member asked what the computer systems do. I do not think what computers do is relevant to the estimates of The Department of Highways.

Mr. Sargent: About $2 million worth.

Mr. Chairman: Is vote 902 carried?

Mr. Sargent: I want the answer to my question.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order, order! Would the Minister like to explain what the computers do, in this particular department?

Mr. Singer: What kind of programme does he do with them; what information does he store?

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: I think, Mr. Chairman, we had better send the hon. member the manual on that.

Mr. Sargent: I thank you. That shows the hon. Minister does not know his own department; he does not know himself.

An hon. member: That is exactly right.

Mr. Sargent: We have a $12,000 fee here for travelling expenses. The first vote we had was $190,000 for travelling expenses. In this department we are spending probably $1 million in travelling expenses.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Chairman, the type of work performed for our department, this is what you want.

Mr. Sargent: You found the answer, go ahead.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: I offered the information for other departments for the member who spoke before you. But for our department, its engineering calculation, transportation study, critical path-analysis, accounting reports, personnel reports, management systems and costs.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 902?

Mr. Sargent: This is most important information!

It would seem we have a contract for rental recurring yearly like this. Where would you need to have travelling expenses on a service project like this?

The firm that supplies the equipment should do all the travelling at no charge to the government.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: This is for the provision of the staff for attending courses to keep up with new equipment.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Windsor West.

Mr. Peacock: Mr. Chairman, I just want to get back to a point which I thought the Minister was going to deal with, and that is why I did not press it earlier. It is this, I would like to find out what is the authorization for the placement of this service with The Department of Highways which is providing computer time to the other departments. Now I want to point out in saying this that I am not at all concerned about the point raised by the member for Scarborough East, we will get to the amounts of money being expended in those other departments when we come to them.

The point I think that he is over-emphasizing is there has to be terminals in these various departments feeding information into a central computer system. We should not get too exercised about the fact that information has to go from one part of the government service into a central computer service.

I want to know, though, why it is flowing into The Department of Highways and why the time rental charges are not being apportioned among the other departments?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if I might say that I think this is all irrelevant other than if these questions concern themselves with the function performed by the computer that is operated at The Department of Highways in Downsview.

There is a computer service centre in The Department of the Provincial Treasurer, there are computer services in other departments. Computer services policy is an overall government function. It would be more appropriate to ask these questions on the estimates of The Department of the Provincial Treasurer rather than The Department of Highways.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that there is a very relevant question here for the Minister concerned at this point.

The quesion is: How do you judge whether or not the costs of running your computer are

real costs? In other words, unless you have an internal bookkeeping system, whereby you can charge off to other departments of government, you have no way of knowing whether the costs of your computer are being met by the services involved; you cannot do evaluation on whether or not you are using your capital equipment to its maximum potential.

Tied with this, if you do no have a price system involved in rationing the use of your computer time among the alternative demands on it from your own department and from other departments of government, you have no rational way of judging what the real costs are. In an modern big business that I know of, including governments in the United States, they do very careful cost-benefit, in-put-out-put analysis, if you like, on the use of computer time. My answer here is that your department has inflated costs, because you are not charging other departments for the time they use.

How can we, as members of the Opposition on this side of the House, know whether or not you are using this equipment efficiently? And this applies to other departments as well. On this, how do you decide that your time on the equipment is more important than the hon. Provincial Treasurer's time, for example unless you have got a rationing system, or does it just depend who you know best and what the personal demands are? If you do not have a rationing system you cannot use your equipment in a rationalized way, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Chairman, the authorization of us having the equipment in The Department of Highways was, of course, a decision of the government to start with. I may say that the equipment is working overtime and we do have the costs, but we just do not transfer them to the other departments. What you say, maybe is the thing that should be done and probably will be done, if we go further with the system and have an overall one for the whole government.

Mr. Peacock: What does the Minister mean, "the equipment is working overtime"? As I understand, computer equipment is so costly, it is scheduled for 24-hour operation.

Does he mean there is a backlog of projects waiting to go on to it? Is it going at less than 24-hour capacity, Mr. Chairman?

Interjections by hon members.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Chairman, I want to inform the hon. member that it is being used around the clock a good deal of the time.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Grey-Bruce.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, it is interesting to know how many computer systems we have in the government now and how much we are paying in total for services of them.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that that question be brought up either in the estimates of the Provincial Treasurer's department or the estimates of Treasury board.

The hon. members who examine their estimates book will find out that central data processing matters are dealt with in both of the departments. I draw their attention—so that I think we could leave these generalities, if you wish—to page 150, The Treasury Department, ADP—automatic data processing standards branch—which is part of the Treasury board secretariat and to page 140, Treasury department data processing operations branch of the systems and programming branch, and the central decisions that are made with respect to these matters are concerned in these two estimates and not concerned with the overall policy of The Department of Highways.

Mr. Chairman: I think the Provincial Treasurer has put the situation very well and these remarks should come through The Department of Treasury.

It being 6 o'clock, p.m., the House took recess.

No. 41

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

First Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Thursday, March 28, 1968

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1968

5

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Thursday, March 28, 1968

Estimates, Department of Highways, Mr. Gomme, continued 1371

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Rowntree, agreed to 1398

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, MARCH 28, 1968

The House resumed at 8:00 o'clock, p.m.

ESTIMATES, THE DEPARTMENT OF HIGHWAYS
(continued)

On vote 902:

Mr. H. Peacock (Windsor West): Mr. Chairman, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. Deans), that vote 902 be reduced to the amount of $1. Mr. Chairman, we have had extensive debate this afternoon on this vote, and I think that the reasons behind my amendment are quite clear. The member for Scarborough East (Mr. T. Reid) has joined in and given a number of very good reasons why this function, the electronic computing system of The Department of Highways, should not be in the hands of this Minister, and in the interim should be placed with, perhaps, the computing services centre of the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. MacNaughton), with a view to the establishment of a central computing services office. I think that the amendment calling for reduction of this estimate is well founded.

Mr. T. Reid (Scarborough East): Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that the official Opposition does not go along with this amendment. I think that we have had an extremely good discussion on this question of the use of data processing and information storage, and I think that we may have made somewhat of a slight impression, however small, on the hon. Minister and perhaps on some of his colleagues who also spend close to an additional $1 million on the use of computer services. I think that we have made our point, and I think that it would be irresponsible to vote for a motion which reduces this particular estimate to $1. I trust that the Minister has taken our comments into account, and that he and his colleagues in the Cabinet will press for a proper centralized computer and data processing service.

I would like, if I may, Mr. Chairman, because it is relevant to the amendment, to ask the Minister a further question—just to let him know that the official Opposition is still very much concerned with this problem although we are not supporting the amendment put by the unofficial Opposition. My question to the Minister is this: Does the Minister think or know whether or not the has enough hard information or data now concerning the use of this computing centre by his department and by other departments of government to evaluate the performance of his computer and data processing centre, by running the hard data through his computer.

The reason that I put this question is this. If he is not systematically collecting the information necessary to evaluate the use of his computer service, he cannot evaluate it. And, as one Minister of this government responsible for so many of the computer and programming services for the government, if he cannot systematically and analytically evaluate the returns for the use of $2 million being spent in this area in his own department, then I think that this exposes the fraudulent claims of the entire Conservative government that they can manage the public accounts of this province in any effective way. I think that the myth has too long been perpetuated that this government is efficient in its management of government.

I for one, on this side, and I share this with my leader, will at every attempt that we can, expose the very simple fact that this government is not being run by the people who can manage a large, over-$2.5-billion enterprise, if you like, on lines of efficiency.

Hon. G. E. Gomme (Minister of Highways): Mr. Chairman, in reply to the hon. member, I would like to point out to him that this department was the pioneer in establishing this system in the government. I tried to explain this afternoon the use that we have made of the equipment, and I also pointed out that the centralized use of this equipment is something that is under study. Of course it is under another Minister, as far as that part of it goes. I believe that what the member says certainly has some validity, and anything that I can do to assist in having one

system to do everything to everybody in the government, I would certainly do.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Chairman, my colleague from Grey-Bruce (Mr. Sargent) asked some questions before dinner about the $12,000 travelling expense in this vote.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Singer: Yes, we talk to each other. Yes, well, we talk with others. As a matter of fact, now that the Minister raises it, I think that a great deal could be accomplished if these Ministers would get together in a caucus and try to save some money through computer proceessing.

However, back to the vote, Mr. Chairman, and the $12,000 figure that my colleague asked about. The Minister's reply was that this was related to travelling expenses for people who operate the commuters. No, excuse me, the computers. The computers are located in Toronto, is that not correct?

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): So are the commuters!

Mr. Singer: Thank you. The training facilities are located in Toronto, are they not, Mr. Chairman? So why do you have $12,000 of travelling expenses to take people from Toronto to Toronto?

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Maybe they moved the computers.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: There are seminars which take place in other parts of the country than Toronto. There are seminars in other parts of the country, besides the ones in Toronto, which these people attend. Also, some of our staff have to travel to our field offices to get certain information which they can use in this equipment.

Mr. Singer: Well, what kind of seminars is the Minister talking about?

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Nixon: Well, it is the same thing; you want $2 million, they want $1. Same vote.

Mr. Singer: Yes, same vote, the motion is defeated, the vote carried. I would have thought that the Provincial Treasurer would have known that.

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Provincial Treasurer): Well, I got the impression that you were not in support of the motion.

Mr. Singer: We are not, we are not. We do not think that you should have $1. We think that you should carry on the business of the province, but we want to know how you are spending it.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. G. Bukator (Niagara Falls): That is right, we are going to be the winners, and they will be the Opposition.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Everywhere, Mr. Chairman, where these data processing courses take place. It could be on the American side and they could be in the western cities or the eastern cities. This is where these people go for that purpose.

Mr. Singer: What machinery do you use? Do you use IBM machinery —or something else.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Yes.

Mr. Singer: You use IBM machinery?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: That is right.

Mr. Singer: Is it not true then, Mr. Chairman, that IBM, having its head offices here, runs its courses here in Toronto?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: All of them are not run in Toronto.

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent): It just struck me, Mr. Chairman, in looking over the public accounts in 1967 and up to March 31, which is estimated—and I do respect the Minister of Highways and also the Minister's officials —I cannot find, after spending $390 million, that you have not lost 5 cents. Can you tell me that there has not been a loss in these expenditures of $390 million? I find that hard to believe.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): $390 million.

Mr. Spence: Yes, and not a nickel lost.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Not a nickel lost.

Mr. Spence: Not a nickel. It is a perfect score!

Mr. Chairman: Is the member speaking to vote 902?

Mr. Spence: It just struck me, Mr. Chairman, that in looking over the public accounts for 1967 I find not a 5 cent loss, and I would just like to ask the Minister, did he honestly

tell me that in spending $390 million there has not been a 5 cent piece lost?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: What has that to do with this vote?

Mr. Spence: Well, I may be out of turn—

Mr. Chairman: Yes, this is why I asked the member if he was speaking to vote 902 or the motion.

Mr. Nixon: We can save that one until later.

Mr. Spence: I will get it in the next vote, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Timiskaming.

Mr. D. Jackson (Timiskaming): Mr. Chairman, could the hon. Minister break down the $12,000 and tell me how much of it has been spent by the actual technicians that are involved in the operation of the equipment?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: We do not have that figure, Mr. Chairman, but I will get it for the hon. member.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please, so the Minister can be heard!

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Chairman, we do not have a breakdown of the $12,000 figure but I will get that for the hon. member. It will take a little research.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, I am obliged to say, if I may, there was a certain amount of generality to the motion proposed by the hon. member for somewhere in Windsor—I do not know where it is.

Mr. Chairman: Windsor West.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Are we going to pursue the detailed question of the estimates of the Minister or are we going to pursue the motion proposed by the hon. member for Windsor West. Which are we going to do, sir?

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, since the hon. Provincial Treasurer has raised this point it is obvious that anything under this particular vote should be completely in order as long as it is in the vote itself, because really the NDP have put forward a motion reducing this to $1; you want it left at $2 million. Surely questions from any part of the House to the hon. Minister on this expenditure would be quite in order.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, I must say I question the procedure somewhat. The hon. member for Windsor West's motion was very general in character, and whether this lends itself to the type of specific questioning process that usually characterizes the estimates, or whether it is a debate on a motion I am not sure, and I asked the chairman for clarification on this, that is all.

Mr. Chairman: The motion is pertaining to vote 902—that vote 902 be reduced to the amount of $1; that is the simple form of the motion.

Some hon. members: Vote, vote.

Mr. Nixon: We can discuss the motion. It is debatable.

Mr. Chairman: I can see no reason why the motion should not be debatable.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, may I ask, and of course it has been determined already, whether questions like the one from the hon. member for Kent-Elgin were admissible. You did not rule him out of order.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Kent was out of order. His question had no relevance to this vote or to this motion.

Mr. Singer: There is no riding of Kent-Elgin.

Mr. Chairman: The matter of travelling expenses of $12,000 is relevant to vote 902. The member for High Park.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): Are we going to have this vote without getting the breakdown which the Minister has promised us or should this vote not be postponed until we have the breakdown?

Mr. Chairman: The Minister had undertaken to provide the information for the member.

Mr. Shulman: Well, Mr. Chairman, should we not have the information before the vote?

Mr. Chairman: No, he has undertaken to provide it. The member for Beaches-Woodbine.

Mr. J. L. Brown (Beaches-Woodbine): I would like a breakdown of the maintenance figure number 3.

Does this refer to the maintenance of the computer equipment, does it refer to the

maintenance of the buildings, the plant? Just what is the maintenance—

Mr. Chairman: I would say to the member that the maintenance estimate of $175,000 is the estimate of the amount being spent on maintenance for the ensuing year based on the actual amount of maintenance expended in previous years and there is not a likely breakdown.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Does the Minister wish to reply to the question?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Well, Mr. Chairman, I still do not know whether we are debating the motion or carrying on with questions on the estimates.

Mr. Singer: Debating the motion.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: I cannot give the figure. The maintenance is made up of the cards, the tabulating paper, the blotter paper, the forms, miscellaneous stationery—$152,000. Office and machine equipment, cards, tapes, other miscellaneous storage cabinets, typewriters, machine ribbons etc.—$23,000.

Mr. Chairman: That is the breakdown of the maintenance. Item 3 and vote 902.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, one question please. If subsequently we find in this breakdown, the figures we have requested, that there are matters which we wish to debate, will we be given an opportunity to debate them?

Some hon. members: No.

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): There is a motion before the House and when that is put and carried there is no debate after that.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): If the Minister of Energy Resources wants to prolong this debate then let him answer that way.

Mr. Chairman: Order, order!

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, it is perfectly legitimate—

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, the Minister knows that a member may move a motion, but the Chair calls the motion and as yet the sub-section is before the House—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, my colleague from High Park raises an interesting point and one that might be thought of by the Chair on subsequent estimates, that when a breakdown of figures is to be given after the subestimate has been passed, and if controversial and significant material is revealed then some procedure has to be found for the members to debate it.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: On a point of order.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Here we go!

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Have we a motion before the House or have we not?

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: We have not put the motion yet, though.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: There is a motion before the committee.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Let us put the motion.

Mr. Chairman: The motion is debatable. The motion is being debated.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: The motion has not been put, though.

Mr. Chairman: No, the motion has not been put.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: That is what I said.

Mr. Chairman: I would point out to the members that the Chairman attempted to put the motion on two occasions and another member arose in his seat and continued the debate. I now put the motion.

The member for High Park.

Mr. Shulman: I would like an answer to the question which I have put, sir. In a situation like this where we have requested breakdowns, if we find material in that breakdown which we wish to debate are we to be given an opportunity to make that debate?

Mr. Chairman: I would say to the member that when the motion is put, if it lost, the vote is automatically carried. The Minister

has undertaken to provide the information to the member.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Mr. Chairman, does the Minister, at this time presenting his estimates, not have an obligation to provide all of the information justifying these estimates to this House before the vote is taken?

Mr. Chairman: The Minister has provided details of items making up the maintenance.

Interjections by the hon. members.

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): Mr. Chairman, speaking on a point of order, it surely should become apparent that when the hon. member has made the motion, speaking for his party, I take it, they had reached a conclusion that they did not want any more information on this vote, that they wanted the whole vote reduced to $1.

If, after this motion is put, it were in order to ask for details on the portions of this vote, it must imply that the hon. member proposes to withdraw the motion and vote, say, $1 million or $500,000, or some sum, not $1. After he has decided he only wants $1 on this vote, what is the sense of talking about details? It is one thing or the other.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, if I may speak to that point of order, surely the Attorney General is raising a pedantic point, and he is doing no service to the House at all in this regard. It is obvious, Mr. Chairman, that you yourself have so ruled that the questions that are based on the amendment put by my hon. friend are quite in order. And I submit to you, Mr. Chairman, that if the Minister would simply be given a chance to answer these questions, without the interruptions that have been coming from his own supporters, we would soon be able to carry even the amendment, or the original motion. Now let us just get on with the business.

Mr. J. H. White (London South): On the point of order.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please! A motion has been placed before us to reduce the vote to $1. I have ruled that the motion is debatable under vote 902. The members have debated this particular item. I would suggest to them that some of the latex questions introduced are in my opinion frivolous. I think it is now time to put the motion. I therefore do so.

Mr. White: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. In fairness to the rules of this House, I must make this point. On page 66 of Lewis, under subsection D, it says: "A motion for consideration of 'the previous question' cannot be made." That very clearly implies that a motion having been put is debatable and that further questions regarding the motion are in fact in order. I think there is no doubt about that.

The second consideration is: when the vote is dispensed with, for instance if this vote is defeated, will we then have the right to debate the matter further? And in my opinion the answer is "no".

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: The member for London South has said exactly what the Chair has ruled.

Mr. Peacock has moved that vote 902 be reduced to the amount of $1.

Those in favour of the motion will please say "aye".

Those opposed will please say "nay".

In my opinion the "nays" have it.

I declare the motion lost and the item carried.

Vote 902 agreed to.

On vote 903:

Mr. Nixon: This particular vote involving more than $1 million of expenditure to finance the head office administration would in my view be the place to raise a matter of some importance which came to the attention of the courts during the last year. I would like to read two excerpts from a news report, extracted from the Toronto *Globe and Mail* of July 19, 1967, which has to do surely with the operation of the head office administration: I will read two brief paragraphs from it:

> In a four-to-one decision, the Ontario court of appeal yesterday upheld the acquittal of ten Ontario road paving companies on a tender rigging conspiracy charged under The Combines Investigation Act. Mr. Justice W. S. Schroeder, writing the majority decision, said there is not the slightest doubt that the actions of the companies were completely devoid of business ethics. The judge added that the methods employed by the companies were reprehensible in the highest degree and cannot be condoned. He said the companies hoodwinked The Department of

Highways and the municipalities with which they dealt.

However, Mr. Justice Schroeder, continued. "I cannot be persuaded that the Crown has proven anything beyond a conspiracy to prevent, or lessen unduly, competition in the performance of work and labour in the resurfacing of provincial and municipal roadways." The five companies were charged with conspiring from 1959 to 1961 inclusive to prevent or lessen competition in the transportation and supply of sand, gravel, stone-chip and asphalt used in road paving.

It seems to me that the control of the contracts under a number of votes which follow this particular one must be the responsibility, first of the Minister and the administration, but beyond him, of course, his head office staff. I would like to hear the Minister's report on the internal investigations that were carried out by his department which may have led to the charges that were made, and what safeguards are presently in operation so that we in this House and the taxpayers across the province can be assured of the honesty and the uprightness, the efficiency and the properness and the propriety of the business deals into which the department enters in this connection.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: They were certainly penalized. They were not able to bid for three months and I—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Is it all right if I answer the question? You cannot wait? They were penalized for three months and then they were acquitted so they were able to carry on.

Mr. Nixon: But the decision to penalize them was made by the department, not by the courts. Is that not so?

I wonder if the Minister could indicate what sort of a penalty this would be for the firms concerned, as far as their share of the year's work was concerned—I would suppose that the amounts of money that would be used in this particular connection would not be paid out uniformly, month by month—and whether or not this penalty was serious, as the Minister would indicate that it was, associated as it is with one quarter of the total year's expenditure.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Chairman, I could not answer that as to the figure, but they were denied the privilege of bidding at all during that period.

Mr. Singer: Well, Mr. Chairman, surely the Minister has not answered the question of the leader of the Opposition. The leader of the Opposition asked amongst other things what steps have you taken in the department to make sure that the department is not again victimized? What improvements have you made in your administration? What checks, what safeguards? What new procedures have you ordered? Because it certainly was the opinion of Mr. Justice Schroeder that the department, and through the department the people of Ontario, were victimized by these processes. Now have you improved your processes so that it cannot happen again?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: I am informed that the people were not victimized. As I pointed out, they were acquitted.

Mr. Singer: No, no, the hon. Minister is not with me on this. Mr. Justice Schroeder said that the actions of the people who were charged were reprehensible. They were not sufficient to allow the courts to convict them of the offence under the conspiracy sections of the code.

But he went on to say, as I heard this news report being read, and as I recall reading the decision, that the department was victimized, that the people of Ontario were victimized. Very simply we are asking the Minister, Mr. Chairman, what procedures have been inaugurated in the department since these facts came to light in court so that the sort of procedures that have victimized the taxpayers of Ontario will not again be allowed to take place?

An hon. member: Sensible question.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: In one of the votes a little later on I can give a complete statement of all the safeguards and all the methods we have for pre-qualification and everything that we use for contractors.

Mr. Chairman: Would the Minister tell us what that vote might be so we can take note of it for future reference.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I think this kind of questioning is relevant under this vote.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please, member for Downsview; I am waiting for a reply from the Minister.

Mr. Singer: I am sorry.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Vote 907, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Thank you, Mr. Minister. Now, the member for Downsview.

Mr. Singer: I think it is relevant under the head office administration—we have gone this far in it—and 907 is a vote that deals with capital disbursements, construction and other capital projects, but let me read this paragraph again: "The judge added—and that is Mr. Justice Schroeder—"The judge added that the methods employed by the companies, reprehensible in the highest degree, cannot be condoned." He said that the companies hoodwinked The Department of Highways and the municipalities with which they dealt.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: What was the dateline of this?

Mr. Singer: The dateline of this is July 19, 1967.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: You made some earlier remarks about this and I wondered—

Mr. Nixon: Perhaps I had better answer the Provincial Treasurer, since he put the question and I read it. It says, conspiring from 1959-1961. But while I am on my feet, if I may say so, sir, this is obviously a matter that the federal combines investigation authorities would take responsibility for and it would be their duty to do the investigation on a specific case such as this and make charges. But I would like to ask the Minister specifically—and this might help him in answering the questions that are put to him—what sort of contacts the department would maintain on a regular basis with the federal combines investigation authorities so that if they are undertaking a continuing investigation and they are receiving information that would deal with this matter that we in Ontario can be aware of any possibility of a combination resulting in price-fixing to our disadvantage?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: We have the very closest co-operation with the federal combines commission and we have a new estimating group in our own department. And then we have the pre-qualification of more contracts which gives us a greater control over them.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, again pre-qualification is fine, that is, to make sure that you have efficient work and you have good credit rating. To go back to this new story, Mr. Justice Schroeder said that the department had been hoodwinked. That is the word in this story. The simple question is what have you done to stop yourself from being hoodwinked anymore?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: The department investigated this—with respect to the hon. Minister—I was the Minister of the day and this thing has been exhaustively examined in this House before.

However, that is beside the point. If the hon. leader of the Opposition wants more information on it I can simply say that whatever branch of the federal government involving The Combines Investigation Act—I forget the name of the particular department, but whoever enforces The Combines Investigation Act first raised this matter before.

The fullest co-operation of The Department of Highways was made available to representative of this branch of the federal government. There can be no question about that and I am quite confident that under the present Minister of Highways, that policy has continued.

It was explained in the House at that time and I recall it very well because it was not a pleasant situation for the Minister of Highways to encounter. But under the pre-qualification procedures of the day, and I am sure they are no less effective today than they were then, stringent measures were taken.

I would point out to the hon. leader of the Opposition that those pre-qualification procedures, involving penalties for a variety of infractions and contractual obligations, were worked out rather painstakingly over a period of years, not only by the department but in conjunction with the Ontario road buildings association representatives of the road contractors themselves.

Among the provisions of the pre-qualification procedures that were worked out and concurred in by the department, by the contractors, represented by their own association, was a section that said, "The Minister for offences of this kind could impose penalties", and the Minister of that day did. He imposed these penalties prior to Mr. Justice Schroeder or any court having sat on these situations and made any type of decision.

Mr. Nixon: I say!

Hon. Mr. McNaughton: But the Minister of the day at that time, in the context of the

pre-qualification penalties that had been worked out between the department and the contractors themselves imposed a very substantial penalty. Now you ask the present hon. Minister—and I say with respect to the Minister again—to put a price tag on what that penalty was worth. Who can say what it was worth.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): One could, very easily.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Would you like to wait a moment, hon. member for Riverdale? Would you be kind enough to do that? Would you really?

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: All right, now I propose to ask in all honesty how you put a price tag on that. They were penalized to the extent that their bidding privileges were withdrawn; totally withdrawn. Now let us bear in mind that this only has value if any one of those contractors bidding the job had been the successful contractor.

Mr. Nixon: They had been successful for many months before.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes, yes, but not during that period of time—that 90-day suspension period. They may have contemplated bidding on A, B, X or Y number of contracts but the penalty, in terms of dollars, must obviously rely on whether or not they were the successful bidder.

Mr. J. Renwick: Well they were, under the system, they—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes, but they were not during the period of the penalty.

Mr. L. A. Braithwaite (Etobicoke): Did they get any more jobs?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Would you wait a moment and hear what I have to say? With respect, Mr. Chairman—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sargent: Who do you think you are?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I sure do not think I am you, that is for sure. I am simply trying to put on the record the processes that were instituted at the time. They were the only processes available at the time to deal with this matter that was before the courts, and The Department of Highways did it.

Mr. Justice Schroeder has been referred to today; I guess he was the Supreme Court justice that heard this situation. He has made his decision. If he did not find sufficient facts in the evidence that was proposed to penalize these people further I cannot account for that nor can the Minister, I think, but only within the limitations available to the department at the time this penalty was imposed.

I go one step further and I am quite confident that the Minister can and will say that at that point and again in conjunction with the Ontario road builders association the whole penalty section was reviewed again. Because I say to you, sir, that with respect to these people, the road construction industry of the province was not happy about this situation. It did not do them any good. It did not do their reputations a bit of good. There are penalties that are imposed whether they are imposed by the courts or not and as a consequence I am confident—certainly in my time as Minister of Highways this matter was thoroughly reviewed. I recall very well, and I say factually to this House, the Deputy Minister of Highways and myself met with the executive of the road builders association and made the position of The Department of Highways very well known.

Pursuant to that, all the procedures were re-examined, and I say to you this much, as far as I am aware, and I know the Minister will endorse this, these procedures are examined from time to time—they are not imposed, they are worked out together with the industry, and they are worked out very well. I say that because of my identification with the situation of the day, Mr. Chairman, and I tell the hon. leader of the Opposition that everything that could have been done before the court heard the specific charges finally laid under The Combines Investigation Act was done, and all the penalties that could be imposed were imposed at that time.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, we find, of course, that in the event, when it did go to court, they were acquitted, I understand, on a technicality. But there exists within the department sort of an internal court—a kangaroo court, if you wish—that exists only because of the agreement with the road builders association. Then who sits "as judge and jury"? Is it the Minister and his deputy who determine when a particular contractor is in breach of a code of ethics, or how does that work, because I did ask for the safeguards and this is obviously the main safeguard that we have working in our interest.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Chairman: I believe there is a question on the floor so the member for Sarnia will perhaps defer it.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Chairman, we have a pre-qualification committee made up of all the senior members of the staff that sit on all of these types of investigations, if you want to call it that.

Mr. Nixon: And this is the committee that applies the code of standards, or code of ethics, that is agreed to by all of the construction firms that are prepared or have the right to bid to the government? Is that so?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: It is not a code of ethics, Mr. Chairman, it is the pre-qualification procedure as laid down by the department. I might say for the information of the hon. members that the type of work that these contractors were doing in this area is very, very small. It was an oiling procedure and we do not do very much of that type of work, so I thought this would be of interest.

Mr. Nixon: I suppose one of the responsibilities of that particular committee would be to go over the bids and perhaps be at least on the alert for certain similarities in prices. Is that so? And it would have a general overview of the companies that regularly do bid so that they would be able to be alert for any collusion of the type that was before the courts this year?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Chairman, this estimating group that we have goes over all these things and they watch for everything that the hon. leader of the Opposition suggests. You understand that all these are open bids?

Mr. Chairman: The member for Sarnia.

Mr. Bullbrook: Mr. Chairman, I am absolutely intrigued with this—this whole concept of a department of government recognizing that someone with whom they do business has entered into some type of reprehensible activity. They cannot take issue with this, Mr. Chairman, because they impose penalties. They feel frankly, sir, notwithstanding the decision of Mr. Justice Schroeder—the hon. member for Downsview is quite right there—that the question of whether they were acquitted or not is of no significance. The Department of Highways, as I understand it, recognizes that these contractors have done something that warrants punitive measures. As I understand it from the hon. Provincial Treasurer, the former Minister of Highways, we go over to a group of the contractors themselves and we say, "Now boys, some of you fellows have been bad, and we think we should chastise you fellows. Now how do you think we should do it?" So they work out a formula themselves—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: You are dreaming now.

Mr. Bullbrook: Perhaps. I was one of the members who, while the Provincial Treasurer was speaking, did not open my mouth. All I ask now is a little reciprocity.

As I understand it we go to the boys and say, "Now fellows, some of your gang have done something wrong and we have to chastise you, so let us try to figure out a formula of chastisement. This is the way we do it. We do not take the position that we are representing Her Majesty and that we are a Minister of the Crown and that we will penalize you as we wish; and we do not take the position, Mr. Chairman, that you have done something wrong and you should not do business in our office again. We have come to the conclusion that for three months, fellows, some of you will not be able to bid."

In my respectful opinion what happens then is all the fellows get together and they say, "Tom, Dick and Harry, you cannot bid for three months so we will fix things up so that we will bid during those three months and you continue to work, and then you can bid after the three months is over." And it does not take a genius to know this. Any person who has ever been involved with the road construction industry knows that they are in entire liaison with themselves all the time; that is what the decision was all about.

This is no punitive measure and it is beyond belief to myself as a representative of citizens of this province that an emanation of the Crown such as The Department of Highways would go to the very people who are deserving of punitive measures and work out with them—because they are members of that association—what the penalties are to be.

I think the question here, Mr. Chairman, with respect, is a very germaine question. We want to know more than just the fact that for three months they could not bid. We want to know what adverse effect this had on them, and we are entitled to know that.

Mr. J. Renwick: I would like to comment on this same problem, I am going to give both the former Minister of Highways and the present Minister, if they will take up their piece of paper and a pencil, the opportunity of telling us what the dollar amount of the penalty was. But before I give them the basic ingredients of obtaining that particular result, I would like to put to the Minister and the Attorney General—he can consult with him, he is sitting close by—this question: Is the government of the province of Ontario considering, or has it considered, or has your department got a legal opinion from the Attorney General of Ontario, as to whether or not the government can sue these particular contractors to recover the profit which they made during the three-year period when this reprehensible practice was taking place?

That is the first question. We want an answer to that question. We do not want "No, we have not" or "We will think about it." We want to know if it ever dawned on The Department of Highways or on the Attorney General that such a question should be asked and an opinion given. That is the first question.

Now there is a very interesting other part of this question that I would like to come to after we have found out what the penalty is. I just happen to have the law report here this evening, and despite what the hon. Provincial Treasurer has to say, this was never fully debated in the Legislature. It was only on November 27, 1967, that the matter ceased to be before the courts, so I do not want the hon. Provincial Treasurer to suggest to this new Parliament that there ever was a thorough-going debate of this problem.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: It was dealt with by this House before.

Mr. J. Renwick: It was *sub judice* from the time that it was first raised until the end of November last year. If you will look at the synopsis of the opinion of Mr. Justice Laskin, he gives some very interesting figures. He states that the evidence disclosed, and out of this will come the mathematics that we want tonight about the penalty—

Mr. Singer: Do you remember reading of the appeal decision?

Mr. J. Renwick: This is the footnote of Laskin's dissent, I am not talking about Laskin's judgment, I am talking about what the evidence was.

Mr. Singer: I think that you are wrong on your dates—

Mr. J. Renwick: Well, it may be. The leave to appeal to the Supreme Court of Canada was quashed and not granted on November 27, 1967, so it was *sub judice* until that time.

Hon. S. J. Randall (Minister of Economics and Development): Let him do this, he knows.

Mr. J. Renwick: The evidence disclosed that during the relevant period there were 40 companies engaged in resurfacing and surface treating in Ontario, and that 26 companies, including the 12 accused, submitted bids. In 1959, the accused succeeded in obtaining 80 per cent of the number of contracts, and 78.7 per cent of the dollar value of such contracts. The corresponding figures for 1960 and 1961 were 60 and 65—in 1961, 100 per cent and 100 per cent. In other words, in the 12-month period of 1961—I assume the calendar year, it may be the fiscal year, but the Minister could tell me that—this conspiracy managed to get all of those contracts in the province of Ontario, 100 per cent in number and 100 per cent in value.

The department imposed a penalty for 90 days, give or take a day, one quarter of a year. What was the annual value of those contracts for the year in which that penalty was imposed, on the assumption that in that year these companies had got 100 per cent and 100 per cent—100 per cent in number, and 100 per cent in value? What was the value of those contracts, what was the net profit of those contracts to those companies? And then we will divide by four if the Minister chooses not to do it, and tell what the dollar value of the penalty was. Now, I may be wrong, and the Minister can tell me that it is a very difficult calculation, but that is that we would like to find out on this part of this question.

Mr. Shulman: May I speak on that particular point? I would like to suggest to the Minister that perhaps one other way he could present the figures to us, and the form of comparison that I would like to see, is the total value of the contract received by those particular companies that year and the following years.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Might I ask the hon. members, either one of them, are you refer-

ring to the contracts just on that type of work, or on all contracts on which those companies might have in that time, because they were not able to bid on anything during that time, and—

Mr. J. Renwick: In order that we do not get diverted, I want to stick to the precise words that are here. When we have got that answer, we can go on to any other ramifications. I want the information which, if this case had come on in the year in which you imposed the penalties, would be meaningful. The evidence disclosed that during the relevant period there were 40 companies engaged in resurfacing and surface treating in Ontario, and that 26 companies including the 12 accused submitted bids. I am going to skip, for the sake of simplicity, 1959 and 1960, and I am going to go to 1961, where the conspiracy was successful in obtaining 100 per cent in number of the contracts, and 100 per cent of the value. And then I want that information for the year in which you imposed the penalty, and then I want it divided presumably by four to get the dollar amount of the penalty for the 90-day period.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: I think that I understand the question that the hon. member is asking, and we can get the information. The only thing that again I want to point out is that these companies were precluded from bidding on anything.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I understand the Minister's point. You see what happened was that the hon. Provincial Treasurer stood up and tried to snow us under the proposition that you could not really figure out this figure. In order to build up what we want to obtain from this information, we want that first piece of information. We can then go on to the other questions of what they would have gotten in the way of contracts in other fields had they been allowed to bid. But the first part of it is the cornerstone of the penalty.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the hon. member if in computing this information he would be prepared to accept this: That on the basis of the prices that were allegedly quoted by this combine, or this compact group, if these are established, will he also admit the comparison of the prices that were submitted by them, with other competitive prices that might have been advanced by outside competitors involved, and the difference if you like is the only cost involved? Is this not fair?

Mr. Lewis: An equitable conspiracy.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: No, it is not, and I am just asking for fairness here, because I seem to recall saying—and I will check *Hansard*, Mr. Chairman, because I took a very active interest in this type of bidding—that I did not like it any more than any member of this House does. We took what we thought was punitive action. If the member for Scarborough West thinks that any Minister of the Crown does not do that, I say to him he is dead wrong. He is absolutely wrong.

Mr. Chairman, I have the floor and I am not through.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I am not through. There is a handful of members in this House who have a happy faculty of attributing a sinister motive to every Minister of this government and everything it has done and—

Mr. Sargent: So what?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: You are one of them. You are one of them. And I suggest to you, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I suggest to you, Mr. Chairman—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, that is not correct.

Mr. Sargent: A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well, let us hear if he really has got a point of order, because I am not through.

Mr. Chairman: State your point of order.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, the hon. Provincial Treasurer has made some very disparaging remarks about me.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I did not hear any from you.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, if he wants to restate them—

There is a scandal in this department. Why do you not have an outside audit and find out what is going on here? But you will not have an outside audit.

An hon. member: That is not a point of order, sit down.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, you have permitted this debate to go on for some time and I want to say there is an element in this House, in this particular session, that can do nothing—

Mr. Nixon: I resent that.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: —nothing but attribute motives of this kind to every member of this government.

Mr. Nixon: This has nothing to do with the vote.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I make this proposition to you, Mr. Chairman, as somebody who has had four years of very close knowledge of one of the most efficiently administered departments of government — The Department of Highways—I would say to you that there is much abject sinister nonsense going on here tonight.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. J. Renwick: A point of order!

Mr. Chairman: State your point.

Mr. J. Renwick: I am going to ask, Mr. Chairman, whether, when we have asked for specific information from a Minister of the Crown, we have to sit and listen to a diatribe from the hon. Provincial Treasurer.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well, you may well have to do that.

Mr. J. Renwick: I think we should attempt to hear from the Minister and let him answer the question.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I would like to—

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, if I may complete my point of order. Will the Minister sit down?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Do not tell me to sit down.

Interjections by hon. members.

An hon. member: You know the rules.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, before you had a chance to rule—

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Mr. J. Renwick: Before you had a chance to rule, the hon. Provincial Treasurer again exploded. Now would you please simply ask the Minister of Highways if he will begin to answer the question which we put to him in as simple terms as we possibly could phrase.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, if I may, I was in the process of asking the hon. member who has just spoken, very quietly, if he would be content to weigh some of the other pertinent factors that are involved when this other explosion took place over here. That is all and the hon. member for Riverdale will recognize it.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, may I take the Minister's question as notice?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well, that is wonderful.

Mr. J. Renwick: And when we got the first part of this information then we would give consideration to the point which the hon. Provincial Treasurer makes and no doubt we can come back to it.

Mr. Chairman: I think that everybody has made their points. Will the Minister answer the questions on the floor please. Thank you.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Chairman, it is refreshing to have quiet again. I want to assure the hon. members that I have absolutely no intention of hiding anything.

Mr. J. Renwick: Of course not.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: But I think it is quite apparent that we could not bring enough material down here to have the figures on hand which you are asking for. But we will get them and I will bring them into the House and give them to you.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): Before the vote?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: And I give you that undertaking.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Chairman—

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, the Minister now poses us with a very difficult problem, because there are four or five other aspects of this same field which are involved and we are now engaged in this debate. There are various ways in which it can be dealt with, that we stand this vote down and proceed with the next vote; until we can complete the debate in its entirety on this vote without impeding the progress of the government's business; or, we can in a most unsatis-

factory way say we will take the undertaking of the Minister and then, at some point, get it.

But we cannot possibly do that and complete the debate that we want to have on this topic. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I would ask that the Minister, knowing now that this whole matter is going to be aired, come fully briefed tomorrow or on Monday to cover this particular vote. If we stood down at the present time we could then proceed with the next vote and return, preferably on Monday, to this particular vote.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: I have said that I will get any information I can. I could suggest to you, sir, that this could be brought up under vote 907, which is capital construction, and if the hon. member desires that I am sure we could have the same debate on that vote.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, I would like to talk directly to the Minister on vote 903, changing the direction a bit.

Mr. Chairman: Just before we go on with that, I believe it would need the unanimous consent to have this procedure adopted. Do we have consent to have this particular item discussed under vote 907?

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I am not prepared to take it under vote 907. I think the Minister had plenty of opportunity to interject at the beginning of the debate and point out that it was to come under vote 907. It has no merit under vote 907, in any event. That is capital construction and it is the very next vote, which is the maintenance vote, under which this would properly come. So I am suggesting, since the Minister has allowed this particular debate to go on, that we stand this vote down, that we proceed with the next vote and agree to return to this vote—

Mr. Chairman: It would be quite proper if the Minister agreed to discuss it under vote 907 and you can bring the same point up then; that is understood by everybody.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, if I may make my point clearly to you. The case we have under discussion and the ramifications of it had to do with re-surfacing and re-paving of highways. It was a maintenance question and, therefore, it comes under the next vote. The only way that we can get out of this conundrum is to stand the vote down —give the Minister an opportunity to come fully prepared because he may very well not have been prepared to debate this whole issue tonight. I can well understand that.

Give him an opportunity over the week-end to be fully prepared, come back into the Legislature and we can revert to this vote at that time. And I would think, Mr. Chairman, that this is in fact the simplest way and the most efficient way of solving the problem in allowing the government to proceed with the business.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, is it proper to discuss this particular vote, taking another vein—

Mr. Chairman: I think we should settle this point first. This is not in the form of a motion, is it?

Mr. J. Renwick: No, it is a request to the chair, Mr. Chairman. I think the logic of it, the equity of it and strict interpretation of it—

Mr. Chairman: I think the Minister wants to co-operate with you in every respect. I do not think there is any doubt about that. He is quite willing to have this whether or not it transgresses the rules a slight amount, to discuss this fully when he will have the information under vote 907, and we could get this vote out of the way as far as that particular point is concerned.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, it is obviously a circumstance where the House leader should give some direction from that side, because certainly what has been forthcoming here is a reasonable alternative. On the other hand, this is the second vote in a row where it has become apparent that the answers were not immediately forthcoming and we certainly should have some leadership from that side.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Well, I think it is reasonable that the matter be set over in some fashion until the answers come from the Minister of Highways. However, I would be a little concerned about the references made by the hon. member for Riverdale, to the fact that the subject matter properly comes under some other vote, and he indicated vote 904. The Minister has indicated vote 907, which is called "Construction and Other Capital Projects".

If we were to go on and, in effect, set this debate and this particular vote aside, I think it could only be done on the complete understanding that the subject matter with respect to the certain construction companies, and their investigation by The Combines Investigation Act, and the references by Justices Laskin and Schroeder, and that that subject matter be not dealt with and it be

understood that it is not to be dealt with on any other vote. Now, I think that would be a reasonable proposition and in that case should we then tie this down, in vote 903, entitled Operations and Head Office Administration. There are three sub-items—one, salaries; two, travelling expenses, and three—maintenance. Could we tie this to say, sub-item 1?

Mr. Nixon: That would be perfectly satisfactory.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: I am trying to anticipate the desire of the other members who would like to get on to possibly items 2 and 3. Now, the arrangement re the procedure in the House, as I understand it, and has been for some years, is that all of the items are passed together. We could go on to a single vote. The sub-items go *in toto* with the whole vote. What I am suggesting here is that in this particular instance we go on and deal with sub-items 2 and 3. This vote cannot go until we come back and revert to the salary item which is the one we are hinging this subsequent debate on. But also, once we have dealt with sub-items 2 and 3, we do not go back to them. And even then, tonight, as the proceedings unravel and develop, we could go on and even have a vote on vote 904 and any other vote subsequent. Would that be agreeable?

Some hon. members: Perfectly satisfactory.

Mr. Chairman: All right then, we will hold vote 903 until we get the information desired. Was there something else in another item you wished to—

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, I would like to—

Mr. Chairman: Just pardon me until we clear this up; we are just holding subsection 1 then, item 1 of vote 903. Do you have something else to say?

Mr. T. Reid: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I notice that in sub-items 2 and 3 the proposed expenditure for 1968-69 for subsection 2, travelling expenses, is 30 per cent more than the actual expenditures in 1966-67. On subsection 3 we find that the proposed expenditures are more than double the actual expenditures in 1966-67, that is from roughly $8,000 to $19,000. And I just add here, under subsection 1, salaries have also increased 30 per cent.

The interesting point here, I think, Mr. Chairman, is that when we take the total for operations, head office, and compare the proposed amount for expenditures in 1968-69 to the amount actually expended in 1966-67, that is a two-year period, we find that the increase is in the order of 30 per cent. Leaving that in mind for the moment, the increase for the total ordinary expenditures for the same period is only 8 per cent, so we find that the centre decision-making body, if you like, within The Department of Highways has increased its expenditures over a two-year period by 30 per cent, whereas the total ordinary expenditures for the whole department have been increased over 8 per cent.

What I would like is perhaps a general comment from the Minister on why the office overhead, if you like, of the head office has increased quite substantially its proportion of the total increase in his department. I am concerned here about a type of bureaucratization in your department, and I would like to know, if I might, why salaries have increased by 30 per cent, why travelling expenses have increased by 30 per cent, and why the maintenance costs in your head office have more than doubled in the period of two years.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: The increase of salaries is of course due to the normal increase plus an increase of 11 in number on the staff. That of course will reflect on the travelling expenses and the salaries and the additional staff we needed for the implementation of the maintenance of the management system, and to carry out the county needs study. This is why we had the increase.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Grey-Bruce.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, on this vote, I think that the place to answer the Provincial Treasurer when he blew his stack there a minute ago—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well, we are dealing with the estimates of The Department of Highways—

Mr. Sargent: I know, but the head office policy insofar as the operation—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Let us get on with the road building—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Bukator: Well, that does not smarten you up too much, no matter what entries you get; you have a lot to learn, young fellow.

Mr. Sopha: The Minister of Energy and Resources Management is not helpful in the conduct of the public business tonight.

Mr. Chairman: Let us hear from the member for Grey-Bruce.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, an article in the *Saturday Evening Post* on highways features a story called "Highway Robbery in the United States," and it reveals the scandalous graft and corruption that are rampant in all phases of highway construction in the United States. They say in the article that on budgets of $25 billion they add $2.5 billion on top to look after the extras, graft and corruption. The record of the government in the years past is not very clean either. In the States they found it necessary to set up in every bureau of public roads, bureau of audit investigation.

I would suggest that if the hon. Treasurer is so concerned about inferences and barbs that we are shooting across sometimes, he should tell the House why he will not allow an outside audit in this very big-spending department. If he wants to carry on, he has taken over the floor from the—

Mr. White: Well, your policy has been to broaden the provincial auditor's scope, not narrow it.

Mr. Sargent: Okay, if he does not want to get into the act then I will ask the Minister why we cannot have an outside audit. Through the chair, sir, may I?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Chairman, we have this—both internal audit and construction audit.

Mr. Sargent: By your own people.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: And I say that they are of the very best, and the very highest.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, I have no reason to doubt your word, but the fact is that in every other jurisdiction in the United States they have outside audits of these things.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Well, we are in Canada.

Mr. Sargent: And if there is an area for wrong there, there is a good chance of it here, with what my leader has given tonight on the hanky-panky going on in the other firms. Why do you not give the people of Ontario a decent break and have a look-see at what does go on really?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: I think, Mr. Chairman, that I gave the undertaking to the House and the members opposite that I would get the information on what the member refers to as hanky-panky, although I do not know what that is. But I will have that information.

Mr. Chairman: Are we waiting for certain information, Mr. Minister, on vote 903. On the first item?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Chairman, we are holding item 1.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, could we have a breakdown of item 2?

Mr. Chairman: Would the Minister provide a breakdown of the estimate?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: I am sorry, Mr. Chairman, that will have to be the same as the previous one. As I tried to explain, we could not carry enough material down here to have all these breakdowns. But we will get it.

Mr. Chairman: Based, I understand, Mr. Minister, on the previous year's total expenditures.

Mr. Shulman: Once again I must make the protest now that this vote should be withheld until we have these items. We should not vote on any of these items if the material is not available.

Mr. Chairman: I should point out to the member that this is the basis upon which these estimates are formed.

Mr. Shulman: This is not the proper basis. We should not be forced to vote on something before the information is made available to us.

Mr. D. M. De Monte (Dovercourt): In this item and other items, these expenses add up to something like $403,000. I think we are entitled to have some details of these items and the fact that they have to be brought down in a truck should be immaterial. We want to know what the travelling expenses were for.

Mr. Chairman: Would the member repeat the amounts he mentioned?

Mr. De Monte: $403,000.

Mr. Chairman: What might that be?

Mr. De Monte: That is all through these estimates, Mr. Chairman, on travelling.

Mr. Chairman: What is the $403,000?

Mr. De Monte: Travelling expenses.

Mr. Chairman: Would the member indicate what the $403,000 is?

Mr. De Monte: For travelling expenses through all these items in The Department of Highways.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Surely the hon. member can look at the estimates. Sub-item 2 in vote 903, being operations head office administration, is travelling expenses $90,000, which is the specific item we are concerned with here. The question has been asked about the details of that and I believe the Minister is going to get the details for the hon. member.

Mr. Shulman: Would the House leader agree that the vote should not be held until we receive the details?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: In this circumstance, I agree.

Mr. Chairman: We are still dealing with vote 903. Is there any discussion on item 3 in vote 903? Item 3 is agreed to. We will hold item 1 and item 2 in vote 903 until the information is obtainable here in the House. We will proceed to vote 904 .

On vote 904:

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Chairman, under vote 904, I would like to ask the Minister if he could supply us with the road subsidies as he had promised he would earlier.

Mr. Chairman: I would ask the member if that is item 6?

Mr. B. Newman: No, it comes under maintenance because there is a subsidy for maintenance and there is a subsidy for different types of things.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the hon. member means the percentage of subsidy we pay or the dollar value?

Mr. B. Newman: That is right, yes.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: The percentage. On the Metro roads it is 50 per cent; on counties it is 50 per cent; townships 50 to 80 per cent; urban, rural, township, 50 per cent; boroughs 50 per cent; cities and separated towns 33⅓ per cent; towns 50 per cent; villages 50 per cent; Indian reserves 50 per cent; improvement districts 50 per cent.

Then on bridges and culverts for Metro it is 50 per cent; for counties, 80 per cent; townships, 80 per cent; urban, rural townships, 80 per cent; boroughs, 80 per cent; cities and separated towns, 33⅓ per cent; towns, 80 per cent; villages, 80 per cent; Indian reserves, 80 per cent; improvement districts, 80 per cent.

Then we have the connecting links, which are special agreements for cities and separated towns on construction, 75 per cent; towns, townships and villages with a population under 2,500, 100 per cent; population over 2,500, 90 per cent; development roads, 100 per cent; controlled access roads, like urban expressways, 75 per cent; and traffic studies, 75 per cent.

Mr. B. Newman: May I ask the Minister the subsidy on arterial roads?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: What do you call arterial roads?

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Chairman, I would like to bring to the attention of the Minister the resolution as passed by a series of councils throughout the province of Ontario requesting that the Ontario Department of Highways pay the following subsidies—that is, 100 per cent on freeways and connecting links; 75 per cent on arterial roads and streets; and 50 per cent on all other municipal streets in cost of land, construction and maintenance. And I would ask the Minister if he has considered the recommendations of the municipalities involved?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: We have received those resolutions and we are considering them but no decision of a change has been made yet.

Mr. B. Newman: Thank you, Mr. Minister.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Wentworth.

Mr. B. Newman: No, Mr. Chairman, I have a few other questions in here.

I am pleased that the Minister is considering this, because the municipalities find themselves, as he well knows, extremely hard pressed to meet certain municipal services. The cost of road construction and so forth has gone to the point where in some instances it actually hinders housing development.

May I ask the Minister, whenever an annexation or amalgamation takes place and a certain portion of the highway is taken over by the municipality, whether he would consider maintaining that as a connecting link, rather than the municipality take it over. As

a connecting link, the subsidy thus would be 75 per cent rather than the 33⅓ that a municipality would normally get.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Chairman, was the member talking about connecting links?

Mr. B. Newman: Yes. I will be specific, Mr. Minister. Back in my own community, Highway 18 was taken over by the city as a result of annexation. Because the city has to take the thing over, the subsidy for the resurfacing or the maintenance of the road drops considerably. Were it to have remained a connecting link as it had been, or Highway 18 as it had been previously, the subsidy would have been, I assume, 100 per cent by your department, or 75 per cent. Now it drops down to 33⅓ per cent.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: I think, Mr. Chairman, the member is talking about a connecting link which was outside of the city.

Mr. B. Newman: That is right. And now it is inside the city as a result of annexation.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Yes, and if we had done any work on it previous to annexation there would have been 100 per cent subsidy in the township, but when it comes into the city the connecting link subsidy is 75 per cent and that is so for all cities.

Mr. B. Newman: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I have one other question. Is the Minister considering the making of Huron Line in the city of Windsor from the city boundary right into the Ambassador Bridge a connecting link or not?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Chairman, I will have to get the information on that.

Mr. B. Newman: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Wentworth.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Chairman, I have a few rather inoffensive remarks to make about the operation of the department under this particular section. I object very strenuously to the callous attitude this department takes towards those people who unfortunately happen to own or operate businesses on land abutting highway reconstruction projects, and in particular to the attitude of the department to all of those people who owned and operated businesses on that stretch of Highway 8 which was recently reconstructed from Stoney Creek to about five miles east of that area.

There have been, over the past few months, considerable flooding problems that have been brought to the attention of the Minister and have received very little attention at all. There was also the matter of loss of business, which was understandable during reconstruction, but since the reconstruction—

Hon. Mr. Gomme: May I point out that new construction is not on this vote; this is maintenance.

Mr. Deans: I am talking about reconstruction.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: You are talking about new construction of Highway 8 which would be under—

Mr. Deans: It is a matter of choice whether it be reconstruction or new construction is it not?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: No.

Mr. Deans: It was existing previously, so surely it is reconstruction.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: It is capital construction which is—

Mr. Chairman: It is a capital item under the capital section, I would say to the member.

The member for Essex South.

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): Yes, Mr. Chairman. The other evening I attempted to raise a question on the department's policy in relation to the many islands within their jurisdiction and as to the policy of providing transportation to these islands. This comes under subsection 1.

The questions I specifically asked were: What are the basic policies of the department in relation to an island; should it: (1) have municipal roads on it, or (2) if it does have a provincial highway on the island, should it be an international link or be designated as a connecting link?

Possibly the Minister could answer this with a view to the work that is being done in the Kingston area—the Wolfe Islands and possibly to my hon. friend's island—the member for Algoma (Mr. Gilbertson).

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Chairman, to try to explain the full situation—if we have a highway on the mainland and a highway on

the island, we operate the ferry. If it is a township road and the township comprises part of the mainland and part of the island, we pay the subsidy on the operation of a ferry, but I think the one to which you refer, Pelee Island, the township of Pelee Island has no land on the mainland. This ferry has been operated by the federal government or by a private individual. We pay the people on the island a subsidy on their roads but not on the ferries because it is operated by the federal government.

Mr. Paterson: What I am trying to get at, Mr. Chairman, is at what point does the department, in its policy making decisions, offer a causeway or a bridge of a type that would, for example, service St. Joseph's Island, or move into another medium of transportation to assist other islands within their jurisdiction. Does this department offer this assistance to more than the three islands that have been mentioned here this evening?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Chairman, in regard to St. Joseph's Island, now that has been brought up, there is a highway on the mainland and on the island. We are responsible for that and it is our intention to build a bridge to connect the two ends of this highway.

Mr. Paterson: Within the foreseeable future, Mr. Chairman?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: That is correct, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Oxford.

Mr. G. W. Innes (Oxford): Mr. Chairman, this has to do with the irregularities in the Chatham district and the heading of this story is "Government Asphalt Used in Private Paving Jobs." I will read you a little of this and ask some questions relative to it:

> Six men who were or who still are employed by C. and W. Asphalt Paving Company claimed Tuesday they made surfacing of private driveways a paying sideline while working on Department of Highways road-patching jobs at Tilbury, Berlin, Chatham and Ridgetown last summer.

They were brought before the courts and the acting Crown attorney W. D. Drinkwater, of London, said that there were 12 paving jobs being completed at issue, with the paving of 12 private driveways on which about 150 tons of asphalt contracted for by the department was used by these men. He said the customers paid out a total of $1,600 to various members of the paving crew.

The dateline on this story is November 15. I would like to know what charges were laid by the department or what action was taken and whether any personnel were dismissed. Certainly, it appears to me that the inspector on this particular job was not working in the best interests of the government or the country as such. I would also like to know what action is being taken to correct this type of situation in the future by the department.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Chairman, this was a case where our auditor, who goes around, found this particular event taking place and the man gave in his resignation, subject to the court hearing. The case was held and he was found not guilty but he resigned anyway.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Yorkview.

Mr. Innes: Pardon me, Mr. Chairman, was he the inspector on this particular job?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: That is correct, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Innes: I do not see how they could carry on this long without the department finding out about it. Why was your man in that particular area not acquainted with the situation where these people were going out paving private driveways to the extent of $1,600? I would think they must have been soliciting quite a few jobs along the route and I think the department was a little lax in not correcting the situation sooner.

Mr. Chairman: Does the Minister wish to reply?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Chairman, I am advised that when our investigation revealed this there were just 12 driveways done—in a very short time. There was no long time taken in our discovering this.

Mr. Innes: I might ask the Minister, are there any other such occurrences throughout the province that you are aware of that have not been properly brought to the courts, or that you have stopped prior to their coming into the hands of the courts?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Chairman, there are none that we know of, but we are constantly looking for these things.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Yorkview.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Chairman, I would like to bring before the Minister a

problem which came rather forcibly to my attention not long ago—a problem of posting signs in respect to repair work along the highway.

In some instances I know signs are well placed well ahead, giving the motorist plenty of warning. In other cases the signs seem to be very near and suddenly the motorist may come upon roadwork without warning and I am not sure what the policy of the department might be. I have in my hand a recent column written by Don O'Hearn, a member of this press gallery, which I think presents the problem pretty dramatically. It reads:

> This morning I nearly killed my wife. We were driving to the office along the Queen Elizabeth Way. One of the stretches of the road is only two lanes in either direction. There was a highway transport directly ahead in the right hand lane. Suddenly it swerved into the other lane. At a speed of about 55 miles an hour I had to suddenly swerve also. This meant shooting into the median between the two rights of way. Ahead there was a direction sign on a standard. Fortunately, the median at this point was hard and had a fairly smooth surface. The car did not get out of control and it shaved past the sign. If it hadn't, or if the median had been a bit poorer, there would have been a tragedy. If there had been, the fault would have lain directly at one door—The Department of Highways.
>
> The truck driver was not at fault. In fact, if he had not been a good man at the wheel, he might have killed a few Department of Highways workers, for there was a highway crew repairing a short patch of road, and he came upon it without any advance warning whatsoever. There were no advance warning signs and though there were a couple of flag men on the job, they were right at the site.
>
> So far as helping to warn people is concerned, they might as well have been at home taking care of their wives.
>
> Some very blunt statements are called for on highway safety these days. One of them is that in forceful and imaginative approach, Ontario must be lagging behind the whole continent. We are spending hundreds of thousands, probably millions of dollars on safety, and for all the effectiveness it is having we might as well have Premier Robarts shoot it in a crap game.
>
> Our safety people have been spending their time either looking in a mirror and admiring themselves or explaining why they cannot do more. Last spring it was announced there were to be advance warning signs ahead of all highway jobs and that there would be speed slowdowns. Have there been? No. This morning I had to take the median because there weren't.
>
> On the same section of the QE there are long sections where the white lines are completely worn out and this is winter when at night lane markings are an absolute safety requirements. George Gomme has been Minister of Highways for a year now. If he can't do better than this, he should get out and while he is going he should take Transport Minister Haskett with him. Neither one has shown that they realize the horse and buggy is now gas propelled.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I bring this to the attention of the House and to the Minister because this has been a problem on some of our highways, and I would like to know if the Minister would indicate to the House the matter of policy.

Some of this may be carelessness on the part of contractors or subcontractors. I would expect that there is a policy on the part of the government and perhaps in some cases the policy is not adequately enforced. I wonder if the Minister would comment on this situation?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. member has answered the question. We have a policy that the first sign is to be approximately half a mile away and the next one at 1,000 feet, and I am sure every member will realize that there are problems. Sometimes the staff are just not fulfilling the regulations which we have; and as for the white line referred to in that item, we cannot paint those in the winter time but it will be done just as soon as the weather is fair.

Mr. Young: I am sure Mr. O'Hearn will be glad to find that out.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Essex-Kent.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): Mr. Chairman, I have one or two or three items in this section. With regard to maintenance on Highway 2 in the township of Rochester, we have made some inquiries as to the condition of the shoulders and so on in a local village. This is a main highway going through a township and the council has made some representation with regard to having some

improvements made on it, as well as drainage.

There seems to be some reluctance on the part of the department to do this. They say it is not a department responsibility. But drainage of a highway is, I think, the responsibility of the department, as well as maintaining proper shoulders. I will agree that after one goes over perhaps ten feet from the shoulder, it is probably the responsibility of the local municipality, and I think that perhaps in this case this municipality is willing to come to any agreement that the department might wish. I wonder if the Minister has in mind to do anything in this line to improve the drainage and the shoulders of the road, in this particular stretch of roadway?

I have some other questions—

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Chairman, would the hon. member tell me what village it is?

Mr. Ruston: The village is St. Joachim in the township of Rochester. Mr. Chairman, perhaps it would be preferable if the Minister answered my questions one at a time.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Chairman, again it is a case that if it is the department's responsibility, we will do it. I think the shoulders and drainage are there. I have been on that site. I think the problem is that they want to have the shoulders paved and we do not feel that this is our responsibility. There are good gravel shoulders there and there are outlets for drainage.

Mr. Ruston: The drainage is not too adequate. I was there a week or two ago and it is not adequate. However, I think they would be open to some discussion on it, on a similar basis to that of a county council putting their road through a local municipality. We had it done in our own area. Curbs and gutters were put in and drainage put in, and the county paid 25 per cent of the cost, the local municipality paid 25 per cent of the cost, and The Department of Highways paid 50 per cent of the cost. This was done in one of the local areas that is considered rural, but it is a built-up area.

Now with regard to Highway 3 in the town of Essex, we know that there is a drainage problem in the town, but the drainage problem is on Highway 3 through the town, which is a connecting link—and I realize that this is a connecting link agreement—but it does entail, no doubt, a lot of work and resurfacing as well.

I know that in the Minister's estimates, there is a by-pass for the town of Essex, but before this road could be finished we are quite sure that it is going to take at least three years. And I would hate to think that this road would be left in the condition it is in for that three-year period. We do know that this stretch of highway from May 1 to October 1 carries as much as a four-lane highway carries. I wonder if the Minister has any thoughts on that?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: I think, Mr. Chairman, that the member said it was a connecting link, and if the town wants to do some work on it, I am sure that we will pay our share of it.

Mr. Ruston: Thank you. With regard to subsidies to municipalities—I have had dealings with The Department of Highways through local municipal grants, and the auditing of the department through the local municipal township is excellent. I think that when they go through your books that it has been exceptionally well done in our own area and, in fact, we have come to the point now that we really do not worry about it too much; we know that The Department of Highways is going to audit and they have done exceptional work in this part. I do know this. It has been very good.

I wonder if the department had considered, in subsidies to municipalities—we will say that one municipality that I can think of offhand has 135 miles of roads and only $5 million of assessment, so for them to try to keep the roads up on a 50 per cent grant is very difficult. My thought would be if a municipality had a small assessment and a large number of roads, perhaps the department would pay a 75 per cent grant to what we call main roads in that municipality and for new construction and not maintenance. I think that if it went only for maintenance, 50 per cent is adequate, but I think for new construction it should be a higher rate because they are bearing a very heavy load. That is with regard to municipal subsidies.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member would tell me if the township he is referring to is on the 50 per cent.

Mr. Ruston: They are on 50 per cent, all of them.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: The townships?

Mr. Ruston: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: We have a formula for working this out. It takes in the assessment

and their ability to pay, and as I explained in my introduction the subsidies range from 50 to 80 per cent. But we can re-examine their figures, if you would name the township.

Mr. Ruston: Well, I would be happy to, Mr. Minister. One I am thinking of in particular is Tilbury East township, Rochester township, and Colchester North township. I think Colchester North carried 17 mills for local road purposes and that is a very high rate to what most townships carry.

With regard to development roads, I see we have $300,000 for development roads and it was the same last year. I was wondering if maybe we are using that as much as we should. I believe there are a number of areas with roads that really are not pertaining so much to a local municipality, but in a way may be a combination of a number of municiaplities and yet the county does not take them over. So we are left with some of what we consider semi-heavy travelled roads.

I think that there should be more consideration by the Minister with regard to development of roads and I believe this is pretty well at the discretion of the Minister. I think it has been mentioned previously that there was a little too much discretion left to the Minister, and perhaps this is one of the areas that should be looked into.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Chairman, if I might point out to the hon. member, the development roads will come under the capital expenditures. This is just a figure that is put in for maintenance of development roads. Sometimes there is necessary maintenance on roads designated as development roads where it appears the expendiutre is beyond the financial ability of the local jurisdiction. In isolated cases the department may carry a proportion of road maintenance expenditure on a completed section of the development road while construction is in progress on the balance of it, and requests from local jurisdictions for grants to assist in work on development roads, but the programme on development roads comes under the capital vote.

Mr. Ruston: Just one final question with regard to the white line. I had the occasion a couple of weeks ago to drive into Toronto on a Sunday evening in heavy fog and I might say, Mr. Chairman, that the yellow line on the left-hand-side lane, which is used in curves and so forth, is the greatest benefit there is in travelling in fog. I do not know if anybody is aware of this but this is a terrific asset. It was much safer driving on the left lane than the right lane because if you came to an outgoing road you did not know for sure where you were. This yellow painting is a great asset to driving, and especially in fog, and I would certainly recommend that any further use of it would be a great asset to the driving public.

Mr. Chairman: The member for High Park.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, under vote 904, there are two or three matters I would like to inquire about.

First of all, repaving present roads is listed as $2,800,000. I notice when comparing this with the public accounts, the last one available here, that this is a raise of one-third of the expenditure and I am sorry to say that this is a pattern right throughout this particular department. The hon. Provincial Treasurer, in his programme which he presented to us, did not mention that highways was one of the urgent matters in which we are going to go ahead. In fact I believe he mentioned on page 18 of his speech that this is one of the matters where we are going to hold the line.

I would like to know, inasmuch as the rest of the province seems to be trying to hold the line, why something of the nature cannot be done in this particular department. The tax packages as brought in—the new taxes about which everyone is objecting so much—are going to raise $105 million. This one department is going to waste two thirds of that in increased expenditures. Surely if the rest of us are being asked to pull in our belts a bit this department should do the same thing. I am going to have a great deal more to say on vote 907 on this particular matter, but at this present time, certainly under repaving present roads, can we not hold last year's line? This is not an emergency.

Also I would like to ask the Minister if he would please break down for me the $400,000 which is just listed under this vote as "other overhead expenditures." I would like to know what this little miscellaneous item consists of. And in addition on the previous page, also under the same vote, there are sundry recoverable expenditures of $250,000 and I would like to have a breakdown of those, please.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Chairman, first in reference to the resurfacing, I do not understand the hon. member's statement about wasting the money, because these roads get

in such a bad shape that if we do not do the resurfacing when it should be done then they would not be able to be maintained. We have a list of roads which we intend to do this year and this adds up to this figure of $2,800,000. I could give you the list of them if you want it.

Mr. Shulman: Is it necessary to increase this by a third from last year's figure?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: No. I think it is the same as last year. Were you looking at public accounts?

Mr. Shulman: I was looking at public accounts. The figure here is $2,100,000.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: That would be to the end of the year?

Mr. Shulman: Of last year. Is it necessary to increase it by a third in the extra year?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: It is to maintain the roads in a satisfactory shape without losing the equity we have in them.

In regard to the second item—the other overhead expenditures—they are miscellaneous items such as purchase and repair of small tools and sundry equipment; gratuity payments for unused sick leave to employees on termination; stock adjustments; loss on returnable containers.

Mr. Shulman: Sir, may I have a breakdown of that please? A list of items where the money went, how it adds up to $400,000.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Chairman, I have just given what the items were.

Mr. Shulman: Yes, but that is not a breakdown. I would like to see a breakdown.

Mr. E. Dunlop (York-Forest Hill): You are going to get into estimate material.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Chairman, again I say it is one of the things which we certainly have but have not got with us here tonight.

Mr. Shulman: Well then, once again, Mr. Chairman, I must point out this vote should not be taken until the details are available.

Mr. White: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I would like you to consider, sir, the import of these remarks. Taking a hypothetical example, we will say vote Y. If the amount is $100,000 and if that is broken down into five items of $20,000 each, then an hon. member can ask for a breakdown of each $20,000. If the Minister responsible provides let us say five different sub-items of $4,000 each, a member can then require a further breakdown. Let us say four more sub-sub-items of $1,000 each, then a member can demand a further breakdown and the whole procedure can be carried to this absurd extremity.

I suggest, sir, that the member for High Park, in his innocence and ignorance, is doing exactly this and I think, sir, that you should not permit yourself to be beguiled into agreeing with this proposition of his. It is not appropriate.

Mr. Nixon: Speaking to the point of order I would say, Mr. Chairman, that I do not think the member for High Park is either innocent or ignorant. Nevertheless the member for London South has an important point, since this is the third particular vote that would founder on the questions of the type that would simply require further and further detail. I do not want to enter into an old debate when I recall to your mind, sir, that the very fact that the advisers to the Minister, under the rules that we have in this House, are not themselves able to give the kind of information that they would have in the detailed information that is on the table before them, is of course a very serious drawback and a difficulty to the Minister. He is required under this kind of questioning to answer the details that seem to get ever increasingly small and picayune.

I do not want to go on at length about this but the first time we almost floundered on this was on the travelling expense account of $12,000. It was put to us from the left that we should not carry this particular vote until we got more detail. Whether we need the information on the individual people and the amount of money that they had spent remains to be seen, but I would say to you, sir, that if we are going to conduct the estimates at all efficiently in this particular forum we are going to have to deal with amounts and information that are just one stage, perhaps more general than that which is asked for by the member for High Park. We do not want the legislative progress to founder completely on the type of questions that are put before us. Certainly, we on this side are interested in a minute and careful examination of the programme of government expenditure. We are also interested in making some reasonable progress with the work of the province.

Mr. Shulman: I am sure, Mr. Chairman, that we wish to get through with it just as

rapidly as the government and the Opposition do.

An hon. member: The government and the sub-government.

Mr. Shulman: The government and the sub-government—I have been corrected. Thank you.

However, items of $400,000 are not small and they are not picayune, and they should be available. It is not necessary for them all to be presented in detail here, perhaps, but they should be available. We should be able to look over these lists before they are voted on, because this is a tremendous amount of money.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: It is going to be carried anyway.

Mr. Shulman: It may not be carried if we find some of the things in there that have been found in the past.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Shulman: Four hundred thousand dollars is a tremendous sum of money. It is larger, perhaps, than some total estimates that come in later along here, and I believe that the Minister certainly should be prepared to break this down in a reasonable way. We are not asking for every penny, but it should be broken down in a reasonable way so that we will know where that money went, who got it and what it went for, and we certainly are not going to agree to any vote unless we are sure that this money is not being wasted.

Mr. Chairman: Order. May I point out to the member that there is no method by which we can tell him where the money went to. The money has not been spent; it is being voted for a future period.

Mr. Shulman: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Where do you hope to spend the money?

Mr. Chairman: If the member would look at the public accounts for the last year, he will find out the type of other overhead expenditures.

Mr. Shulman: That does not answer my question.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, on the point of order—

Mr. Chairman: The member has put a question to the Minister. Does the Minister have any further information he can give on this particular point?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Chairman, I believe that I have broken these down as minutely as I can.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Essex South.

Mr. Paterson: Mr. Chairman, I have two points I would like to raise at this time, one referring back to my former comments on islands. It is a simple request, that at the convenience of the officials of the Minister's department I could be supplied with the list of the names of islands within the province of Ontario receiving some sort of transportation subsidy by the department and the type of service—whether it is a ferry or the construction of a bridge to connect the island to the mainland within the past year.

The second point I would like to raise is something of current interest in my own area and it comes under "winter maintenance". As you well know, Mr. Chairman, I come from the "sun parlour" of Ontario and in looking into the public accounts I see that district number one, or Chatham, receives the smallest grant towards winter maintenance. This particular winter we have had two abnormal snowfalls in our area, and I wonder if the hon. Minister could explain to me the basis on which snow removal and special grants are made to other areas in our province, and whether these would be available to the municipalities such as Windsor or Leamington for assisting in the very high cost they have been put to clear the snow.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: We give no special subsidies, Mr. Chairman, but there is the supplementary bylaw which might be of assistance.

Mr. Paterson: This would be of assistance.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Sarnia.

Mr. Bullbrook: Mr. Chairman, along this very line—the question of the fact of winter maintenance in the Chatham region—I have had considerable correspondence over the past month with people from Sarnia. I have had three letters, one of which is a copy of a letter directed to Mr. Brown, who is the district engineer at Chatham. It recounts two fatalities which occurred on March 2, 1968, on the highways between Sarnia and London.

In making these remarks, I want the record to show that I am not in any way attempting to impute the sole cause or, for that matter, the partial cause of these deaths to inadequate maintenance, because I do not know whether this is the situation or not. But I want to

read into the record, if I might with your permission, certain correspondence in connection with these particular fatalities. This is a copy of a letter from Mrs. G. W. A. Baines of 556 Riverside Drive, Corunna, Ontario—this is outside my riding, sir—a letter that had been sent to Mr. Brown, a copy of it to the Minister of Highways, a copy to myself and two copies to the local newspapers at Sarnia. While I am mentioning the newspapers, Mr. Chairman, I want to point out that the hon. Minister is no doubt aware that there has been extensive criticism—I pointed this out in a letter to the Deputy Minister subsequently—in connection with winter highway maintenance on 7 and 22 between Sarnia and London. We have a particular problem there. I do not know the exact number of deaths that have occurred, but I believe that two years ago there were 13 fatalities between Sarnia and London. Now we are happily aware that as a result of the announcement several weeks ago of the possible implementation of the 402 extension through London—but reading from the letter:

> I would like to draw to your attention the deaths of two women on the London-Sarnia highway on Saturday, March 2, 1968. I am enclosing copies of the recent newspaper accounts and the pictures taken at the scenes of the accidents. As you can see, the fatalities occurred during daylight hours. It is obvious that the road is coated with ice.

She refers to the photographs here.

> I travelled that same road on Saturday night, arriving in Sarnia about 10.30. I would judge that 80 per cent of the distance was a sheet of ice. It was obvious that salting and sanding was sorely needed, and yet—

and this is capitalized:

> NOT ONCE IN THE 60 MILES DID WE SEE A SANDING AND SALTING TRUCK. If the road was in such a treacherous condition that the OPP issued a hazardous driving warning, why was the road not serviced, and continue to be serviced until it was in a safe condition?

As matter of record, also, this woman is an extremely conscientious woman and well recognized in our area for her good conscience. I subsequently wrote, Mr. Chairman, to the Deputy Minister in this connection. Part of that letter, if I might be permitted, says:

> Recognizing that Mr. Brown has an overall responsibility, I am more interested in seeking out the person or persons who are clothed with the duty to see to immediate action. I would also appreciate, Mr. Deputy Minister, if you could generally advised of the procedures established in connection with salting and sanding.
>
> By way of example, who dictates when such salting and sanding should begin? How much equipment is available for such work? Is the amount of equipment commensurate with the need and commensurate with the equipment per mile available in other areas? Where are the stockpiles located?

That was a letter of March 7, 1968, to Mr. A. T. C. McNab. On March 21 I received a reply from him which reads as follows:

> Dear Mr. Bullbrook:
>
> In reply to your letter of March 7, I understand that our district engineer, Mr. F. C. Brown has replied to Mrs. Baines, which answers some of your queries concerning the salting and sanding operations on this highway—

And I might interject here that it did not answer, for the information of the Deputy Minister, some of the specific questions This is the significant part of the letter:

> The allocation of equipment, materials and staff has been re-examined by our head office maintenance staff, and it has been found that this complement is commensurate with patrols in areas of the province where similar winter conditions exist. A further examination of the operation reveals that the maintenance forces involved carried out the recognized practice and procedures of winter maintenance on March 2, 1968.

I will not continue, but I will say this, that in connection with the causes of the fatalities, the Deputy Minister does mention that these were small cars and there were tremendous windy conditions that night. I subsequently wrote to the hon. Attorney General to request the possibility of an inquest in connection with either or both of these deaths because I am concerned, Mr. Chairman, that we have to have some objective evaluation as to the degree of maintenance in connection with this strip.

As I say again, I want it to be specifically understood by all that I do not impute a lack of proper maintenance as being the cause or the partial cause of these fatalities, I do not know, but it causes me concern, Mr. Minister, through you, Mr. Chairman, that

your Deputy has come to a conclusion that there is adequate maintenance. I have just read one letter to you, and we have evidence in my hands that for this whole period there was no salting and sanding that had been undertaken.

I want to say something else for the information of the Deputy Minister. I want the Deputy Minister to hear this if I might, Mr. Chairman. I had many occasions since coming to this office of driving that road during winter conditions and it is an extreme problem, Mr. Chairman. I have yet to see one salting and sanding truck in all the times that I have driven from Toronto to Sarnia. So it is a problem. And so I ask the Minister if he would comment on this and if he would assure us that further consideration will be given to more adequate expenditures if it is necessary in the Chatham region, so that we can have adequate winter maintenance.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: I am sure, Mr. Chairman, that the member will realize that we are very interested in giving the very best service possible and I drive on the roads a good deal and I see these trucks all the time. I cannot imagine that you never see any.

Mr. Nixon: They all wave at you when you go by.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: I take your word for it, but you must drive when the weather is excellent, because I do see them.

Mr. Bullbrook: I appreciate, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. Minister takes my word for it. I am concerned. I realize you are not attempting to be facetious in this connection nor am I, but I am vitally concerned in this connection that there is a general feeling in the Sarnia area that there is not adequate maintenance there. The point, as I glean it from the Deputy Minister's letter, is that he feels this is commensurate, having regard to the maintenance in other parts of the province. I suggest, with the greatest respect, the maintenance in the other parts of the province must be in tragic circumstances.

Mr. M. Makarchuk (Brantford): Mr. Chairman, this is regarding the government's policy on subsidies for roads and bridges and other structures. I just wondered why it is that the cities have been singled out to receive the lowest subsidy of all the other groups? I notice that in the roads subsidy, the boroughs or the towns get a 50 per cent subsidy, whereas the cities would get a 33⅓ subsidy. Similarly in subsidies for bridges, as an example, the borough of Scarborough would get an 80 per cent subsidy, whereas the city, including my own city of Brantford, would only be entitled to a 33⅓ per cent subsidy.

I could mention in terms of road subsidies that the town of Burlington, with a population of close to 70,000, would get a subsidy of 50 per cent, whereas again getting back to a city of 55,000 or possibly less or more, it would only get 33⅓ per cent subsidy. Could the Minister explain just what is the rationale behind this particular method of introducing the subsidy?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Chairman, this was based on the basis of assessment which cites had and which smaller municipalities did not have. And I also pointed out in explanation of subsidies that there are connecting links in the cities where we pay 75 per cent. So it is not all just 33⅓ per cent.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Kent.

Mr. Spence: Mr. Chairman, I would like to bring to the attention of the Minister, Highway 21 in the county of Kent going north. Approaching the town of Dresden there is a very bad curve in this highway. The view is hidden and there have been some very serious accidents over the last number of years and there have been citizens who have lost their lives.

Also a little farther past this particular curve on Highway 21, which passes through the town of Dresden, Highway 21 has been in a disgraceful state of affairs for the last couple of years. Looking over the work book, I see nothing in there for that portion. I wonder if you would look into this and bring Highway 21 up to a proper standard in the Dresden area, at the south portion of the town of Dresden?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I will look into it.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, I would like to take a somewhat different tack on this estimate. I am looking at three items in estimate vote 904—patching, bridge painting and repairs, and repaving of present roads.

For my argument, I shall have to refer to simply the repaving of present roads, because in the comparison I am making between actual expenditures in 1966-67 and the estimated expenditures for 1968-69, I do not

have the 1966-67 figures for hot mix patching and bridge painting and repairs. They are not listed, to my knowledge, in the public accounts of the province of Ontario for this fiscal year ended March 31, 1967. So I will restrict my remarks simply to the one item, the repaving of present roads, for my comments and question.

We find that in 1966-67, the actual amount expended was $2,155,000. The amount estimated for expenditure in 1968-69 is $2,800,000. This is roughly a difference of about $645,000 increase, which is an increase of about 31 per cent. What I am interested in is whether or not part of this increase is due to an explicit policy on the part of the government, executed partially through your department, to counteract the cyclical influences in the economy of Ontario. In other words, is the increase, roughly 31 per cent, for this particular item over a two-year period, part of the general counter-cyclical policy, a stability policy on the part of the government.

Obviously part of this increase would be due to trend conditions and price inflation, but rather than simply a general increase in response to pressures, part of the increase could be due to the government's consideration of an attempt to stabilize the Ontario economy. For example, in 1966-67, there was a very low level of unemployment in this province. In 1968-69 many economists are predicting higher levels of unemployment. The present rate in Ontario, seasonally adjusted I believe, is approximately 4.6 per cent, and this is an increase over the comparable time in 1966-67.

One other fact, Mr. Chairman, to the Minister, is that in 1966-67 the unexpended amount of funds appropriated for expenditure on this item was $145,000—that is, the unexpected portion of the appropriated funds was roughly six per cent of the amount appropriated in the estimates for that year. I would say that would be consistent—whether or not it was planned or not, I do not know—with an implementation of a policy attempting to put a lid on high pressures in Ontario economy, so that you hold back expenditures when there is a low unemployment rate and price inflation.

With those facts in mind, I would like, Mr. Chairman, to refer the Minister to a publication of the government of Ontario, entitled *Theory of Fiscal Policies Applied to a Province*, by Clarence Barber. It is a study prepared for the Ontario committee on taxation. I think there are a number of relevant quotations in this document which will state our point of view in the official Opposition concerning the need for the province to become actively engaged in the fiscal policy and counter-cyclical expenditures and so forth. The first quotation is on page 39 and it is one of the conclusions that Professor Barber comes to, and I quote directly from the text:

> It has been a conclusion of this analysis that provincial governments in Canada should develop an active fiscal policy directed towards the objectives of low levels of unemployment, reasonable stability of prices and an adequate rate of economic growth. The traditional view that fiscal policy is appropriate only at the central government level cannot, I repeat, cannot be supported. Most of the differences between the position of the central government and that of the province are differences of degree rather than kind and should not prevent an active fiscal policy on the part of the provincial government.

And Professor Barber adds:

> This is particularly true of the larger provinces such as Ontario, Quebec and British Columbia.

Then, on page 36, there is another statement by Professor Barber, and I quote again directly:

> Let us now turn to a consideration of what action a province might be expected to take to reduce or eliminate seasonal and structural unemployment.

This is in addition to the cyclical problem.

Mr. Chairman: I wonder if the member would indicate the relevancy of the material he is reading? What particular relevance to what section?

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, in about one minute I will come to the relevant section. It is highly relevant, in my opinion, with respect, sir.

> For seasonal unemployment the first step would be to make a concerted attempt to introduce counter-seasonal bias in the province's own expenditure programme. Changes in the timing of expenditures should be made, of course, if the anticipated benefits exceed the cost.

And the final quotation, Mr. Chairman, is this; it is on page 32:

> The federal government would feel freer to pursue an extensive fiscal policy if it felt confident that its possible inflationary effects in some areas of the country would be offset by countermeasures on the part

of the provincial government in these areas. Further, there may be circumstances when the most appropriate expansionary measures are those that fall under the control of the provincial government.

This, Mr. Chairman, is the point of this exercise.

Thus, highway expenditures may often be the form of social capital expenditure that can be expanded most quickly in periods of economic slack.

That brings us to the end of the quotation and that brings me right back to the question. Simply this: In the Minister's planning of expenditures was this particular increase—the repaving of present roads, which represents many of the operating or current costs of your department, sir—was the increase in expenditure partly determined by an attempt by your department to increase expenditures in a period of increasing unemployment to counteract that unemployment, particularly for the type of person who would be working on the repaving of roads; or was it simply due to the political pressures of members putting forward their case for various roads?

I would just say that I would hope, speaking generally, that instead of there being at the end of 1968-1969 a 6 per cent unexpended portion in such areas as repaving of present roads, that it would be zero. Because this would be one very explicit way of meeting the rising unemployment rate, particularly among those members of the labour force who have lower levels of education and who might be hired to work on this type of project.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I can do no better than to end with a quotation from the economic report of the President of the U.S., 1965, page 10, and the quotation is this:

In principle, public measures can head off recessions before they start.

Mr. White: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order.

Mr. Chairman: Would you state your point of order, please.

Mr. White: The rules very clearly state, as evidenced to May in chapter 26, page 736, On Civil Estimates, the debate must be kept to a specific object of the grant which is placed before the committee. For instance, the grant for the salary for the Chief Secretary of Ireland was held not to justify a review of his conduct and so on.

Now sir, this is a very good example. This hon. member is utilizing this grant to talk about a far more general matter. I suggest, sir, that it unduly prolongs the debate on the estimates, that it is not fitting under this order of business, that it can be amply dealt with in the Budget debate or some other such debate. I would hope sir, that in this and other instances you would rule the members out of order when they depart from the specific object of the grant which is placed before the committee.

Mr. T. Reid: On the point of order.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, I will—

Mr. Chairman: All right, proceed.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, I will speak to the point of order.

The member for London South is an economist. We have had very good discussions about some of these problems and I would say to him, Mr. Chairman, that the Opposition is concerned with the fiscal policy of this government and not simply with expenditures based on criteria such as political pressure. I find it highly relevant to—

Mr. White: There are other orders of business for those matters.

Mr. Dunlop: That is what the Budget debate is for.

Mr. T. Reid: —ask this Minister whether he is pursuing fiscal policy or whether this is just in response to pressure. What is his criteria for an increase in this expenditure?

Mr. Chairman: Order, please.

I would say that the member for London South does have a point and that the members are, to some extent, straying from the item before us, that is the estimates for the current year.

I think that in committee we do have a fair amount of freedom in our discussions and I did, just before the member for London South interjected on a point of order, ask the member for Scarborough East to state the relevance of his discussion to this particular vote. He indicated he would get to it in a moment or two and I afforded him that privilege. So if the member for Scarborough East will proceed and get back to vote 904.

Mr. T. Reid: My question to the Minister—

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if this might be a convenient time for me to move that the committee rise and report progress.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, thank you for your indulgence. My question is very simple, sir: On what criteria did the expenditures in the section entitled the repaving of present roads and voted under 904—what criteria did you use, sir, to increase the expenditures from the $2,155,000 actually expended in 1966-67 to a projected expenditure of $2,800,000, an increase of 31 per cent?

An hon. member: Pretty good question.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Mr. Chairman, maybe this would be the appropriate time for me to move that the committee should rise and report progress.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree moves that the committee of supply rise and report that it has come to certain resolutions and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report it has come to certain resolutions and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we will continue with the estimates of this department and I would like to give ample notice of our intention to call on Tuesday for the debate on the education bill.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 10.35 o'clock, p.m.



Legislature of Ontario Debates

No. 42

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

First Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Friday, March 29, 1968

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1968

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Friday, March 29, 1968

Loan and Trust Corporations Act, bill to amend, Mr. Rowntree, first reading 1401

Insurance Act, bill to amend, Mr. Rowntree, first reading 1401

Charitable Institutions Act, 1962-1963, bill to amend, Mr. Yaremko, first reading 1401

Homes for Retarded Persons Act, 1966, bill to amend, Mr. Yaremko, first reading 1402

Children's Institutions Act, 1962-1963, bill to amend, Mr. Yaremko, first reading 1402

Provincial courts and judges, bill to provide for, Mr. Wishart, first reading 1402

Centennial Centre of Science and Technology Act, 1965, bill to amend, Mr. Auld, first reading 1403

Question to Mr. Wishart re demonstrations in front of embassies and consulates, Mr. Sopha 1403

Questions to Mr. Davis re school trustees, Mr. Braithwaite 1403

Questions to Mr. Davis re the Ontario teachers' federation, Mr. Pitman 1403

Question to Mr. Davis re the Hamilton board of education, Mr. J. R. Smith 1404

Questions to Mr. Simonett re hydro failures and air pollution, Mr. Sargent 1405

Questions to Mr. Bales re unemployment, Mr. Sargent 1405

Questions to Mr. Brunelle re sale of fishing licences, Mr. Sargent 1405

Questions to Mr. Davis re school boards, Mr. Worton 1406

Question to Mr. Bales re the workmen's compensation board, Mr. Ruston 1406

Estimates, Department of Highways, Mr. Gomme, continued 1406

On notices of motion No. 4 and No. 9, Mr. Bullbrook, Mr. Young, Mr. Kerr, Mr. White 1415

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Rowntree 1425

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

FRIDAY, MARCH 29, 1968

The House met at 10:30 o'clock a.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are always pleased to have visitors to the Legislature and today we welcome as guests, students from the following schools: In the east gallery Dr. G. W. Williams secondary school, Aurora; and in the west gallery Forest Hill Village junior high school, Toronto.

Later this morning we will be joined in the east gallery by students from St. Anne junior high school in Tecumseh and in the west gallery by Bayview junior high school, Willowdale; and later again in the east gallery by students from Ridgetown district high school in Ridgetown and in the west gallery by students from Bendale secondary school, Scarborough.

Presenting petitions.

Presenting reports.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

THE LOAN AND TRUST CORPORATIONS ACT

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Loan and Trust Corporations Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Mr. Speaker, it is proposed as part of these amendments that subsection (1) of section 8 be altered to increase from $500,000 to $1 million the minimum capital required for the purpose of incorporation under The Loan and Trust Corporations Act. The applicant will also have to file with the registrar an affidavit showing that the stock has been subscribed for and taken up in a *bona fide* way by at least 25 responsible subscribers.

Another amendment requires that the conditions of public necessity and confidence required on incorporation of trust companies be extended to loan corporations.

THE INSURANCE ACT

Hon. Mr. Rowntree moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Insurance Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: This bill, Mr. Speaker, proposes a number of housekeeping amendments to The Insurance Act having to do with records of claims, permitting fraternal societies to file annual statements for the fiscal instead of the calendar year, and the graduation of fees.

Another significant change will make it possible for us to require additional protection for an insured against the possibility of a company becoming insolvent.

At this point, might I point out to the hon. members that there are certain legislative involvements with respect to the insurance industry which are not in The Insurance Act but are rather contained in part 6 of The Corporations Act, and there will be some amendments pertaining to this industry advanced by way of amendment to part 6 of The Corporations Act. This is quite separate and apart from the detailed study of The Business Corporations Act, the proposed bill which was called 141 last year and comes under the purview of the Provincial Secretary.

CHARITABLE INSTITUTIONS ACT, 1962-1963

Hon. J. Yaremko (Minister of Social and Family Services) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Charitable Institutions Act, 1962-1963.

Motion agreed to: first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, there are three main portions to the Act.

There is an extension of the definitions of corporations that may be approved. Second, there is the section which will enable the approval of a charitable institution so that it may be dated prior to the giving thereof. Very often institutions are in operation

before the paper work, if I may use that expression, is completed and we do not want the charitable institutions to suffer by reason of that factor. Then the main section is the repealing of the requirement of residence in Ontario.

THE HOMES FOR RETARDED PERSONS ACT, 1966

Hon. Mr. Yaremko moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Homes for Retarded Persons Act, 1966.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, as in the changes that I outlined in respect of The Charitable Institutions Act, these are the same changes in respect to homes for retarded persons.

THE CHILDREN'S INSTITUTIONS ACT, 1962-1963

Hon. Mr. Yaremko moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Childrens Institutions Act, 1962-1963.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Again, Mr. Speaker, the same basic changes are made in respect to The Children's Institutions Act.

PROVINCIAL COURTS AND JUDGES

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to provide for provincial courts and judges.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, the bill, which will provide for a new approach to the provincial bench, was prepared prior to our receipt of the McRuer report, but it has recognized most of the major principles which related to these particular courts. The bill was modified when the report was received so that it now represents the practical application of the relevant recommendations of the McRuer report, and makes it possible to proceed to others as our experience and adequate time permits.

I know that the hon. members will study this significant bill in detail, but may I be permitted to touch upon some of the more significant features of the Act?

The present magistrate's court will become the provincial court, criminal division, while the juvenile and family court will become the provincial court, juvenile and family division. These courts will be constituted for every county and district. The magistrates and judges will become provincial judges and have a provincial jurisdiction, while they will be designated for particular courts by the chief judges of the respective divisions.

For the first time in Canada, a judicial committee will be established to assist the Attorney General in the appointment of provincial judges, and to review complaints respecting the conduct of provincial judges. The committee will be composed of the chief justice of Ontario as chairman, the chief justice of the high court, the chief judges of the two divisions of the court, the treasurer of the law society of Upper Canada, and two other persons appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor in council. It is intended that at least one of the latter appointments will be a layman, unassociated with the law or the bench.

The judicial integrity of the judges will be preserved as they may not be removed from office except after a public judicial inquiry as presently required for magistrates. However, the judicial committee will be able to receive complaints, investigate them and discuss matters privately with the judges in an attempt to resolve in an appropriate forum those matters which do create concern to us all. If the committee then feels that the only appropriate solution is a judicial inquiry it may so recommend to the Lieutenant-Governor in council.

The salaries, pension benefits and other emoluments for the provincial judges will be dealt with by regulation so that these matters will be published and available through The Ontario *Gazette* and the regulations of the province.

The Act further provides that the criminal jurisdiction under part 16 of the criminal code of Canada must be conferred by order in council, and that it may not be conferred upon a judge unless he has been a member of the bar for five years, a provincial judge for five years, or was a full-time magistrate or juvenile and family court judge prior to the coming into force of this Act.

Mr. Speaker, there are other important features of this bill, but I should not take the time of the House further at this stage. I do, however, commend these new principles to the earnest consideration of all the hon. members.

THE CENTENNIAL CENTRE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY ACT, 1965

Hon. J. A. C. Auld (Minister of Tourism and Information) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Centennial Centre of Science and Technology Act, 1965.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, the amendment authorizes the delegation by the board of any of its powers to a committee, and the name of the director of the centre is changed to director general.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Sudbury.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Attorney General. In recognizing that property and civil rights are matters of provincial responsibility, does the Attorney General agree with the statement by Magistrate L. A. Sherwood that there should be a law to make demonstrations in front of embassies and consulates illegal?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, I did not read the statement which is referred to in the question. However, if Magistrate Sherwood did make the statement attributed to him, then I would not agree that there should be a law which makes a demonstration *per se*, illegal. I think that these are proper activities and they should not be prevented by law, bearing in mind always that such demonstrations should be orderly and must not unduly interfere with the rights of other citizens.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Etobicoke.

Mr. L. A. Braithwaite (Etobicoke): Mr. Speaker, I have a two-part question for the Minister of Education.

1. In view of the attempted removal of two school trustees from office in Etobicoke by Etobicoke ratepayers, C. W. Cooper and D. R. Meeson, as reported in yesterday's Toronto *Daily Star*, because the trustees in question, Etobicoke board of education chairman John Parker, who is alleged to be employed as secretary treasurer of McCarthy and McCarthy, the board's solicitors, and because board member S. Ted White is a regional manager of International Business Machines Ltd., which has rental and service contracts with the Etobicoke school board, will the Minister inform this House what, if any, amendments he plans to introduce to section 50 of The Schools Administration Act to clarify the position of a school trustee who is connected with or has any interest in a company having business relations with the board?

2. Will the Minister assure the House that this situation does not exist in any other school board in the province?

Hon. W. G. Davis (Minister of Education and Minister of University Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the provision already exists in subsection 6 of section 50 of The Schools Administration Act to resolve the dispute. I personally do not know of any other situation; and I think, Mr. Speaker, that the member is asking a bit much of the Minister of Education to assure him that out of the many hundreds of school boards and thousands of trustees that this situation may not exist somewhere else, in some isolated instance, in the province of Ontario. I really cannot give the hon. member that assurance —but I do not know of any.

Mr. Braithwaite: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker: Does the Minister have any thoughts of sending out a directive to the various school boards in the light of this action?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I think the legislation speaks for itself and really it is not necessary to send out any directive at all. It is all spelled out very clearly in the Act.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Peterborough.

Mr. W. G. Pitman (Peterborough): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Education.

In view of the confusion which resulted in the banning of the president of the Ontario teachers' federation from a meeting of the interim committee—that is the interim committee in Peterborough, as the Minister knows—would the Minister send a directive clarifying the policy of the department as to the relationship which should exist between these committees and the teachers' federation?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, this matter has already been in the process of clarification.

Mr. Pitman: May I ask a further question, Mr. Speaker? Does it mean that the Minister will be sending a directive and does it mean that there will be some effort by which the teachers of Ontario will be assured that they will have a part to play in the future of education in every single part of this province?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member will read the guidelines carefully he will see a specific reference to the role that the teachers will play in the organization and the preparation of the policy recommendations to the county board of education that will assume office on January 1, 1969. The guidelines very specifically state that the teachers not only have a contribution but should be involved in these discussions. I think that has only happened in one or two areas and, I say, it is in the process of clarification.

Mr. Pitman: A further question, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the Minister could tell us whether he will be prepared to bring down permissive legislation to amend The Teachers' Profession Act allowing school boards to assist teachers' organizations in collecting dues with no less than ten instalments rather than by the lump sum method now made necessary.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, this matter is presently under review and I am really intrigued by the wording of the question when the hon. member suggests that it would be "permissive legislation" because I am not sure that this is in fact the request we have had from the OTF.

Mr. Pitman: Mr. Speaker, we will discuss this perhaps at a later time, but I wonder if he might suggest whether this legislation would come down before the third reading of the new legislation re larger administrative units, so that the new school boards would have some definite information and policy in regard to this.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I am sure that we will be discussing this during the current session and I am sure that there will be some indication as to what the policy will be before the session is concluded.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Hamilton Mountain.

Mr. J. R. Smith (Hamilton Mountain): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Education. Would the hon. Minister please inform the House of any change in the grant to the Hamilton board of education?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, the member for Hamilton Mountain and the member for Hamilton West (Mrs. Pritchard) have discussed this problem with the Minister, and the officials of the department estimates—and I want to make this very clear, this is an estimate on the basis of tentative financial information provided by the Hamilton board—that the 1968 general legislative grant to the Hamilton board of education for elementary school purposes will total $4,991,000, and for secondary school purposes, $6,171,000. This estimate reflects, Mr. Speaker, an increase of more than $1,300,000 over the prior year's grant. I do emphasize that it is based on information provided by the Hamilton board of education that our estimate would indicate that this will be an increase of $1,300,000.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Grey-Bruce.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Mr. Speaker, through you I have a number of questions for the Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) but I would hold those. I would ask if the House leader is in a position to tell the House if the letter sent to the provincial Premiers by the Rt. Hon. Lester Pearson insofar as the wage and price review—

Mr. Speaker: Order, order! The member has not placed that question with the Speaker's office and if he—

Mr. Sargent: I realize that, but it is very important that we find out—

Mr. Speaker: If he wished to have that question asked he should have placed it with the several other questions—

Mr. Sargent: Wait a minute, will he answer the question?

Mr. Speaker: The Speaker has ruled that the member will not put the question because he has not put it in the proper manner.

Mr. Sargent: This is a matter of very urgent public importance.

Mr. Speaker: The member then, if he wishes to have a debate on a matter of urgent importance—

Mr. Sargent: That is not necessary—

Mr. Speaker: —should have advised the Speaker's office this morning as the rules provide, and then it could have been debated this morning if the House felt that it was such a matter. So, as a result, the member will have the option of placing that question either as a question or as a matter for debate on Monday when the House meets again.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, a question to the hon. Minister of Energy and Resources Management.

In view of the report that Hydro Quebec engineers say that air pollution in Montreal last week was so severe as to cause power failure through short circuits, will the Minister advise what his technicians tell him is a comparative basis here in Ontario?

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Mr. Speaker, I might say this is from the technicians too—I did not realize they had air pollution in Montreal, I thought it was all in Ontario.

Mr. Sargent: We had it here last night, too.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Well, this does not say anything about that.

Mr. Sargent: The hon. Minister is the champion.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I believe there is no situation in Ontario which can be compared to the particular circumstances in Montreal referred to in the question.

Mr. Sargent: I cannot hear the Minister.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I am sorry, I do not control the loud speaker system.

Ontario Hydro is well aware of this type of problem and has adopted protective measures. Operation and maintenance of power equipment involves endless research, around-the-clock alertness, war against the elements and attention to a fantastic number of details. One operating problem has been insulator contamination which can reduce effectiveness. Hydro has come up with one solution to the problem—silicone grease spread one-eighth of an inch thick over the insulators. The unique qualities of the grease readily absorbs grime which gradually coats insulators.

Insulators may become coated with dirt and result in flash-overs causing power outages. One solution used by line crews is simply washing the insulators. They are doused with a jet stream of air and pure water under pressure of 1,100 pounds per square inch directed from trucks equipped with 700-gallon water tanks and insulated aerial buckets. The work is carried out on live lines without interrupting service to customers.

However, this method cannot be used around transformer stations where the maze of insulators is in close proximity to transformers and circuit breaker bushings which would be adversely affected by any overspray. The research division of Ontario Hydro says Hydro has been fighting insulator contamination for years:

> We tried silicone oil at first but it weathered off too fast. Further we tested silicone grease on specially mounted test insulators. Satisfactory results prompted us to use it on the insulators in particular areas. Silicone grease is a light, tasteless, odourless non-volatile compound which can be applied by brush, hand or pressure hose. Conditions at transformer stations demand hand application.

It seems silicone grease has the problem solved, although it is expensive. So is washing which presents the further problem of hazardous operations in certain kinds of weather. Silicone grease is used in different parts of the world. Hydro engineers working on the Dez River project in Iran, for example, ran into an insulator contamination problem. The problem was referred to Ontario Hydro which had tests undertaken and results indicated the solution was the use of silicone grease.

Mr. Sargent: Would the Minister define silicone?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Yes—manufacture it.

Mr. Sargent: To the Minister of Labour:

Would the Minister advise the number of people out of work here in the city of Toronto and would he advise the House if he is preparing a course of action with his Cabinet colleagues to meet the high level of unemployment which is predicted will be at a ten-year high this year?

Hon. D. A. Bales (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, in reply to the question from the hon. member for Grey-Bruce, I am unable at the moment to give you the figures of the number of people out of work in the city of Toronto, but I can assure the hon. member that it is the constant concern of this government to help in the creation of job opportunities for the people of this province.

Mr. Sargent: Would the Minister agree that they tell us the figures in Montreal are 57,000 people out of work? Would he try to find out the position here in Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Yes, I would be glad to.

Mr. Sargent: This is a question to the Minister of Lands and Forests:

1. Is it the policy of the department to allocate outlets for the sale of fishing licences on a regional or a population basis?

2. Is the Minister aware of the application of Ivan Vienot, Box 852, Bancroft, Ontario, to sell licences at his place of business, Ivan's Sports and Bait Shop in Bancroft?

3. Did the department reply to his registered letter in file number 40145 in which Mr. Vienot asked why his licence application was refused by Mr. Bales of the Minister's department?

4. Does the Minister believe that additional outlets to sell licences will be needed in view of the new regulations?

5. Is the Minister aware that the denial of a licence on the part of the department to a specific business creates unfair competition within a community?

Hon. R. Brunelle (Minister of Lands and Forests): Mr. Speaker, in reply to the hon. member for Grey-Bruce:

Question number one, a licence-issuing authority is granted on basis of need in servicing an area.

Number two, yes, I am aware of this application.

Number three, Mr. Vienot was notified on February 26 of this year that the department felt the area was sufficiently serviced and that we were not prepared to appoint another issuer at this time.

Number four, at this time I do not believe that additional outlets will be needed in view of the new regulations.

Number five, I do not feel that our present policy creates unfair competition. Where there are too many issuers in one location, there is only a small amount of business for each issuer. Also, for our own department it creates additional bookkeeping and administrative expenses.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): What does Mr. Rollins say about that?

Mr. H. Worton (Wellington South): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Education.

Is the Minister's department providing financial assistance to the staff of the county boards to assist in the implementation of the reorganization of school jurisdiction? If the answer is yes, will the Minister indicate what school boards are receiving such assistance?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, there are no boards receiving any financial assistance. I am endeavouring to find out for the hon. member whether or not administrative and secretarial staff in the regional offices are assisting any of the interim committees and I will convey this information to the hon. member as soon as I receive it.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Labour.

In view of the fact that the workmen's compensation board does not pay into the unemployment insurance fund nor into the Canada pension plan while an individual is on compensation, will the Minister make the necessary changes in the Act to provide for payments to both funds on behalf of such individuals?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Speaker, in reply to the question from the member for Essex-Kent, I am pleased to advise that this matter is under study in my department at the present time.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The 43rd order; House in committee of supply, Mr. A. E. Reuter in the chair.

ESTIMATES, THE DEPARTMENT OF HIGHWAYS

(Continued)

On vote 903:

Hon. G. E. Gomme (Minister of Highways): Mr. Chairman, it was my understanding that the second and third sections of 903 were passed but number 1 was not passed. I do not have the answers which the hon. member asked for on number 1 yet; however, we were on vote 904 last night.

Mr. Chairman: That is right. We had started 904, but 903 as a vote had not been carried pending certain answers. Does the Minister have any information on 903 this morning?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: I do not have the information on that, but I hope to have it on Monday. There are two other pieces of information that I have. The member for Parkdale asked about the regulations laid down re employment and classifications and I would like to table The Public Service Act and the Ontario regulations and then a leaflet "Working Together for Ontario" which is an employment information leaflet.

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): Mr. Chairman, on this point, can the Minister not give us some idea of the hiring policy of the department in regard to the various types of labour?

Surely anybody can go and read the ads. Surely, the Minister must have some idea, when he has temporary help, when he has permanent help and he has casual—and again. It is the same question I asked—whether there are any pension rights for the so-called casual labour you keep hiring year after year. Can you not give us some idea?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Chairman, as I have tried to point out, we are governed by The Civil Service Act and that is the regulation which we follow.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Chairman, does the Minister have any idea how many casual employees the department hires a year?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: The seasonal unclassified employees that we have are in the neighbourhood of 1,600.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister, through you, does he know if any record is kept of how often these employees—so-called casual—are hired year after year? I would venture a guess, Mr. Chairman, that 75 per cent of these 1,600 employees have been in the employ of the department for many years, and again I ask this question—I have asked it about four or five times now—is there any protection of any type of pension rights for these employees at all?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: I cannot give the hon. member the number that are re-employed from year to year but I understand that they do not have any pension rights under The Civil Service Act of Ontario, but they contribute to the Canada pension plan.

Mr. Trotter: Over the years, there have been practices by private firms of getting around regulations which have had to be amended from year to year, and this goes over a long period of time where they hire trainees and employers avoid the minimum wage in various ways. Gradually government has attempted, and in most cases has put a stop to it, but here is a situation where The Department of Highways representing the province of Ontario, one of the worst employers in the country—and I mean that.

They are literally using these people, regardless of patronage which we discussed yesterday. They are literally using these people and in effect, in the long run, they are denied many fringe benefits that most labouring men today can obtain if they work for a private firm. I think this business of hiring casual labour should be stopped.

I admit there is a necessity, in certain areas where you are building highways, where you may actually use one individual or a student maybe once in his lifetime. But this business of hiring the same individual for maybe four or five months a year and calling this casual labour, despite the fact that he has been on the payroll for 25 years, should be stopped.

We have a Minister who is perhaps new on the job, but this is something worth looking into because it involves a good many hundreds of people during a year and over a five- or ten-year period it literally goes into thousands of people. I think, it is an abuse of labour that should be stopped, particularly when you are representing the people of the province of Ontario.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Chairman, I might point out to the hon. member that a lot of these people ask for seasonal work. Some of them prefer to have three of four months or something like that in the winter time when they have not got other occupations.

I know in my own area we have certain fellows on small farms and so on, who are glad to get on winter maintenance, and this is why they are taken on from year to year.

Mr. Trotter: This may be true, Mr. Chairman, in some areas, but in a good many areas this type of work—working on the highways—is about the only cash income that many people receive. Many of them no doubt, would work more than four months or five months if they had the opportunity.

It is true that the government, either through the highways as under this estimate, or The Department of Lands and Forests, are really highly important operations in certain areas of the province as far as cash income for individual working men is concerned. I just feel that the policy of the government, and particularly of this department, is Victorian. It is completely outmoded and it should be completely redone.

Mr. Chairman: I should point out to the member for Parkdale that this is properly debatable and may be discussed under The Department of the Provincial Treasurer when we deal with the civil service because the remarks directed to the Minister of Highways do not apply simply to The Department of Highways, they apply to civil service generally. I think that that would be the appropriate place under which we can discuss the matter of civil service and part-time employees.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Chairman, I think your comment is a valid one. There is just one aspect of the situation on which I would like to get clarification.

Does the procedure for switching a person from casual to permanent rest with the civil service commission or is it the department that take the initiative?

I raise this question because I remember we debated this issue at considerable length six or eight years ago when we discovered that there were literally thousands of casual civil servants and most of them were concentrated in The Department of Highways. To give credit where credit is due, the then Minister of Highways, the hon. member for Haldimand-Norfolk (Mr. Allan), said that he would re-examine the situation and he came back the next year and said that literally thousands had been put on the permanent staff. So presumably those on casual were reduced to persons who really did not want to be on permanent staff, they were just seasonal workers.

My question is: In the context of the advice which you have given, does the initiative for switching a person from a phony casual staff —if I may describe it as such—to a permanent staff to get the benefits that he is entitled to, does that initiative rest with the department or with the civil service commission?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: I think the hon. member is referring more to what used to be casual employees who worked most of the year, not just the seasonal ones.

Those are disappearing at a great rate and I think what the hon. Minister of the day said then has been carried on. I will have a look at that and see if it can be reduced further if there are still some in that classification. But most of ours are people who are taken on strictly for seasonal work, and a lot of it is for winter maintenance as I pointed out before.

Mr. MacDonald: The only thing that disturbs me is the Minister's suggestion that this is disappearing at a fast rate. If it started ten years ago, and anything of it remains, I think it merits his examination.

If a person is a casual for 12 months of the year then I think this is indefensible. I think you are really playing games with categories and classifications in the civil service commission. I assume from what the Minister says that the initiative for getting rid of this old approach rests with the department, that you in effect say to the civil service commission, this person works for us casual for 12 months he should be put on a permanent basis.

We can get around to another discussion —and, as the Chairman has indicated, I think maybe rightfully so, under the civil service commission—about the procedure in many departments of having seasonal casual people. In one sense there might be some justification for it if their employment was needed only on a seasonal basis. But it raises a lot of what I might describe broadly as philosophic problems.

I think that what happens is that some of the government departments in effect become another welfare department to supplement the grossly inadequate incomes of depressed areas, to bring them at least closer to what should be a guaranteed annual income.

It is a funny way of going about it—that The Department of Highways should be the means of providing what is, in effect, welfare to depressed areas.

My colleague interjects "eastern Ontario". He is right. I suspect Lanark county is fairly high up on the list where people who are depressed economically, but who get their income supplemented by The Department of Highways.

I am not objecting to them getting it, except that I go back to our debate yesterday. I think they get it only if they happen to be a Tory, or willing to become second class citizens and keep their mouths shut, so that nobody knows what their political views are. This is the only way they can get on the list and be okayed by the employment committee of the local Tory riding association.

An hon. member: Right!

Mr. MacDonald: However, we can come back and deal with this broad issue if it relates to other departments—as I believe it does. Lands and Forests, Agriculture and Food, Public Works and Highways—these are the four outdoor relief departments for the Tory party in the province of Ontario, supplementing welfare payments where the people's income is such that it really needs supplement. But this is the wrong way of going about it. This is the old-fashioned "pork barrel" approach to it rather than a modern up-to-date approach through the implementation of a guaranteed annual wage.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Chairman, I was merely going to make a point in reference to your remarks, that while

there is a general aspect of this which might be pursued under another set of estimates, certainly as it applies within this department I think it is most appropriate that the Minister be questioned about the practices in regard to his own department. I think that has been established now so I will just let it go.

Mr. Chairman: I think this is part of vote 903. Answers to other questions will be provided. There is more information to come, so vote 903 is not carried—that is all except item 3 which has been carried. We will proceed with vote 904.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Chairman, in reply to the last two members, the figures that we have are: Permanent employees, 10,408 and we have 1,659 who are seasonal employees. These are people who may have winter work or some of them just summer work.

I also have an answer to a question asked by the hon. member for High Park in regard to overhead expenditures. It is broken down in this way: Tools and sundry equipment; protective clothing; safety equipment for maintenance crews; stock adjustments; portable road signs; barricades; cable flashers—for the 18 districts, $205,000. Gratuities for employees who terminate with unused credit; death benefits as provided by The Public Service Act—$195,000. This makes a total of $400,000, which is in this estimate.

I may say that last year our approximate total—we do not have it quite up to date—was $300,000 for these items.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park) Would the Minister please explain the gratuities item?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: I did not catch the question.

Mr. Shulman: Would the Minister explain the gratuities?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: They are entitled to 50 per cent of their unused credits on retirement, and this is where this comes from.

Mr. Shulman: Does the Minister also have the breakdown I requested for the sundry recoverable expenditures on $250,000?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: No, I do not have that one today. That is one we were unable to get in this short time, but I will get it.

On vote 904:

Mr. Chairman: The member for Algoma-Manitoulin.

Mr. S. Farquhar (Algoma-Manitoulin): Mr. Chairman, in this vote, under "maintenance," I want to speak for a minute about two highway areas on Manitoulin Island, Highways 68 and 540.

For years, Mr. Chairman, the maintenance problem on these two highways has been a real thorn in the flesh. The Minister is aware that he and I and his people have been bombarded annually and monthly by delegations with respect to the condition of these two highways. This year, I notice on page 1996 of this report which reads as follows:

> The reconstruction and improvement of Highway 68 on Manitoulin will continue this year. We propose awarding a seven mile grading contract covering a section from 4.5 miles south of Sheguiandah and southerly, and a contract for clearing another 6.5 miles preparatory to future reconstruction of the section.

To begin with, I compliment the Minister with respect to the fact of doing something besides maintenance and repair. Finally they are taking a section of this road and saying, "Okay, we will rebuild it." And this is all, really, that the residents in these areas want, something that seems to be moving toward the total programme rather than just perpetuation of the old problem without any real possibility of a final and total solution for it. This is all they want.

If it is 10 years or if it is 20 years or if it is five years, that is not the important thing; the important thing is that they are moving toward something, rather than just filling in the holes and draining the water in the spring and so on.

Now in this regard, Highway 540 sent a delegation down here a couple of weeks ago —the Minister will remember. Their contention is simply and absolutely and strictly the same type of contention. Can they, over a 40 or 50 mile stretch of highway, get consideration to develop a programme that finally will build a new road—even if it is spread over a period of time and a chance for some funds, if necessary, for maintenance. Because, really, there is no objection to the amount of maintenance that has been put on these roads.

It has been a big figure and I am not going to quote it here, but there has been recognition of the amount of money and the amount of work that has been done on these roads. The only point I am making is that

this money goes nowhere. It continues to provide a road all right, as such, but it is not really developing a programme that could finally put decent roads in these areas.

I would like to have the Minister's comment with respect to the possibility of this same approach being taken on Highway 540.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: The hon. member mentioned the fact that he was in a couple of weeks ago with a delegation. At that time I told him we would re-examine the situation on Highway 540 and we are doing that, and I hope we will have something for him shortly as to our plan of reconstruction.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Rainy River.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a few general comments before I ask a number of questions of the Minister.

I would first of all like to disagree with the member for High Park and some of the other members last night when they stated that repairing and maintenance of roads was not a high priority. In my area, Mr. Chairman, this is of vital concern. If the roads are not in good shape, or in excellent shape, if they are run down, if they are broken or if they are cracked, this is going to lead to a loss of human life and there is nothing more vital and should be of a higher priority than the preservation of life in this province.

I would like to make a couple of suggestions to the Minister, but first I would like to speak specifically about Highway 11—the 20-mile stretch running east from Atikokan to the Sapawe Junction at Niobe Lake. This particular stretch of road is in an abominable condition. To travel it at speeds over 30 miles an hour is taking the risk of having a serious accident.

The condition of the road is partly due to frost upheavals and so on, but this stretch of road requires immediate attention. In our area the tourist industry is of vital importance and if we are trying to attract tourists to our area it is nonsensical to subject them to roads of this kind and this calibre in our area.

We have the same problem in my riding on Highway 71 south and north of Nester Falls which is in very poor shape. I must compliment the Minister and his department —they are doing some work on this stretch of highway but there are literally hundreds of thousands of cars travelling over this highway every day, especially during the summer months—most of them tourists. We get increased numbers of complaints about the condition of this highway and the tourists are simply not going to come into our area if they have to drive on these kinds of roads.

I would like to say something about the particular conditions we have in northwestern Ontario as far as the severe winters go and the general environment of northern and northwestern Ontario. Now, I suggest to the Minister that his department conduct a study, if they are not doing so already, of the different effects environment has on roads constructed by The Department of Highways. Now I understand that some work is being done on this and I will ask a question later on, but I would like to know at what the stage of research is.

Last winter the stretch of Highway 11 between Atikokan and the junction of Queen's highway, for almost two or three months, Mr. Chairman, was ice covered, icy patches, and was in a very dangerous condition and imposed an extreme hazard to life and property.

The Department of Highways informed me that at the extreme temperatures that we experience at this time sand had been put on the roads, but it was not able to stick on the icy surface. A great deal of salt had been put on the roads, but at these extreme low temperatures the salt was not able to react and melt the ice.

I would ask the Minister just what is being done to find an alternative that will work on these icy conditions, especially in these very low temperatures that we experience in northwestern Ontario during our winters.

I would like to wind up, Mr. Chairman, by asking a number of questions and I would like to ask them one at a time. I know the Minister has a lot of questions fired at him all at once and it is hard to keep them straight, so I would like to ask one and have him answer and then ask another one. I only have two to three here.

First of all, Mr. Chairman, I would like to know whether the Minister could procure for me an engineering report of Highway 11, especially the stretch that I have mentioned, from Atikokan to Sapawe Junction. I have talked to the district engineer and he informs me that no such report is available. I would ask the Minister if he would be prepared to investigate this situation immediately?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Chairman, in answer to the hon. member, we are aware

of the frost heaves and problems that you have on that road, and we have a programme for this year for correcting those parts of it.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Thank you. Is the department currently studying the effects of environment on The Department of Highways' roads in northern and northwestern Ontario, and if so, could you give us some indication of how these studies are proceeding; and if not, could you tell us if the department has any plans to conduct such a study?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Do I understand the question? Are you referring back to the icy conditions and the fact that the salt and sand would not work?

Mr. T. P. Reid: That, Mr. Chairman, would be part of it.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Yes.

Mr. T. P. Reid: We have extreme types of environment in different sections—this would be the whole ball of wax so to speak. That would be one aspect.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: I might inform the hon. member, Mr. Chairman, that all road authorities who have the same weather conditions as we have in northern Ontario are working on this problem, and we have not come up with a better solution yet, but I am sure there will be one found.

Mr. Chairman: Does the member have another question?

Mr. T. P. Reid: No that is fine.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Chairman, if I may ask the Minister following the comments he made yesterday concerning supplementary assistance to municipalities for snow removal. In southwestern Ontario it is once every five or ten years that we really have snow conditions that municipalities find most difficult to contend with. As a result, they budget themselves to an extent where they figure the funds budgeted would carry them over during the normal type of winter.

The last winter was unusually difficult in my own community, in fact budgeting to the extent of $133,000 for snow control alone. The municipality has already spent $85,000. It leaves only a bare $50,000 for them for the balance of the year, taking into consideration the fall season or the winter of 1968, that is the months of November and December.

Now, were the municipality to find themselves financially embarrassed as a result of extreme snow conditions would the department make supplementary assistance available to them?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Chairman, I think I said yesterday that the department would recognize a supplementary bylaw with assistance at the normal subsidy rate.

Mr. B. Newman: The municipality then, Mr. Chairman, would have to pass a bylaw asking for this. Is that what you are referring to?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: That is right.

Mr. B. Newman: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Then I would like to ask the Minister what plans the department has undertaken in the past year concerning the general highway safety, and I refer to the marking of highways, to the use of such things as boxed dots that I made mention of several years ago in lane marking and general marking of highways; in the types of warning signs for level crossings; in some way of overcoming the accidents at level railway crossings. There is the whole gamut of highway safety. We have heard nothing from the Minister concerning this and we would certainly appreciate his comments.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Chairman, I think I have referred to it a couple of times already. We are doing everything we can to research on highway safety. The particular thing you refer to about rail crossings, I think the hon. member realizes that we have most of the rail crossings on highways guarded now. I do not say all of them, but most of them. But we have to apply to the board of transport commissioners and the need has to be proven that something better is needed than is there.

I do know we had a case just lately where we were not able to get three we applied for. A lot of the rail crossings unprotected are in the municipalities and of course it is up to them to start the plan to have theirs cleared up. Those are paid for—I think it is 80 per cent by the board of transport commissioners, then we subsidize the balance of the payments which in effect leaves a small amount for the municipality to pay.

Mr. B. Newman: Has the department undertaken some type of study and made

some type of recommendations so that at level crossings, either on county roads or even on arterial roads, some type of warning system to notify the motorist that there is a train approaching? The warning system has to be some type that will maybe startle the motorist, to alert him that there is a train coming and there is extreme danger.

We in Essex county have run into some most unfortunate accidents on level crossings, and apparently there does not seem to be a solution. We thought that the Minister of the department could come up with some type of recommendation to overcome some of these level crossing accidents. Would the Minister care to reply as to what the department is doing?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: There is constant research, I might tell the member, all the time. Do you think that the flashing signs that are now in effect are not good enough? Or is it something further than that your are looking for?

Mr. B. Newman: To my own thoughts there is something further than that, maybe a half a mile away, or a quarter of a mile away from the crossing; some type of a light that would blink and would be activated by pressure on a track; something to inform the motorist that danger lies ahead.

The crossing marker at the intersection is too late. I think that with the motorist informed earlier, even though he might not be alert, he could probably react in time to prevent a most serious accident.

Now, I would like to ask the Minister if any special consideration is being given to protect both the motorist and the worker in new construction of the highways? Too often you find or you hear of accidents where the signal man happened to be too close to the construction and, as a result, some unfortunate incident took place.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Yes, Mr. Chairman, we are working with The Department of Transport construction safety league on that matter. I think that you will recall that the hon. Minister of Transport (Mr. Haskett) brought in a regulation last year cutting the speed through construction areas. This is part of the plan.

Mr. B. Newman: Well may I suggest to the Minister that the warning be placed well in advance of any type of construction, and the warning sign be such that the motoring public have no difficulty at all of being alerted to it. Now, may I ask the Minister if there is any type of warning being contemplated by the department on intersections on arterial roads, and even freeways, because in Essex county I think that we still have 22 roads over Highway 401. Eventually you will build overpasses, I would assume. But in the meantime, some type of warning device well in advance of the intersection is in order I think. Our friends to the south of us quite often use a yellow light at an intersection in the evening. This is very good, you are alerted to it well in advance, but that does not take care of the problem that may exist under adverse weather conditions, or even in the daytime.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: The only thing that I can say to the hon. member is, if he would like to give me a list of those crossings, we will certainly have them looked at, and see what we can do for him.

Mr. B. Newman: I appreciate that, sir, because that is the right attitude to have, and we certainly would like to see as much safety not only in the Essex county area, but throughout the province. The county road study prepared by The Department of Highways and issued in September, 1966, comes out with the following summary. I would assume that this is as of 1966. It makes mention that of a total of 10,025 miles of roads, 2,969 of the roads, or 30 per cent of the roads, were deficient; and of the 15,011 bridges, 328 of them or 22 per cent were deficient. That is deficient now. Deficient in five or ten years, you will have a total of 4,399 miles of roads in the county road system out of 10,025, or 44 per cent of the county roads would be deficient. As far as bridges were concerned within a period of ten years, 385 out of 15,011 bridges would be deficient. What plan has the department to overcome these deficiencies?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: I might point, out Mr. Chairman, that this particular item would come under construction.

Mr. B. Newman: I see, but—

Hon. Mr. Gomme: But the county needs study was really laid out so that these roads could be built during a specified time—

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Chairman, I am really bringing it up under maintenance because you really have the road there now and it would simply be a matter of improving it, and if it could be improved, then the rebuilding of the structure itself.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: I think again, Mr. Chairman, this is in the county system, and it is our intention that these be reconstructed with the proper standards during the time that the study—

Mr. B. Newman: Has the hon. Minister a whole set of plans to overcome all of these deficiencies? Have you plans?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Yes we have.

Mr. B. Newman: All right, thank you, sir.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Wellington South.

Mr. H. Worton (Wellington South): Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I first want to thank the Minister and his staff for the courtesies that they have extended to me in the past year.

There are three or four items which I believe are of concern to my area, and I believe one in particular to your area too, Mr. Chairman, and that is the historical old Waterloo Road, Highway 24. This has not had any resurface or major reconstruction on it since it was laid in 1932. I would appreciate it if the Minister would review his needs for our area, and see if some solution can be brought up to pave that highway and do some redesigning. I feel that it will be a great help to take some of our heavy traffic off Highway 6, which goes to Highway 401, and also provide better service to the town of Hespeler which is in your area, sir.

The other item that I would like to bring to the attention of the department is the Highway 401 cutoff at Highway 6. It is in somewhat of a hollow, and just recently, or at least twice since the new year, we have had the overhead standard which directs the traffic to Highway 6, knocked down and considerable damage done. But it does lie in a hollow, and it creates a very dark spot. I think that there should be some consideration given to providing illuminated access to that road.

The other is a problem north of Guelph on Highway 6, where there have been considerable deaths at the junction of county road 58, I believe, and Highway 6 north. This is one of those divided-lane highways where the guard rails are not embedded in the ground at the front. A number of motorists have hit head on and considerable injury and death has taken place on a number of occasions.

The other item which will conclude my remarks on this is the fact that in the past year The Department of Agriculture and Food and The Department of Public Works have established some 1,000 acres in the Pilkington township of the Wellington South riding and have lost some $55,000 in assessment. I remember some years ago I brought it to the government's attention, with regard to the agricultural college, to have a greater subsidy paid to the township in regards to these roads. They are having heavier traffic of public works vehicles and agriculture trucks, and because of the fact that the township has lost considerable assessment, I would urge the Minister to see if there can be some improvement made in the subsidy in this particular area.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Chairman, I can tell the hon. member that I have a note of his four requests, and I will look into them.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Waterloo North.

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): Mr. Chairman, under vote 904, I would like to deal with operation of ferries. Will the Minister answer my questions probably one at a time? Are there more than four ferries involved, the two at Bay of Quinte, Wolfe Island and Upper Canada ferries?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: I did not hear the ones that the member mentioned, but I could tell him that there is the *St. Joseph Islander* in the Sault Ste. Marie district, there are the *Quinte* and the *Quinte Loyalist* in the Kingston district, the *Wolfe Islander* and the *Upper Canada* in the Kingston district, and the *Cassiopia* in the Cochrane district.

Mr. Good: Regarding the operation of these ferries, does this $900,000 include just the operation of the ferries; or does it include maintenance on the boats themselves? Is there any capital cost allowance here or is this merely the operation of these ferries?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: This is the operation and repairs of the ferries, wages of the crews, inspection and overhaul and repairs to the ferry docks of the department-owned ferries.

Mr. Good: Mr. Chairman, I have been unable to find in The Department of Highways annual report, revenue from these ferries. Are these all free ferries or is there revenue derived?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Any that we operate are free.

Mr. Good: I suppose, Mr. Chairman, these are operated free on the assumption that this is the only route for these people to get to their destinations.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: These are connecting King's highways. There is a King's highway on each side of where the ferry docks.

Mr. Good: As you know, four of these are down in eastern Ontario and from them there is no revenue. I would like to make the comparison with your argument yesterday—that where there is an alternative route, you feel free to provide a toll on the bridges—when we were discussing the bridges yesterday under the other section. When the people living on Bruce peninsula—and I, myself, am there in the summer—want to go to Manitoulin Island I could not quite conceive the route around by Parry Sound and in through the Trans-Canada Highway as an alternative route to get from say, Wiarton or Lion's Head up to Manitoulin Island. What is your argument for the fact that no provincial service is provided for those people when your eastern Ontario residents at Wolfe Island and the Bay of Quinte have free service to their islands?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Chairman, I do not remember referring to the long distance across Georgian Bay, and that is a federally subsidized ferry.

Mr. Good: I understand that, but does the province feel no obligation to provide transportation for people from the island coming down through Owen Sound or Wiarton?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: No, Mr. Chairman, we do not, as long as there is a service provided there.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Grey-Bruce.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Mr. Chairman, in regard to the ferry from Tobermory to North Shore, this does connect to provincial highways and I do not know the mechanics of it. Why would it not be a provincial ferry instead of a federal ferry?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Chairman, I cannot give the member the historical background of it, but it has always been a federal operated one, and naturally we do not run to them and say let us take it over, not as long as it can give service to the people.

Mr. Sargent: That is the key, I agree—service. You only run in the peak periods in the summer time. But nothing happens in the off season and so anyone who wants to go to the North Shore has to go down through Toronto to Parry Sound. There is a real area of concern here to develop that area in the future.

While I am on my feet and talking about this vote, I think there is a great area of concern for those of us who drive a lot, back and forth on the highways in the lack of liaison between the Ontario Provincial police and your department. I would like to ask the hon. Minister, do the Ontario Provincial Police have authority to call out sanding equipment; is there liaison between the two bodies?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: There is a liaison; absolutely, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Sargent: Thank you.

Insofar as purchasing is concerned, on this vote—I think further on there is a purchasing section; vote 905 is purchasing—we have a new office of purchasing, I understand, coming into the hopper sometime—

Mr. Chairman: We are on vote 904.

Mr. Sargent: Yes. Speaking on vote 904, Mr. Chairman, there is a big ball of wax here in 904 that no one will ever get to the bottom of. I do not think we can shoot with a rifle here because we cannot get any straight answers, so we will just kind of hit and miss.

Mr. MacDonald: You have alerted them so now you will not get the answers.

Mr. Sargent: Pardon?

Mr. MacDonald: They did not know you were after something. Now you have alerted them.

Mr. Sargent: Believe me, if they do not know now, they never will know.

Mr. Chairman: On vote 904 please.

Mr. Sargent: On this vote 904, we have an item like $2,352,000 for car mileage. Would the Minister explain the basis of this? Let us talk about car mileage for $2 million.

Mr. Chairman: Is that on vote 904?

Mr. Sargent: I believe yes, sir.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: I do not see that figure, Mr. Chairman, under this vote.

Mr. Sargent: Well it is in public accounts.

Mr. Chairman: The member is referring to the 1967 public accounts?

Mr. Sargent: Right!

Mr. Chairman: With which we are not dealing. We are dealing with vote 904 in the 1968 estimates.

An hon. member: That is right.

Mr. Chairman: What particular item is the member referring to other than that figure?

Mr. Sargent: Well you have—

Hon. Mr. Rowntree moves that the committee of supply rise and report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report progress and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

NOTICES OF MOTION

Clerk of the House: Private member's motion No. 4 by Mr. Bullbrook.

RESOLUTION:

That Ontario should introduce a system of automobile insurance based on the principle of compensation without fault that would reduce the case load on our courts and ensure prompt and fair payment for the injured in line with the recommendations of the select committee on automobile insurance.

Clerk of the House: Private member's motion No. 9 by Mr. Young.

RESOLUTION:

That, in the opinion of this House, legislation should be enacted to provide a system of compensation without fault for injuries, death and property damage caused by automobile accidents, as unanimously recommended by the select committee on automobile insurance, and that such a system be administrated by a public agency.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Kitchener (Mr. Breithaupt) resolution No. 4 standing in my name.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Speaker, I move resolution No. 9, standing in my name.

Mr. Bullbrook: Mr. Speaker, in this connection I must confess that in rising I recognize my own limitations and the general knowledge of members of this House. This has been a question of concern to our predecessors and I imagine is a question of continuing concern to ourselves.

I want to first say, in deference to the hon. member for Welland (Mr. Morningstar) and the hon. member for Hamilton West (Mrs. Pritchard) that they looked with some concern upon the volumes that I brought in. I do not intend to read them sir, in their entirety. But, I do recommend them strongly to you sir, and to the other members of this House and in particular sir, if I might, a volume of the *Harvard Law Review*, Volume No. 78, Nos. 1 to 4, 1964-65, entitled, "Basic Protection—a proposal for improving automobile claims systems", authored by Robert E. Keeton and Jeffrey O'Connell.

Of the material that I have had occasion to read, this is the most substantial in its impact and the most careful in its analysis. Speaking just for a moment in connection with resolution No. 9, substantially the resolutions put forward by myself and the hon. author of resolution No. 9, are the same with the exception of course of the significant words:

> —and that such a system be administered by a public agency.

I do not intend to dwell, Mr. Speaker, unduly on the addendum proposed in resolution No. 9, except to say this, if one would read the volume of the *Harvard Law Review* to which I made reference, you will see in there the opinion of the authors that the insurance industry can adequately and well take care of the basic protection concept that we have in mind with respect to our resolution. I speak for myself, and I hope for my colleagues in saying this, that it is not necessary in our opinion that the rights of private industry again be usurped by government.

This industry, subject to governmental control and properly subject to governmental control at this time, can adequately and well take care of the requirements of the people of the province of Ontario. I see no great benefit to continue the process of socialism in this respect.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if I might say as I mentioned, this House has been concerned with this problem for many years, and your select committee on automobile insurance in making its third report to this House made specific recommendations to you, and it is

with respect to these recommendations that I now stand to speak.

I want to refresh the minds of the members in connection with this and I quote from page 5 of that report. This was unanimous, by the way, with the possible exception of the then member, Mr. Davison, who felt that there should be the extension to government operation.

> The committee is of course concerned that some form of remedy should be available to all persons injured in automobile accidents. This after all must be the ultimate objective of any automobile insurance system. The committee sees wisdom in the views of certain eminent persons who believe that the traditional fault liability system sometimes falls short of providing justice to those involved in or affected by automobile accidents.

and I wish there, sir, to interject. The basic system, as hon. members recognize, of tort liability was a feeling that is now, in my respectful opinion, an archaic feeling—that the person doing damage must compensate the person damaged. And the authors and the members of the committee recognized that the ownership of a motor vehicle in this day and age is not a luxury and that accidents result in many instances from the great propulsion of need for automobiles and that society as a whole must bear some responsibility in this respect. Continuing to read, sir:

> To put the problem in its simplest terms, society can no longer be entirely satisfied with the idea that the cause of every accident rests with an individual or individuals and the financial consequences whatever they may be should therefore rest with an individual or individuals. In this automobile age society as a whole is perhaps responsible for traffic accidents and their consequences to a greater extent than we have thus far realized or admitted. It may also be, as was suggested in the first interim report, that the task of establishing responsibility and that all the complexities today are quite frequently an almost impossible burden on those who adjudicate cases.

And this is germane to what I say. It is almost an impossible burden. Sir, I must say again that people have analyzed this situation, people much more talented and with incisive ability much greater than mine, and have come to conclusions that support the recommendations of our committee. And we cannot as a party understand the lethargy of the government in enacting legislation to support the recommendation.

They did with due despatch enact legislation, Mr. Speaker, with respect to the prior recommendation and we, as is our wont in the Liberal Party, commend them for it.

Subsequently, sir, the government in its wisdom did undertake a study as you are aware, and hon. members are aware, by Osgoode Hall under the chairmanship of Professor Allan Linden. This study entitled, "The report of the Osgoode Hall study on compensation for victims of automobile accidents" was published by the Ryerson Press in 1965.

This is an exhaustive study and I do recommend it to you also. Its statistical evaluation of the situation from the point of view of the magnification of the use of automobiles, the damage done to property—I interject here by way of example. The analysis was done as the result of accidents in 1961 and I ask the hon. members to consider this for a moment.

It showed that in the county of York alone, there was over $14 million of property damage done in the year 1961. Now just consider for a moment, as the hon. Minister of Transport (Mr. Haskett) has pointed out, the extension of use of motor vehicles in the county of York alone since 1961, and project that throughout the province of Ontario, and only one word can come to mind in connection with loss and that word must be staggering; it is absolutely staggering.

As I say, these matters have been looked into by people of great talent who have come to these conclusions. I think there is a need today on the floor of the House to simplify the problem, and I suggest that nobody is more qualified to be simple than I.

I want to give you an instance of the problems that people face today. I hypothesize this for you, sir. I am driving in my car to visit a friend and I decide to pick up another fellow, and we are approaching the first friend's home and we are travelling north and I wish to proceed to the west into his private driveway. I make my signal on this cold, wintry day, with the snow coming down and I go into his driveway.

Just as I am entering his driveway I am struck by another car that was following me and right away I feel a certain degree of responsibility for the broken arm of my passenger. But I feel that I was without fault. And then the adjusters descend in connection with this and eventually the lawyers descend,

and they start looking at part 8 of The Highway Traffic Act.

And I suggest this to you, sir: The Highway Traffic Act and the rules of the road contained in part 8 were intended originally to control the proper flow of traffic on the highways of the province of Ontario. And what has happened is this, that they have become in effect a method for adjudication as to the proportion of negligence between people involved in litigation, and understandably so. And so we find that when my hypoethetical person is dealing with the adjusters, he finds that one adjuster says, "you neglected to take into consideration the section of The Highway Traffic Act; that puts upon you an onus that before making a left hand turn you must see that the same can be done in safety."

And then you find that the other adjuster says, "Oh yes, but the obligation on the other car was to see that the pass could be made in safety." And then you have the one driver saying, in effect, there was no signal given, and the other driver saying that there was a signal given. And so in essence what happens, Mr. Speaker, is the adjudication of this matter comes down to a question of credibility to be assessed by the courts as to whether the damage suffered was a result of the lack of signal or that there was a signal.

I suggest that the equity position between these people in this accident should not become a matter of purely the judge's setting the credibility. This is the type of case that lends itself to the basic protection philosophy, that we request legislation of this House making it compulsory in any standard form of automobile insurance that certain basic protection requirements be written therein.

The select committee did recommend certain amounts. I say unequivocally, and I imagine that my friends in the legal profession would agree, these are now outdated. They are obviously outdated.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): They are four years old.

Mr. Bullbrook: Yes. They are four years old and there must be a system of constant review in this connection, because if I might be permitted an aside, not only has this province been Conservative for 25 years in its politics, it has been unduly conservative in the adequacy of its awards from our courts in negligence matters.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Bullbrook: But this conservatism, as a result of the enlightenment of several of our Supreme Court judges, is passing. And this must be considered in connection with the schedule of basic protection that is required by this House.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to get back to that poor, gratuitous passenger in the back seat with the broken arm. You recognize that anything, any negligence, attributed to his driving is attributable to him. He might, in effect, be of no responsibility—well, he is of no responsibility—but he is in essence responsible for the negligence of his driving. And this, sir, is again one of the most archaic principles that I have ever heard and I think it is something that should be got rid of as quickly as possible.

This is the problem in connection with that gratuitous passenger who, in many circumstances—and I have given you a very simple motor accident case, but consider if that gratuitous passenger happened to be the father of six children who is earning $30,000 a year. Think of the inequity there, sir. Surely we, as legislators, cannot permit this type of justice to be preserved in the province of Ontario, that this man, because of some whim of statutory need many years ago, should be deprived of his rights and his entitlement.

I have not dwelt unduly with the case load on the courts, but this is a matter of concern, the question of delay. So many times in motor accident cases there can be traumatic experiences and psychological adversity, but if I might say—this is another thing that the select committee has not covered, as I see it. It must be covered and the courts now see a need for compensation in that field, so we must keep this in mind.

But, sir, in my respectful opinion, so many more times the most traumatic experience of all is waiting five years to have your case heard and you, sir, as a lawyer know this. It it not always the fault of the lawyers.

You will recognize many instances. Take some cosmetic difficulty, a young lady with a tremendously bad scar. No lawyer in his right mind can assess the quantum of claim for her until he has full and adequate professional advice, and in connection with this type of injury it takes not one year, but many years.

I suggest to you, therefore, that we must consider, as members of this House, the traumatic experience in waiting for trial by so many people.

Basically, I return to the report of the Osgoode Hall study. It says, in effect, that

we cannot throw away the existing tort system—and with this I agree. Society cannot as a whole undertake the responsibility for every motor vehicle ill that is perpetrated in the province of Ontario, and we do not intend this. As you read this, Mr. Speaker, you will see that what is being recommended by the select committee and being proposed in this resolution, as I have mentioned before, is a beginning and a rightful beginning.

We on this side of the House, Mr. Speaker, exhort the government to take action now in this respect. There are members on the other side of the House whom I believe to be in full agreement, and if you would permit for one moment before I close, a digression, I want to say this.

I most enjoy the debate in the House; I am tremendously enthused with it. But I do feel a certain waste of time in doing some research to educate myself, if possible, in connection with questions, to stand up before this House for perhaps 20 minutes and have the benefit of voicing my opinion, but I feel that it is tremendously fruitless if we do not have the opportunity of expressing our opinion by way of a vote.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Bullbrook: Mr. Speaker, I do not expect that the government should stand or fall or subject itself to standing or falling on what the hon. member for Sarnia has to say with respect to the basic protection policy of insurance. But I would like to see an expression of the opinion of all of us, something that we see with great joy and vitality on most occasions in the private bills, committee. I exhort you, sir, in your high office, to bring to the attention of the hon. Prime Minister, my particular desire that we have an opportunity to vote on these private members' resolutions.

Thank you, sir.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Young: Mr. Speaker, we have heard, I think, a pretty effective plea on the part of the hon. member who just spoke, for certain changes in our system of automobile insurance in the province of Ontario. But it always amazes me how this member and members from his own group who have spoken before have always stopped short of the implementation of their philosophy through a public agency.

Time after time we have heard speakers from this side of the House who have huffed and puffed against the insurance companies—huffed and puffed against the system and the inequities and all the other things that we heard about this morning. On several occasions they have said: "Now, if the private agencies do not do something about it, then we will have to reconsider the matter."

As a matter of fact, on one occasion the member for Grey-Bruce (Mr. Sargent) who sat in the back row at that time, went over the brink and opted—almost—for a public agency. Then the heads in the front row suddenly swivelled and their baleful glares caught him and he clawed at the top of the precipice with his fingers and clawed himself back up just in time to save himself from committing his party to the public administration of car insurance.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Young: Oh, yes, this happened. The hon. member will remember it very vividly because I started to compliment him on his stand at that time and he was rather proud of himself until he realized what he was doing to the party at that moment.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Young: Fine. The member has gotten back into grace and is now occupying one of the front pews.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Young: Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member said that many people agree—and he agrees—that the tort system is archaic. He also said that he believes that the present system can adequately and well take care of the present situation.

Now, how in the world can he say these things and believe them, because as his own party has said time after time after time, the job just is not being done. And that is what the member said again this morning. It just is not being done by the private insurance that we have in the province of Ontario.

I do not need to bring forth proof; he quoted the Linden report this morning and I could quote that too. It has been quoted time after time in this House, but on page 3 it says this:

> For example, the survey shows that the tort system alone falls far short of providing full economic reimbursement for all the injured. Indeed, the majority of those

hurt or killed receive nothing at all by way of tort recovery. 57.1 per cent went without tort compensation, while only 42.9 per cent did receive some tort compensation.

However, even when a claimant receives some tort recovery he does not necessarily achieve total reimbursement. Thus, only 28.8 per cent of those suffering economic losses recovered all of their economic losses or better via the tort route alone.

Moreover, in the more serious—

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): It is the same speech the hon. member gave last year!

Mr. Young: The same speech must be given time after time because the hon. member has not seen the light yet. I continue:

Moreover, in the more serious injury cases there is less likelihood of full recovery than in the minor injury cases. Paradoxically, a complete absence of tort recovery was more common in the more serious cases than in the minor ones.

The conclusion to be drawn from these figures is that the tort system operates more efficiently in compensating fully the less severely injured than it does in the more serious cases.

In other words, what Mr. Linden says here and what I repeat this morning, is that this system which we know today is not efficient. It does not cover the majority of the people who think they are buying insurance. In other words, the average person who takes out his insurance policy on his car thinks he is getting protection. But the Linden report and what the hon. member said this morning is that he is just not getting what he is paying for, and this is the thing that I think has to be driven home time after time, that we are not buying insurance, not getting the coverage that we think we are getting until the day comes when we have an accident.

I have a couple of instances here which I would like to place before the House. A letter which came to me only a day or so ago, dated March 26, from Downsview. That is a post office, not a riding, as my hon. friend knows on the front bench.

Dear Sir: In May of 1966 I had, or so it seemed at the time, a minor traffic accident, a rear end collision, for which I have admitted liability. I thought I was amply protected by my insurance.

Imagine my amazement when almost a year later I was served with a $2,000 lawsuit. It was only then that I discovered that the Wentworth Insurance Company had gone bankrupt. We have since settled for about $1,300—a large amount for a working man who has never driven without insurance for over 20 years, or had a claim against him to pay.

As a result of this accident, for which I was personally held responsible for payment, my insurance rates have increased considerably. I do not wish to be a cry baby, but how does a government grant a licence to an insurance company without sufficient deposit for assets to pay its claims?

Another case: A gentleman came in to see me about his automobile insurance—he had paid his premiums regularly since 1958 with this company, Allstate—he had no claims until October, 1967. At that time he backed out of his driveway and bumped his neighbour's car. There was no damage to his own car but $54 was the result of the damage to his neighbour's car. This was paid by the insurance company and then a little while later came the time to renew his insurance. He had been paying $93 a year insurance on his station wagon. After his accident the bill came for $157. The accident had cost the insurance company $54.

I took the trouble to investigate this case a little bit further and I found that the reason for this big increase is not alone the accident —not alone—because on October 11, 1966, the gentleman in question lost three points for improper passing and on February 8, 1968, he lost another three points for disobeying a stop sign. In other words he had lost six points according to the provincial demerit system and he had had an accident which cost the insurance company $54, so they raised his rate from $93 to $157. In other words what is happening here is twofold:

1. This is not insurance, it is a loan fund. In other words the company has loaned this gentleman enough money to pay the damages and then is going to recover it many times over. It is a loan fund just as is the government fund for which the people who do not pay private insurance, pay.

2. This insurance company usurps the function of the Minister and of the courts and in fact penalizes the driver for having broken the traffic law.

Yesterday I had a report for immediate release, from the Ontario Department of

Transport, which told the story of 47,000-odd suspensions last year, 4,611 of them imposed under the demerit point system. This significant phrase is here:

> "Suspension by the registrar can be appealed to the licence suspension appeal board and the board's decision can be appealed through the courts. We do not adopt a totalitarian concept of sneaking around normal principles of justice to squelch the rights of the individual," Mr. Haskett said.

Yet, while the government itself does not do this, the insurance company does exactly what the Minister of Transport repudiates as far as the department is concerned. These companies are able not only to penalize by way of finance for the money they must pay out, but they also penalize for the breaking of the law, a matter which should be in the hands of the police and the courts. So this is completely wrong and fundamentally inappropriate in this kind of a situation.

Of course, we heard a great deal about the delay, and I agree with this. Time after time people who need insurance most are the ones who face up to delay after delay after delay. And the courts, of course, are jammed. Just because we have private insurance in this province rather than a public system, the courts are jammed with cases that should never be there.

Early in 1965, we are told, one third of the cases before the Ontario Supreme Court and 40 per cent of the cases before the county courts—2,765 cases in all—related to traffic accidents. Most of those should not have been in the courts at all if we had had a proper system of insurance in Ontario. This again would solve much of the problem that the courts face at the present time—cleaning them out of these small disputes and letting the courts do the job that they are designed to do.

Every year, as we all know, we have to buy a licence for our cars, and what simpler procedure than to sell to every car owner an insurance policy with that licence, as has been the case in Saskatchewan now for many years. It cuts out the selling cost and it cuts down the expense of advertising, of high pressure salesmanship. As I have pointed out in this House many times before I am not a bit worried about the insurance agents becoming unemployed. They are a group of people with some real ability and there is no more reason why they should have feather bedding than the auto workers in the plant who are producing the machines. Technology has changed the pattern of production in the motor car industry drastically and people have had to adjust to that, the workers have had to make the adjustment. In the same way the insurance industry throughout can make the adjustment and can do the job that has to be done after a change of this kind.

First of all, in a public plan we see the cost of selling drastically reduced, but the second thing that can be done, as I have already mentioned, is that we cut out the court costs and that will drop costs again. But the other thing is a very significant one which again has been talked about time after time in this House. I have before me a copy of *The Financial Times of Canada* dated January 17, 1958. An article in that issue is headed: "Auto Insurance Report Is Coming." That article says this, in part:

> Canada's 300 automobile insurance companies earned an estimated $700 million in premiums last year, ten per cent more than in 1966. They paid out about $480 million in claims.

In other words, the difference between the intake—and in premiums alone—and the output in claims was $220 million in Canada. One thing is not mentioned here; there is no mention in this article of the income from reserve funds. I put this on the record last year, and I want to read an excerpt from it again, for the hon. members' education—

Mr. J. H. White (London South): Well, you hate anything that is successful.

Mr. Young: We will deal with that in a moment.

Mr. James Ridgeway in *The New Republic* pointed out that insurance companies set up two reserve funds. Those reserve funds over a period of time build up millions of dollars in interest rates. But this is never ploughed back in the setting of rates. Now this is one of the great leakages in the books of the insurance companies, and they have never denied that this exists.

The fact is that much of the income in a public plan comes as it does in a private plan —from the interest and reserve funds. In a public plan this comes back into the mainstream of the organization. In a private plan it is siphoned into profits and the books—in large measure because of this and other devices that Ridgeway points out in his article in *The New Republic*—are able to show a loss where as a matter of fact they are showing a healthy profit. In other words,

the cooking of the books takes place so that losses can be shown, and the companies can come before us and say: We lost money on car insurance last year, and—

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): Just the last few months!

Mr. Young: Yes, just the last few months. And raise the rates to all of us.

Mr. Speaker, just in closing I want to point out this, that year after year, members of this House have fought against public intrusion in what they call private business. Well, last year, I quote the words of the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) who was talking at that time about public housing, a matter which had been fought by this government until private enterprise just could not produce the goods.

So the Prime Minister said:

> But it must be recognized that government and business are complementary rather than competitive. Business and government must proceed as partners in progress if we are to achieve the solution of the complex economic and social problems that stand before us. However, where it is clear that private business is not, and cannot be organized in a manner necessary to undertake a crash programme, then this responsibility must fall to the government.

These are significant words. Because in recent years, the hon. members of the Liberal Party, as well as the hon. members of the government, have backed into positions on medicare and on housing and many other matters where, after fighting it for a long time, they were finally willing to admit that the government must take over and supplement the role that private enterprise has played.

In this situation, as I have proved this morning, private enterprise has just not been efficient. It does not provide the protection that people pay for. And if we are going to have that protection, if we are going to give people protection on the highways from accidents, injury, and death, economic protection of this kind, then private enterprise has failed. Members of the party who had just spoken have time and time again in the House, berated the companies and said they have got to produce. Well, they have not produced. They are not producing and the time is here for this party to take the logical step and carry on and do the job that is recommended in resolution 9 on the books.

I just want to say this, that so far—and I will estimate that the reply from the government side this morning will not face up to the fundamental issue here—experience over 22 years of public insurance in the province of Saskatchewan has demonstrated that out of the premium dollar only 14 cents has been required for administration. The others have gone back into paying claims.

In Ontario the figure is 33 cents to 34 cents for administration with the balance going to claims. These figures have not been proven wrong.

Mr. White: That statement is incorrect; Saskatchewan is heavily subsidized.

Mr. Young: These figures have not been proven wrong. As a matter of fact just within the last year the hon. Liberal Treasurer of Saskatchewan has stated again that these figures are correct.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): That is the most authoritative Tory comment you can get on the question.

Mr. Young: In the face of these figures I ask this House to vote for—if that is possible, although as the hon. member pointed out we are not allowed to vote here. And I think many of the members here would vote for this resolution, and to support in the days ahead the idea of a public plan for automobile insurance to give our people not only the more reasonable costs but far better protection than we get today under the private plan.

Mr. G. A. Kerr (Halton West): Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a small part in this debate dealing with resolutions No. 4 and No. 9. I would like to deal with resolution No. 9 first of all. The hon. member for Sarnia mentioned that the only difference between his and the hon. member for Yorkview was the phrase, "that such a system be administered by a public agency". However, I do not believe that the select committee report recommended inclusion of property damage. I think that property damage is certainly adequately covered under our present system of automobile insurance, not only by way of collision but by liability coverage which is property damage and public liability.

Now I can imagine the situation, Mr. Speaker, where even the hon. member for Yorkview in his younger days down in the Maritimes, being the owner of an old clinker, decides because he needs the money that he would drive that old clinker over the hill and collect under a system of compensation without fault, which includes property damage.

Mr. Shulman: Shame! Shame!

Mr. Kerr: You may think this is being facetious but it just happens, Mr. Speaker, that cases of fraud have been proven in the state of New York and the state of Massachusetts, where people have intentionally damaged their automobile in some way or another and attempted to collect compensation.

Mr. MacDonald: This is an irrelevant argument.

Mr. Kerr: This is not irrelevent, it is quite possible, Mr. Speaker. I think we should deal mainly with the select committee report, particularly as it deals with personal injuries and personal loss. The hon. member for Yorkview really did not debate the principle of compensation without fault. He chastised private agencies and recommended the glories of a public agency. Does the hon. member for Yorkview really think that there would be a saving in such a public plan for automobile insurance?

Mr. Young: The figures prove that there is a saving.

Mr. Kerr: Does he really believe, in all sincerity, Mr. Speaker, that the administration by a public agency will be less costly than by private carrier?

Mr. MacDonald: Just as the government has proven in hospital insurance.

Mr. Kerr: When you look at OHSC costs, Mr. Speaker, since 1959; OMSIP costs, certain compensation board costs, surely they are going up increasingly, continuously. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the profit motive—

Mr. MacDonald: The hon. member ought to look at the facts.

Mr. Kerr: —is less costly than the inefficiency of public administration! I think the hon. member for Yorkview is either terribly naive or terribly doctrinaire.

Mr. MacDonald: The hon. member is talking about himself—a perfect description!

Mr. Kerr: Mr. Speaker, I would like to deal with resolution No. 4 and the hon. member for Sarnia. I might start off by saying that the hon. member is too modest. I think he is a very capable member. He made a very adequate submission for his resolution. He has got style, he is going to be a great member; the only problem is he is just the wrong colour.

An hon. member: Wrong party!

Mr. Kerr: Mr. Speaker, I would like to review briefly the situation that exists at present and the law of tort in negligence includes the ingredients of liability and fault. Our present legislation dealing with this includes The Highway Traffic Act, The Motor Vehicles Claims Act and The Negligence Act. The legislation during the years has affected recovery by accident victims by some relaxation in requiring proof of fault.

Now, I would like to read a report by Professor Linden which was in the *Bar Review Report* some months ago in respect to our tort laws, he says:

> The response of tort law itself is disappointing. There was some stiffening of the standard of care required of motorists, some relaxation in the requirement of proof of fault, some increased willingness to use legislative prescriptions as determinative of fault and some expansion of vicarious liability. By and large however, tort law withstood the pressure of social need. The reaction of our Legislatures on the other hand was somewhat more satisfactory. They began to alter some of the background in which tort law operated. By enacting legislation making owners liable for all damages occasioned by their vehicles, permitting courts to apportion liability between the contributory negligent plaintiff and defendant, requiring insurance policies to contain various statutory conditions, allowing direct action against insurers by third persons, and prohibiting iniquitous defences such as drunkenness, racing and the like, qualifies third persons at least up to basic limits.

Assisted by financial responsibility laws, compulsory insurance—this is in the liability area—and such other devices as the uninsured motor vehicle fee, the incident of private liability insurance soared so that the province of Ontario could boast that almost 98 per cent of its vehicles were insured to basic limits. Moreover, to ensure that even the so-called black risks could secure coverage, assigned risk plans were established by the insurance industry. Mr. Speaker, this statement speaks for itself, but I would like to re-emphasize the fact that 98 per cent of our motorists are insured to basic limits.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, in Ontario, in the event of injury by hit-and-run or unknown motorists, victims are compensated by The Department of Transport, as if the motorist was found or identified. Recent amendments

to The Highway Traffic Act allow coverage for the gratuitous passenger. I agree with the submissions of the hon. member for Sarnia that this section should be further amended. I do not like the particular wording of it as it stands at the present time.

The hon. member also mentioned reducing the case load on our courts. Professor Linden gives us information, which is corroborated by the law society, that less than 2 per cent of all accident cases actually go to trial. I suggest, Mr. Speaker that certain case law does influence pre-trial settlement—

Mr. MacDonald: Those 2 per cent clog the courts.

Mr. Kerr: The vast bulk of our motor vehicle claims are concluded by negotiation rather than litigation. And, then dealing with injury cases, the percentage is only 1.2 per cent. In fact, Professor Linden indicates that writs have been issued in approximately only 13 per cent of all injury cases. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that much of the cause of our case load and backlog of cases in our courts is partially the fault of lawyers and parties who are continually asking for adjournment. Part of this, of course, cannot be avoided because final medical diagnosis is not always available.

I think that rather than including this as a valid argument, possibly we should increase the facilities of our courts and increase our judges. I do not think that this is a valid argument for introducing major changes in our insurance laws.

Regarding the matter of pain and suffering, I think that even if the fault concept was absent, there would still have to be a certain amount of appraising done, of assessing and inquiring and investigating. This would not be completely eliminated, because there are certain types of injuries that the select committee did not include in the schedule and which would have to be appraised and assessed. So this type of injury, this type of recovery, could not be entirely eliminated, and the idea of a saving by having compensation without fault is not entirely true with respect to this type of injury.

Since the 1963 report, Mr. Speaker, we have had an extension of our OHSC coverage. We have OMSIP and we have increased workmen's compensation benefits and certainly there is available all forms of insurance covering bodily injury, income protection and accident policies. The reason I am making this point, Mr. Speaker, is simply to say that the need now is somewhat less than when this select committee report was made.

We should deal with the idea of responsibility as far as driving is concerned. I agree that the driver may not be more irresponsible because he has some sort of such coverage for injury or death, in the event that he drives carelessly or indifferently or dangerously, and the fact that he may know that he is covered or his family may be covered. But I think responsibility, Mr. Speaker, is a factor not only as it affects driving attitudes and habits generally, but also the responsibility of looking after one's own protection, one's own family interests and buying the necessary insurance coverage that will protect them and the driver under all circumstances.

I think that owning and driving a car today is a tremendous responsibility. I would like to read again from some of Professor Linden's remarks:

> Insurance premiums continue to rise. The problem of delay has not been solved and many victims are still not fully compensated, but the problem of soaring insurance rates is not as much a product of the present system of automobile accident compensation as it is of today's automotive society. More cars, more highways and more travel generate more accidents. Higher repair prices, higher medical costs and higher incomes produce higher losses and therefore higher damage awards.
>
> Because of the increased accident frequency and cost per claim, the cost of indemnifying these losses rises, and hence premiums are pushed up. To attack this problem by abolishing tort law is to miss the point. What must be done is to reduce the number of accidents and the severity of injuries resulting therefrom. By stricter enforcement of rules of the road, by clamping down on drunk driving, by offering driver education courses, by building safer roads and crash-proof cars, we may be able to shrink the accident toll. If this were done, not only would the economic problems be mollified, but the human suffering would also be diminished. Regardless of what steps are taken, however, to avoid accidents, they will never cease to occur altogether and therefore there will still be a place for the law of torts.

What, Mr. Speaker, about the cost of such insurance coverage involving compensation without fault? All actuarial experts seem to agree that it will cost something. Estimates

range from $8 to $57 more on annual premiums. Auto insurance premiums in many cases are almost prohibitive now. This extra cost, if this programme were mandatory, would in effect have the careful driver subsidizing careless or indifferent drivers. Responsibility subsidizing irresponsibility.

I would like to read from the remarks of the law society, in its submission to the select committee:

> The proposal to compensate without fault is actually a proposal to pay only certain expenses and part of the loss income, but nothing for pain and suffering and general damages. Were the proposers of compensation without fault able to give true compensation at a price the average motorist could pay, they would win converts very quickly, even though this would be giving preferential treatment to the victims of the motor car.
>
> The solution of the differences would be quite simple. Let the government and the insurance industry undertake appropriate research to discover the cost of truly compensating all traffic victims. Then a comparison between the present and the proposed premiums would provide the answer. The public would then know what it would cost to compenaste all motor car victims and could readily decide whether they could afford it.
>
> If, at present, premiums were to be increased by 100 per cent there are many who might be attracted to compensation without fault. If the cost is apt to be $300 to $400 per motor car the answer would be that such prohibitive expense would make it impossible for great numbers of people to own and operate a motor car.

They suggest that this, as I suggest, be a subject of study and that comparative costs of compensation without fault be found out. However, Mr. Speaker, I am a reasonable man and I would submit the sort of plan for peaceful co-existence. My main reason is that I agree with the hon. members—

Mr. MacDonald: That is appeasement of the companies.

Mr. Kerr: As suggested by the hon. member for Sarnia, there is a great traumatic experience when injury is involved as the result of an accident and I agree there is a great vacuum to be filled. I am thinking of the driver who is seriously injured and has a long period of recovery. This imposes great hardship on him and his family. If he does not happen to be covered by some other type of insurance with compensation, this could mean arrears of mortgages, loss of home, and then the family on general welfare.

Death benefits are important, but I think you will agree, Mr. Speaker, that they are not quite as important because most people have some type of life insurance and therefore they would be compensated in that regard. But they still should be included. The select committee report on page 7 does set out a schedule of weekly benefits for injuries, and I do not quarrel with those, except possibly they would have to be updated from 1963 to certainly 1968.

There is a great delay at the present time in the payment of claims and this is when the claims usually are very high and when the injury has been severe. I think it is important, as the resolution suggests, that prompt and fair payment be made. I would suggest that there be new limited accident benefit clauses to all policies and as far as the tort system is concerned, it can be, shall we say, repaired without being abolished.

I see that my time is up, Mr. Speaker. I would just end by saying that actually I think it should be on a voluntary basis, as the law society suggests, and in this way we could find out how it would work and how much it would cost.

Mr. White: In the several minutes left, I should like to make some very brief observations.

First of all, the present system is undoubtedly obsolete because of qualitative and quantitative changes in cars and roads. Point number two: the fault is almost impossible to apportion in many, if not most, automobile accident cases. Third, a better system must be found by the industry preferably, or failing that, by this Legislature. As hon. members know, I believe that free enterprise is more efficient and effective in situations like this, and my hope would be that the industry could recognize the serious situation and provide solutions which will satisfy the needs of our public.

I draw your attention, sir, to a system which has been advocated by professors of law at Harvard University, namely, Professor Robert E. Keeton and Jeffrey O'Connell, who propose a form of automobile insurance called "basic protection", which would pay benefits more widely and efficiently and yet preserve both private enterprise and the right

to file a lawsuit for severe injury and economic loss.

Very briefly, sir, under "basic protection" all motorists would carry compulsory insurance and start paying victims immediately, regardless of who was at fault. These limits would be fairly modest—perhaps $5,000 for an individual. If the victim of the accident felt he had not been appropriately compensated by this basic plan, he would then have the right to take his case into a court of law.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Mr. Speaker, on Monday we will proceed with the estimates of The Department of Highways, and if they are concluded in good time, we will go on to The Department of Health, as announced earlier. There will be a private members' hour at 5 p.m., and I remind the House again of what I said last evening with respect to the calling of second readings and the debate on the education bill on Tuesday.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 1:00 o'clock, p.m.

No. 43

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

First Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Monday, April 1, 1968

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1968

5

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Monday, April 1, 1968

Public Commercial Vehicles Act, bill to amend, Mr. Haskett, first reading 1429

Motor Vehicle Accident Claims Act, bill to amend, Mr. Haskett, first reading 1429

Railways Act, bill to amend, Mr. McKeough, first reading 1430

Administration of justice, bill to provide for, Mr. Wishart, first reading 1430

Coroners Act, bill to amend, Mr. Wishart, first reading 1430

County Courts Act, bill to amend, Mr. Wishart, first reading 1430

County Judges Act, bill to amend, Mr. Wishart, first reading 1430

Crown Attorneys Act, bill to amend, Mr. Wishart, first reading 1430

Jurors Act, bill to amend, Mr. Wishart, first reading 1430

Crown Witnesses Act, bill to amend, Mr. Wishart, first reading 1430

Division Courts Act, bill to amend, Mr. Wishart, first reading 1430

Justices of the Peace Act, bill to amend, Mr. Wishart, first reading 1430

Land Titles Act, bill to amend, Mr. Wishart, first reading 1430

Partnerships Registration Act, bill to amend, Mr. Wishart, first reading 1430

Judicature Act, bill to amend, Mr. Wishart, first reading 1430

Probation Act, bill to amend, Mr. Wishart, first reading 1430

Sheriffs Act, bill to amend, Mr. Wishart, first reading 1431

Fire Marshals Act, bill to amend, Mr. Wishart, first reading 1431

Registry Act, bill to amend, Mr. Wishart, first reading 1431

Homes for the Aged and Rest Homes Act, bill to amend, Mr. Yaremko, first reading.... 1432

Ontario Producers, Processors, Distributors and Consumers Food Council Act, 1962-1963, bill to amend, Mr. Stewart, first reading 1432

Question to Mr. Auld re recreational facilities, Mr. Nixon 1432

Questions to Mr. Bales re strike at Canada Sandpapers Ltd., Mr. Nixon 1433

Question to Mr. Brunelle re the J. J. McFadden mill closedown, Mr. MacDonald 1433

Question to Mr. Brunelle re hydro situation in Sultan, Mr. MacDonald 1433

Questions to Mr. Gomme and Mr. Brunelle re Indian reservation near Gogama, Mr. Martel 1433

Questions to Mr. Brunelle re the report of the forestry study unit, Mr. T. P. Reid 1434

Question to Mr. Dymond re asbestos pollution, Mr. Ruston 1434

Questions to Mr. Stewart re appointment of vegetable inspector, Mr. Jackson 1434

Questions to Mr. Rowntree re Clairtone shares, Mr. Shulman 1434

Question to Mr. Brunelle re Norply mill at Nipigon, Mr. Stokes 1435

Statement re grant to Grey-Bruce livestock co-operative, Mr. Stewart 1435

Question to Mr. Gomme re the Wanapitae River bridge, Mr. Martel 1435

Estimates, Department of Highways, Mr. Gomme, continued 1436

On notices of motion No. 25 and No. 14, Mr. Potter, Mr. Davison, Mr. Trotter, Mr. Gisborn, Mr. Deacon 1454

Recess, 6 o'clock 1462

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

MONDAY, APRIL 1, 1968

The House met at 2:30 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: Today we have with us as visitors to the Legislature, students from the following schools: in the east gallery from St. Clement's school, Toronto, and St. Christopher's separate school, Clarkson; and in the west gallery from Winchester senior public school, Toronto and Our Lady of Perpetual Help separate school, Toronto. At 3:15 in the west gallery, we shall be joined by pupils from St. Alfred school, St. Catharines.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

I beg to inform the House that the Clerk has received and laid upon the table returns from the general election of 1967 and by-elections since the general election of 1963.

Presenting reports.

Introduction of bills.

THE PUBLIC COMMERCIAL VEHICLES ACT

Hon. I. Haskett (Minister of Transport) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Public Commercial Vehicles Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Speaker, this bill to amend The Public Commercial Vehicles Act contains significant provisions to make the Act more meaningful in the light of progress and changing conditions in the field of transportation for compensation by motor vehicles.

A new principle has been introduced in the licensing of freight forwarders by highway. Although the freight forwarder performs a service to the public almost identical to the common carrier, his responsibility to the general public has not been defined. The proposed amendment will give the general public the same protection as is given in respect of the common carrier. Specific examples would be the requirement to issue a bill of lading and to file proof of insurance in the event of loss, destruction or damage to the cargo.

There are amendments that will strengthen the sections of the Act which control the use of leasing of vehicles, which has been used in recent years as a means of circumventing the Act.

There is a provision exempting the operators of dump trucks in the transportation of gravel and related types of aggregate, as well as road building materials from the necessity of proving public necessity and convenience before the Ontario highway transport board.

In view of the temporary nature of such trucking contracts, this requirement has placed a burden and a restriction on the trucker which has not provided any benefit to the public interest. Dump truck operators in the transportation of such materials, will continue to be required to comply with the other provisions of the Act, such as proof of insurance.

In addition to these requirements, it is intended to require such operators to file proof of mechanical fitness in respect of the vehicles being operated under the operating licence.

It is also proposed to amend the penalty provisions of the Act to increase the minimum penalty from $20 to $50. This fine has not been changed since 1923.

THE MOTOR VEHICLE ACCIDENT CLAIMS ACT

Hon. Mr. Haskett moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Motor Vehicle Accident Claims Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Speaker, under the Ontario rules of practice, an infant, that is any person under 21 years of age being sued for damages occasioned by a motor vehicle, must be represented by a guardian *ad litem*. The guardian is charged with the duty of protecting the interests of the infant.

In respect of an uninsured infant defendant, the proposed amendment removes the requirement of appointing a guardian *ad iltem*

on the basis that the infant's interests are protected under The Motor Vehicle Accident Claims Act.

THE RAILWAYS ACT

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Minister of Municipal Affairs) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Railways Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, these amendments are similar to amendments made to the federal Railway Act in 1967.

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to provide for the administration of justice.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, this is the main bill which provides for the takeover of the administration of justice costs, particularly on the facilities or the facilities side. I have a number of bills which are involved and which are companion bills to this measure which are in a way small amendments—they are brief—I would like the leave of the House to introduce these and then speak generally to the matter.

THE CORONERS ACT

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Coroners Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

THE COUNTY COURTS ACT

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The County Courts Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

THE COUNTY JUDGES ACT

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The County Judges Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

THE CROWN ATTORNEYS ACT

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Crown Attorneys Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

THE JURORS ACT

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Jurors Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

THE CROWN WITNESSES ACT

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Crown Witnesses Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

THE DIVISION COURTS ACT

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Division Courts Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

THE JUSTICES OF THE PEACE ACT

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Justices of the Peace Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

THE LAND TITLES ACT

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Land Titles Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

THE PARTNERSHIPS REGISTRATION ACT

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Partnerships Registration Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

THE JUDICATURE ACT

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Judicature Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

THE PROBATION ACT

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Probation Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

THE SHERIFFS ACT

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Sheriffs Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

THE FIRE MARSHALS ACT

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Fire Marshals Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

THE REGISTRY ACT

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Registry Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, all of the bills which I have just introduced represent those amendments which are necessary for the assumption by the province of the cost of the administration of justice. In order that these bills might be dealt with together and within the context of this overall programme, I have taken care that the bills themselves deal only with matters relative to the programme, namely, the assumption of the cost of the administration of justice.

It may well be, Mr. Speaker, that other bills will be dealt with by this Legislature in respect of the same statutes, but these other bills will deal with those matters of substance and principle which may be relevant to the bill, but which may not be relevant to the cost of administration as contemplated in this particular programme.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that this will be more convenient to the hon. members of this House and they will avoid the complexities that might arise if all of these bills dealt with matters of substantive law, as well as the matters of the assumption of the cost.

Perhaps the most important bill, and the one bill which is entirely new, is the bill intituled, An Act to provide for the administration of justice. This bill, Mr. Speaker, is designed to provide the basic framework within which our programme will be carried on and it does provide, in section 2, for the arrangement by which we will assume the responsibility for the accommodation that may presently be provided by the municipalities for the administration of justice.

I am sure all of the hon. members will recognize that this is a very extensive and involved programme which will have to be dealt with over a transitional period devised to meet the needs of both the municipalities and the province.

In essence, the statutory provision provides the authority, under which the Minister of Public Works, on behalf of the province and any municipality, may enter into an agreement for the acquisition or assumption by the province of the accommodation for the administration of justice within the municipality. In order that the status of this accommodation may be ensured during the transitional period, the same section provides that the municipality remains responsible for the provision of that accommodation until such time as an agreement is entered into with the province.

This provision is necessary in order that the administration of justice may be maintained on an orderly basis throughout our province, while we are progressing with the arrangement within the various municipalities throughout Ontario.

The province has developed the general terms of reference within which these individual arrangements will be accommodated to meet the situation in the municipalities, and the Treasurer of Ontario (Mr. Welch) will be making a statement respecting this policy within the near future. That policy will be consistent with the statutory authorization which I have outlined and which is dealt with in section 2 of the bill relating to the administration of justice.

Section 4 of this bill, Mr. Speaker, deals with the fines which will be paid to the Treasurer of Ontario in accordance with the policy which was announced at an earlier date and under which, the municipalities are being paid a per capita grant of 50 cents in lieu of the proportion of fines which might previously have been paid under the statutory provisions relative to the various courts. The balance of the provisions in this Act are rather mechanical in nature, and have been collected from other statutes of the province which will now be repealed in their present form, as found in The Administration of Justice Expenses Act.

All of these bills, Mr. Speaker, represent our resolution of the difficult administrative task in assuming the cost of administration of justice throughout the province, and I will, of course, be pleased to deal in detail with each particular bill at the appropriate time.

I did feel, however, that I might explain the general principles relative to this rather substantial number of bills.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Attorney General could advise us if these bills are to be referred to the legal bills committee?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I would think, Mr. Speaker, that this would be the proper manner in which to deal with this legislation.

THE HOMES FOR THE AGED AND REST HOMES ACT

Hon. J. Yaremko (Minister of Social and Family Services) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Homes for the Aged and Rest Homes Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, there are a number of provisions in this Act and the more important ones are as follows:

Councils of Indian bands are empowered to establish and maintain homes for the aged, and rest homes; certain provisions relating to residents are repealed.

The designation of the superintendent of a home or joint home is changed to administrator.

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might have the unanimous consent of the House to introduce an amendment to The Food Council Act of 1962-1963?

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps if the Minister would indicate—this is without notice, I presume.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes.

Mr. Speaker: If he would indicate to the House what is in the amendment, then it might be easier for us to deal with it.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: It is a very simple amendment; it just provides that a quorum of the food council should consist of three members of whom one shall be the chairman or vice chairman, and the purpose of the amendment is that we would like to enlarge the food council's present membership. Because of their duties and responsibilities, they cannot always be at a meeting and I would like to take care of this technicality.

Mr. Speaker: Has the Minister the unanimous consent of the House to introduce this bill?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and hon. members.

ONTARIO PRODUCERS, PROCESSORS, DISTRIBUTORS AND CONSUMERS FOOD COUNCIL ACT, 1962-1963

Hon. Mr. Stewart moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Ontario Producers, Processors, Distributors and Consumers Food Council Act, 1962-1963.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the leader of the Opposition would place his question to the Minister of Tourism and Information, who has to get away.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Yes, I will do that, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to ask the Minister of Tourism and Information if he plans any action on the recommendation from his study committee to develop recreational facilities in the lower Grand River; and does he plan to consult with the federal Department of Transport in implementing these recommendations?

Hon. J. A. C. Auld (Minister of Tourism and Information): Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. leader of the Opposition for asking this question.

First of all, I may say that I believe the report to which he refers is one prepared by the research branch of my department at the request of the Niagara-Iroquois tourist council which we, of course, support.

Perhaps I could acquaint the leader of the Opposition with some of the background related to the studies of recreational use of our waterways in Ontario. Several months ago a joint study committee representing departments of the Dominion government and the provincial government was set up to study the recreational potential and uses of the Rideau waterway. A preliminary report of this committee is now at hand, and it includes proposals for widening the scope of its enquiry to include other waterways; this proposal is now being considered by my colleague, the hon. Minister of Transport of Canada. From these studies we expect to evolve the policy for recreational development on these waterways, and to delineate areas of jurisdiction between the various departments of the governments of Canada

and of Ontario. I would add, however, that The Department of Tourism and Information itself is not considering the expansion of our basic research and promotional functions to include physical development of recreational facilities on waterways in Ontario.

Mr. Nixon: We may have an opportunity to discuss the matter in the estimates since I know a colleague of the Minister is involved through the conservation authority.

I would like to ask at this time a question of the Minister of Labour. Can the Minister report what progress his department has been able to achieve in the settlement of a strike at Canada Sandpapers, Plattsville?

Hon. D. A. Bales (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, in reply to the question of the hon. leader of the Opposition, the department sponsored a meeting between the parties on March 7. We were unable to bring the parties to agreement at that time. Since then, their respective positions have not been significantly altered and consequently settlement has been impossible to achieve. The conciliation branch is continuing to watch the situation with a view to bringing the parties together at the earliest opportunity.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, if I might ask the Minister—do his officials take any initiative in this or do they wait to be asked by one side or the other to use their good office?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Speaker, we attempt to take initiative in a variety of ways. I can appreciate the member's concern and we are trying to keep in close touch with the matter.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Lands and Forests. What action is the Minister taking to meet the situation which will be faced by many communities in the Blind River area in light of the closing down of operations of J. J. McFadden Co. at the end of 1968?

Hon. R. Brunelle (Minister of Lands and Forests): Mr. Speaker, in reply to the question from the hon. member for York South: The Department of Lands and Forests is most anxious to assist in every possible way to help the people of Blind River and area when the J. J. McFadden mill closes down. Efforts are being made to encourage new wood-using industries into the area, and we will continue this promotion as much as possible. I have met with the mayor and council of Blind River, along with some of my colleagues, with the result that studies are presently being made to see just how we can assist them.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, if I might ask the Minister a supplementary question: Does the department take any action in light of the situation, such as exists in Sultan where Domtar Newsprint ceased operation at the end of 1967 and have announced that they will not be providing electricity to the town after April 30? In other words, they are the sole source of electricity, and as of April 30 the town is faced with a blackout and everybody must move out in advance. Does the department, or any other department that the Minister is aware of, take action to cope with that kind of a situation?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Speaker, I am aware. This problem was brought to my attention—I believe it was last fall—and I have communicated with the chairman of The Ontario Hydro Electric Commission and have brought it to his attention. I understand there have been negotiations with Hydro along with the assistance of our department. Just where it stands, I do not know, but I would be pleased to let the hon. member know just where negotiations are.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): A two-part question for the Minister of Highways: Who is responsible for looking after the road leading to the Indian reserve north of Gogama and will the Minister instruct his department to give immediate attention to the road leading to the reserve to make it usable so that the Indians do not have to pack their food on their backs into the reserve?

Hon. G. E. Gomme (Minister of Highways): Mr. Speaker, the answer to the first question is: This road is the responsibility of the department of Indian affairs. Its expenditures are through the municipal roads section and we subsidize it 50 per cent. The answer to the second question: The department of Indian affairs, in conjunction with The Department of Highways, are going to conduct a study for the purpose of establishing a new road between the reservation and the new Highway 144.

Mr. Martel: A question of the Minister of Lands and Forests: Because Indians living on the reserve, north of Gogama, must pack their food on their backs into the reserve because the road to it is impassable by car, will the Minister instruct his staff in Gogama to use the equipment at their disposal to truck food to the Indians three or four times a week until the road is repaired?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Speaker, in reply to the hon. member's question, the road to the Indian reserve north of Gogama is, as it is each year at this break-up time, impassable. This road, I understand, is maintained by The Department of Highways through an agreement with the department of Indian affairs. Our staff, that is the Lands and Forests staff, at Gogama, have been instructed to ensure that no family suffers hardship as a result of the difficulty in securing provisions. As well, may I add, I am having the situation drawn to the attention of the department of Indian affairs.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests, notice of which has been given. In view of the statement of the Minister on the report of the forestry study unit, issued by him on March 28:

1. Will the Minister indicate what recommendations have been implemented?

2. What recommendations are under active study?

3. What recommendations will be implemented in the next 12 months?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Speaker, in reply to the hon. member for Rainy River, of the 70 recommendations contained in this condensation report of the forestry study unit, the department has already implemented the following recommendations: 1, 2, 3, 5, 7, 11, 13, 15, 16, 18, 28, 29, 30, 32, 34, 36, 37, 39, 46, 54, 57, 59, 60, 67, 68, and 69.

In reply to question 2, all the remaining recommendations are still under very active study. In reply to question 3, the following recommendations will be implemented as soon as the necessary provisions can be made to permit them to be put into practice effectively. Numbers 6, 21, 27, 31, 40, 42, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 58, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65 and 66.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Health. In view of the widespread use of asbestos in more than 3,000 ways, and as reported in the *Commercial Letter* of the Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce for March, 1968, and because of the impressive research published by the University of Miami school of medicine indicating a strong relationship between asbestos and the incidence of lung cancer, what steps is the Minister taking to outlaw asbestos spray guns and to restrict asbestos pollution from vehicle brake linings?

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, this is an area that has been of concern to our industrial hygiene section for a long time. The occupational health service of our department has for several years been conducting periodic chest X-rays of some 2,500 men in Ontario who work with asbestos in various occupations, including the industry and the manufacture of brake linings. Our industrial hygiene engineers work closely with The Department of Labour to ensure that dust concentrations in industry are kept at lower than currently accepted threshold limit values. There is not sufficient evidence to date, in our opinion, to justify prohibiting the use of asbestos spray guns or of asbestos brake linings, nor do we know of any national or state jurisdiction that is considering such action.

Mr. D. Jackson (Timiskaming): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Agriculture and Food. Has a fruit and vegetable inspector been appointed for the New Liskeard area?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: The answer is "no", Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Jackson: Mr. Speaker, will the Minister permit a supplementary question? When does he anticipate appointing an inspector?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, just as soon as we can get a qualified man for the job. We have not been able to find the experienced type of man for the job as yet.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs, notice of which has been given. When will the report of the Ontario securities commission study into trading in shares of Clairtone by insiders be completed, and a report of this study is available?

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I am unable at this time to give any date, nor indeed can I give any assurance that the report will be made public. For example, under section 114 of The Securities Act the court may order the Ontario securities commission to take action in lieu of the company in a case where after 60 days the company refuses to commence proceedings when there is an allegation of improper insider trading. It would not be proper for the commission at this time to release any information on the matter.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day—

Mr. Speaker: Would the Minister please wait unit we finish the questions? The member for Thunder Bay.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Mr. Speaker, I have two questions for the Minister of Lands and Forests.

Will the Minister assure Messrs. Bill Astrum and Roy Worne, of South Porcupine, who cut timber for the clearance of right of way on Highway 129 between Chapleau and Thessalon, that they will be paid for cutting fees for work done under permit No. 6095?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Speaker, may I take this as notice? I hope to have the reply for him tomorrow.

Mr. Stokes: I have another question for the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests.

In view of the recommendations regarding integrated logging operations, made in the report of the foresty study unit of 1967, and if no progress is apparent in attracting a buyer for the Norply mill at Nipigon, will the Minister assure the people of Nipigon that these recommendations will be implemented so that the local plywood mill may be reopened.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Speaker, in reply to the hon. member for Thunder Bay, while we cannot guarantee that the Norply mill will be reopened, we have indicated to several prospective purchasers that the department would assist in negotiating a suitable log supply with other local industries.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Yorkview.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Speaker, I have a point of personal privilege. Last Friday we had a debate on the subject of automobile insurance, and I have a copy of the *Globe and Mail,* Saturday, March 30, 1968. It is discussing that debate and it says this:

> —the Liberal-New Democratic Party motions calling for an improved system of compensation for those involved in automobile accidents. The NDP motion also asked that the system be administered by a private agency.

There must have been a Tory gremlin in the typesetter here or something but, of course, what the motion said was that there should be a public agency administering this plan.

Mr. Speaker: The Minister of Agriculture and Food.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day I wish to announce that a $20,000 grant to assist the Grey-Bruce livestock co-operative in rebuilding and extending the Wiarton sale yards has been approved. This assistance is provided for under The Agricultural Rehabilitation and Development Act. The federal and provincial governments share equally in the cost of this assistance. Total cost of this project is estimated at $40,000, with half of the money to be raised locally and the remainder provided under ARDA on a dollar for dollar basis.

Plans for the renovation and extension of the Wiarton facilities have been prepared and with this announcement it is expected work will begin very shortly, in order that the yards will be fully ready and operative in time for the co-operative's 1968 sales. Supervision of this project will be the responsibility of the rural development officer of the ARDA branch of The Ontario Department of Agriculture and Food, located in that area. The Grey-Bruce yard is one of the most important livestock marketing facilities of its kind in the province. It serves some 825 members of the co-operative in the two counties of Grey and Bruce. In 1967 this co-operative held four sales in which over 7,000 head of cattle were auctioned for a total return of $1,353,910. It is the second consecutive year that sales through the yard exceeded the million dollar mark. The Grey-Bruce livestock co-operative limited was organized in 1952 to meet a need for co-ordinated marketing facilities for feeder cattle in this very predominantly beef production area.

Mr. Speaker: The Minister of Highways.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a statement regarding the subject brought up in the House recently by the hon. member for Sudbury East. The matter was in regard to the Wanapitae River bridge on Highway 17, east of Sudbury. I am pleased to announce that repairs to this bridge have now been completed. All major repairs were finished on March 18, 1968, and other minor repairs which caused one way traffic on the structure for varying periods during each day have been accomplished between March 18 and last Friday, March 29. As of 5 p.m. on Friday, March 29, 1968, the bridge was totally repaired and is now permanently open to two way traffic.

I would also mention that all other bridges of a similar design which were built in the same period, 1938—as the Wanapitae bridge

—are being checked by our bridge maintenance engineers to ensure that similar conditions do not exist as were found east of Sudbury. To date we have not found any other bridges which have suffered in a similar manner.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Kitchener.

Mr. J. R. Breithaupt (Kitchener): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day I would like to thank you for your kind permission in allowing me to have delivered to the desk of each of the hon. members a new brochure which we have prepared in the city of Kitchener. This has been sponsored by the Kitchener chamber of commerce, and under their direction, the managing director of the chamber, Mr. Archie Gillies, has prepared and designed this brochure. Members will note that credit is given to The Department of Tourism and Information for their kind co-operation in allowing certain of the photographs which they have available to be used in this document.

This brochure, Mr. Speaker, hopes to have as its goal a means of showing, especially to our new corporate citizens, the kind of city we have, and as well to show to other individuals and families who may choose to live in our community, the kind of community that we want to develop in our area. I hope that the hon. members will take advantage of looking through this brochure and visiting us in Kitchener soon.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The 30th order: House in committee of supply; Mr. A. E. Reuter in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF HIGHWAYS
(Continued)

On vote 903:

Hon. G. E. Gomme (Minister of Highways): Mr. Chairman, I would like to reply to the comments of the hon. member for Riverdale (Mr. Renwick), under item 1 of vote 903. He questioned the action taken by The Department of Highways in August, 1964, in respect of the collusive tendering practices of 13 road contractors bidding on road surfacing contracts. The term "road surfacing" used here refers to a process whereby an existing pavement is coated with asphalt and stone chips to rehabilitate the riding surface. It is more correctly referred to as "surface treatment".

Following a review of the report of the restrictive trade practices commission on road surfacing in Ontario, released in the summer of 1964, the Minister of Highways advised the 13 companies named in the report that they would not be allowed to bid on department contracts for a three-month period, because of the deceptive manner used by them in bidding on surface treatment contracts. The letter from the Deputy Minister to the companies involved, notifying them of the department's action, reads as follows:

Dear Sirs:

The Minister of Highways, the Hon. Charles S. MacNaughton issued a press statement under date of August 27, 1964, the first four paragraphs of which are quoted verbatim as follows.

"Without in any way prejudging the charges levied by the restrictive trade practices commission, it is clear to me that from the admissions made by contractors named in the report, those firms acted in a deceptive manner when bidding on certain contracts of the department.

For this reason and as provided in the pre-qualification procedures I have ruled that pending further action by the Minister of Justice, contractors named in the report by the restrictive trade practices commission will be assessed a 100 per cent penalty for a period of three months. At the end of this period the situation will again be reviewed.

A 100 per cent penalty means that the companies named and their associated companies will not be able to bid on Department of Highways contracts during the period mentioned.

The effective date with respect to the direction I have given will be the date of the tabling in the House of Commons by the Minister of Justice of the report of the restrictive trade practices commission."

Therefore, in accordance with the pre-qualification procedures, the department has made a 100 per cent reduction in the qualification rating of your firm and a 100 per cent reduction in the qualification rating of any associated companies.

The effective covering period of this penalty will be from August 10, 1964 to November 11, 1964 inclusive, and this will therefore affect the DHO tender openings Nos. 20 to 33 inclusive and any invitation

bids within the same calendar period aforementioned.

Yours very truly,
A. T. C. McNab
Deputy Minister

Mr. Chairman, I would draw particular attention to the basis upon which this action was taken. The letter specifically states that the action was taken in respect of the deceptive manner used by the companies when bidding on certain contracts of the department. It was not the intent of the Minister to impose a penalty which could punish the companies in respect of the alleged unlawful agreement to lessen competition. The imposition of such a penalty is properly the responsibility of the courts following a successful prosecution by the federal authorities responsible for the administration of The Combines Investigation Act.

I would also direct attention to the Minister's statement that "at the end of this period the situation will again be reviewed". When the three-month period expired no further conclusive proceedings had occurred, and there was, therefore, no basis upon which further action could be taken. In fact it was not until November 27, 1967, that the final appeal of the case was dealt with by the Supreme Court of Canada. This final appeal confirmed the decision of the Ontario court of appeal. In the judgment of the Ontario court of appeal the following statement was made:

> It has not been suggested that the respondents took any measures by agreement or otherwise to restrict in any manner whatever the sources of supply of asphalt, oil, gravel, sand or stone chips or to impede the free flow of these products to consumers. Nor is there any basis for contending that the ready availability of transportation facilities at standard rates for the movement of these products was affected in the slightest degree by any act or omission of the respondents. Nothing done or omitted by them resulted in an enhancement of the cost of these commodities or of the means of transporting them so as to enable the respondents to frustrate the efforts of potential competitors not affiliated with their groups.

Although the Ontario court of appeal pointed out that the actions of the companies prosecuted, "were completely devoid of business ethics", the decision of the court did not reveal any new area in which the department would be justified in taking further action. The actions of the companies referred to by the court as being devoid of business ethics were the deceptive bidding practices which were the basis of the department's action in denying the companies the opportunity to bid on department contracts for a three-month period.

However, the department's actions were not restricted to the suspension of the opportunity to bid for three months. The department noted the comment made in the report of the restrictive trade practices commission on road surfacing in Ontario, at page 27, as follows:

> It is true that the knowledge and experience of the engineers and officials of The Department of Highways of Ontario and the common sense of municipal governments exercised an important restraint on the road surfacing contractors. Even where competition was eliminated in effect, no contractor would be likely to submit a bid calculated to win the award of a contract, which by comparison with last year's costs, or similar bids submitted in other areas, would be unreasonably high. Equally, a ceiling on the tender amounts for seal coating by the spray method was set by the poised competition of companies distributing compound aggregates such as Dix Seal. If prices became too high contracts could be lost to the newer, more expensive processes.
>
> On the other hand unquestionably, both The Department of Highways and the municipalities were led to award surfacing contracts at prices higher than they would have in circumstances of normal competition among the spray companies.

And I would interrupt the quote at this point to draw attention to the fact that this conclusion is contrary to the finding of the Ontario court of appeal previously quoted. Continuing with the quote:

> The system of assigning territories, highway districts and municipal accounts was rendered the more false by courtesy tenders. This illusion of competition was calculated to lull the customer into thinking that it had the benefit of careful bidding in an open market where sufficient competitive supply would keep prices to a fair minimum.

The department consulted with federal officials involved in the investigations under The Combines Investigation Act and asked for their comment on the department's tendering procedures. We were advised that

in cases where the sort of practices uncovered in the road surfacing case are involved, there are no means known for combatting them other than vigorous investigation and enforcement of The Combines Investigation Act whenever information becomes available which affords reason to believe they are being employed.

Notwithstanding the apparent difficulties involved in controlling collusion bidding, the department took steps which it is hoped will make it more difficult for contractors to deceive the department. An estimating division was established in the department, staffed with personnel highly qualified in all respects of road construction tendering practices. This division maintains a constant statistical analysis of prices being bid in various areas of road building. It pre-estimates the value of contracts being called by the department and reviews all bids submitted to determine whether low bids are reasonable bids for the work. In a proper case it would recommend against the award of the contract. In order to reduce the opportunity for contractors to arrange for a division of contracts amongst themselves, the department's practice of releasing the award schedule of contracts to be called was discontinued.

Mr. Chairman, it has been suggested that the three month suspension was not a significant penalty. In reply to this, I would point out that during the three-month period in question, 132 contracts, with a value in excess of $24 million were awarded. Not only were the 13 companies prevented from bidding on any of these contracts, but they were also prevented, during this period, from becoming a sub-contractor on any department contract regardless of when it was awarded.

Since surface treatment contracts are usually called in the spring, only one of the 132 contracts awarded during this period was for the type of work involved in the collusive bidding practices. However, much of the other work called was of a type they would bid or work on as sub-contractors and it did include 30 contracts for winter maintenance, a type of work in which many of these companies are particularly interested.

In the 1963-64 fiscal year the 13 companies were awarded $6,530,841 in contracts by the department. In the fiscal year 1964-65, during which the suspension was in effect, the 13 companies were awarded only $4,707,927, a decrease of 28 per cent.

The above, in my opinion, clearly indicates that the penalty imposed by the department was significant and meaningful, once again keeping in mind that the penalty was imposed in respect to the deceptive bidding practices and not as a penalty in respect of the alleged unlawful agreement to lessen competition.

For the information of the House, the penalty was imposed by the department under the department's system for prequalifying contractors. This system is unique in Canada. Originally introduced in 1957, it was designed by the department working in conjunction with the Woods Gordon firm of management consultants. It was subsequently reviewed by the department and that firm in 1962. Although the department liases with a committee of the Ontario road builders association in respect of changes in the system, I wish to emphasize that the introduction and administration of the system was and is entirely within the hands of department officials. The Ontario road builders association plays no part whatsoever in the imposition of penalties.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I would like to state again that the department's actions were designed to deal with a deceptive bidding practice. The action taken was appropriate to the facts known at the time the action was taken. Subsequent judicial review has not revealed any new facts justifying further punitive action by the department.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Mr. Chairman, I intend to refer to a number of reports including the report that has just been mentioned, and to go into it in some length, and into some rather interesting paragraphs not referred to by the Minister.

First of all, with respect to the Department of Justice in Ottawa, I think we are all aware, or, if we are not, we ought to become aware, of the rather restricted staff and budget that these people operate on in investigating complaints of this kind, with respect to restrictive practice, price fixing, monopolistic structures. All the way round, therefore, it is severely limited in what it may or may not do.

The report itself, Mr. Chairman, like most of the reports of this kind, is a shocking document as to the chicanery and deviousness employed by the individuals involved in reaching their gainful ends. The director, on page 2 of the reports, states that his summary and conclusion of the statement of evidence is as follows:

That the group of companies named were parties to an agreement to submit fictitious tenders for road surfacing to their customers, higher prices than those decided upon by the member of the group designated to obtain particular jobs and, secondly, the participants enjoyed competitive advantages due to location in many of the most heavily populated areas of the province and in these areas they recognized each other's vested rights to secure the contracts for road resurfacing.

On page 3 is contained a list of 12 companies, some of them extremely well known in this province, who participated in this collusive enterprise.

Mr. Chairman, for years we have heard as members of the public on hearsay and under suspicion, I am afraid, without being able to place our fingers to any extent on the cause, of a division of geographical territories among contractors. This is with respect to the bidding that they do, not only with respect to The Department of Highways but to townships and municipalities also. The boys really have it rigged.

It is a curious thing that certain firms seem to get the bulk of the contracts over the whole span, not just road surfacing—the whole span of paving and construction contracts in a particular geographical area. This is true again with respect to the highway traffic department, I should say, The Department of Highways itself, and with respect to the municipalities throughout this province. This practice is nefarious, costs the public a great deal of money and must be brought to an end.

In going through this report, I took the time off over the week-end to go back into the accounts of the public accounts of the province of Ontario ending on March 31, 1962, to check out a number of these contracts. Having about 50 projects going at the present time, Mr. Chairman, I was not able to make a completely thorough check on these 12 companies as to their various awards in this particular period of time and checking it against subsequent years as to what happened under these contracts.

However, as far as I have been able to get to date, according to those budget reports, the K. J. Beamish Company on page G16 were awarded 16 contracts. Of these contracts, two fall into line with the statements of the restrictive practices committee. The statement to which I refer is contained on page 11 of the federal government report. It reads as follows:

The DHO contracts to be tendered on for the year were discussed—

This is at a meeting of those firms on June 7, 1961.

—agreement was reached on the divisions that would be recognized as the territories of each contractor and so listed on a sheet introduced in evidence as serial 791. The Riverside Construction was to have the Chatham and London district; Cornell Construction—Stratford; Grey-Wellington—Owen Sound; Beamish—Toronto; Ryder Paving—Port Hope and Bancroft; Beamish Construction again—Kingston; Ottawa was followed by McFarlane and Roads Resurfacing and a question mark, evidently indicating that no agreement had been reached on the Ottawa division.

Again, referring back to the public accounts, sure enough the Beamish Construction Company under contract 6-571 obtained the road to surface treatment contract, with respect to the Toronto district, for $31,138 and some odd cents. Again, in accord with what the restrictive practices commission has disclosed, they got the Kingston district contract under number 61-574 for $34,410.

Against this, I thought it just as well to check the 1965-66 public accounts in the province and on page H15 or again—all these years later, I notice that Beamish has still got the Kingston district under 65-570 for $22,339. Also, it has apparently picked up another district from one of its competitors—Ryder's used to control the Port Hope district, according to the agreement. Under contract 65-587 the Beamish Construction Company consummated this work in the amount of $38,226.

The other firm which I found rather interesting was W. A. Ryder Paving Ltd., and in 1961 budget public accounts it is indicated that they were given five contracts of all kinds. In one of them, contract number 61-573, they were awarded the Port Hope district in the amount of approximately $31,400. Again, under contract 61-576 they were given, in accord and in line with what is said in the commission report, the Bancroft district for surface treatment in the amount of $57,788.

In the subsequent year 1965-1966, which is as deep as I have been able to go thus far, they got the New Liskeard district in this form of contract and they also picked up the Hamilton district at that time.

While it stays in my mind, may I point out, Mr. Chairman, that in the last public

accounts book that we have in our possession, the accounts book for 1967, an eminently sensible practice—and the only fair method of information, I suggest, that has been followed throughout these years has been discontinued, and I would seek to prevail upon the hon. Minister to bring that practice back into being.

What I am referring to is, taking the public accounts for March 31, 1967 at page (i) 20—I checked out Beamish but I cannot find out from there, as opposed to all previous years, what the nature of the contract was. The department has descended to simply giving contract numbers.

I may say to the hon. Minister if this is going to be the practice of his department then we on this side of the House will call for a complete accounting of every one of these numbers. We will want to know, as in previous years, and has been the practice of this department for many years, precisely what is being done under each of these contracts so that we may be able to give supervision to the extent possible of the affairs of this province in this "pork barrel" portfolio.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lawlor: These road surfacing contracts are not great in figures nor great in sums of money. They are—if I may use the term—"peanuts", as compared to the totality of the contracts being given to these various firms and the totality of the contracts under highway contract work. Nevertheless, we cannot help, in the light of the facts that have been presented, as they have gone through the courts and been reviewed in the courts, in no instance, either at Mr. Justice Jessup's level or at the court of appeal, have they in any way denied that all the practices, all the deviousness, all the tricks of the game were not in operation.

They have stated their opinion quite conclusively as to the morality of this whole thing, as the hon. Minister has indicated and which I will read at greater length.

But apart from that the cases obviously went off on a technicality. The technicality, namely, that under our combines legislation for this country, servicing of all kinds is not within the ambit of the statute. And so the court in its wisdom deemed this to be primarily servicing, *pace* the rather intelligent and deeply reasoned arguments of Mr. Justice Laskin in the matter—which I would think for any person reading it would have great weight—Laskin would have convicted them, as you know. On the other side of the fence in this business of servicing, they said that goods and chattels and various articles were not involved and therefore the statute did not apply.

There is another area in which one of these companies escaped any liability—in any event, one of the companies went into amalgamation—and apparently, if a company dissolves itself, or builds into a merger relationship with another company it can no longer be stigmatized with criminal proceedings and drops out of liability. What a wonderful device this must be, in some instances, for companies to set themselves up and enter into collusive practices only to dissolve themselves and escape criminal proceedings.

The way in which this thing was done is worthy, I think, of being brought to the full attention of the House. With your permission, Mr. Chairman, I shall take some time to read the section from the restrictive trade practices commission's report, as follows:

> In theory, at least, capable newcomers should be able to enter the field with a minimum of purchased equipment and respond to Department of Highways and municipal tender call. If he could underbid the established firms he would get work. In practice, however, a new concern met substantial obstacles to establishment in the industry. Unless a contractor owned a large percentage of the equipment needed and sufficient working capital, his chances of eventual success were small. Many who have tried to enter the field with rented equipment only, have failed in competition with the established firms which were generally substantially financed and equipped.
>
> One of the major causes of entry difficulty facing the new contractor was that he would have to be prepared to bid very low—at cost, or less, to secure the contract. The established firms were prepared to fight him concertedly and effectively. The method used was described as "policing the bidding". To police the bidding it was first of all necessary to know who the likely bidders on a contract would be. In most cases it was relatively simple for a contractor to find out who was expected to tender on a contract, since it was impossible to bid without a tender form setting forth the engineer's estimates of materials required.
>
> As regards the municipalities—

Departing from the quotation, I would ask the Minister to place under advisement that when his department is giving substantial sums to municipalities for this kind of work, or for any work, connected with highway development, one of the terms should be that these tenders be not made known that the firm which draws the tender forms and which submits the tender be not made known to the other tenderers.

As the Minister indicated a few moments ago, his department, in practice, now does this. I continue to read from the report:

> As regards the municipalities, the information as to what firms have requested tender forms was available at the office of the township or the county. As regards The Department of Highways, Mr. G. M. Bishop of Municipal Spraying and Oiling said, "The Department of Highways has a set pattern and they have published lists of people picking up the tenders and it is in their room and available for anybody to see."
>
> The availability of this information was of considerable aid to a contractor in protecting a division or a municipality which he regarded as his own account.
>
> Policing the bidding, in effect, meant that when an outsider really seemed likely to bid, the man who had the consent of his fellow contractors that a contract was to be his, would see to it that the outsider did not get the contract unless the newcomer was prepared to bid at cost, or at less.
>
> A good example of policing the bidding can be taken from the evidence of Mr. Bishop concerning the checklist, serial number 739, used to arrange for bids on tenders for the township of Essa. A photostat of this checklist will be found in appendix B. A checklist is a sheet on which is calculated the quotations the prospective successful bidder proposed to quote and the quotations he would ask other companies to submit. Serial number 739 is headed "Township of Essa" and then follow four vertical columns headed, MSO, Beamish, Bruell, Miller. In the MSO column appeared the prices MSO would quote for the supply and applications of these materials—sand, emulsions, mortar chips, limestone; and in the Beamish, Bruell and Miller columns, appeared varying higher unit prices which MSO asked these firms to quote for supply and application of these materials. Ordinarily, since these four firms were the only ones bidding in the township of Essa, Municipal Spraying and Oiling could depend on the high bids of the others, resulting in MSO being awarded the contract.
>
> However, Mr. Bishop discovered that Caswell Construction Co. Ltd. of Kirkland Lake had taken out tender forms on the work. He sent a representative of the company down to the municipal offices to attend the opening of the tenders. This man was equipped with two envelopes. One of these envelopes contained a tender form with the unit prices for him to get the contract—if no one beside Beamish, Miller, Bruell did—and a cheque for the security deposit which he would be required to deposit on the basis of these figures.
>
> The other envelope contained a tender form in which the unit prices were cut to the bare cost, and a deposit cheque calculated on the tender total. If, as he suspected, a tender was filed by Caswell Construction, then he would submit to the municipal authorities his lower tender envelope, which, since it was a tender at the minimum cost, would be sufficient to keep Caswell from getting the job. However, if it appeared that Caswell did not in fact intend to submit a tender, then the first tender form which he had made out—in the knowledge that the tenders being submitted by Miller, Beamish, Bruell, would be too high—would be placed in the envelope and submitted as MSO's bid.
>
> It is true that the filing of the low tender would mean that he would be doing the work at a price that would give him little or no profit. But in the long run, this trick was worth his time. This would indicate to Caswell Construction that there was no point in Caswell filing tenders to Municipal Spraying and Oiling accounts unless they were prepared for a number of years to bid very low to get them.

Now here comes the crowning insult.

> Incidentally, in the example cited, Caswell Construction, was the low bidder that won the contract despite the Mr. Bishop's second thought submission.

Connected with these things, incidentally, is another aspect in seeing to what lengths these people are prepared to go. There was another pooling agreement under an insurance form where each firm insured the other against loss. If they lost certain contracts, or were not the low bidder, or had to bid under the price, and would lose money by losing the contract, then there was a pool, 10 per cent of other profits from other contracts, which

the various firms could apply to reimburse themselves for any losses which they might suffer.

There is some interesting information under this heading, also, in the report. Now, Mr. Chairman, in the light of these facts, there are a number of questions that I would like to raise for the Minister.

Is there any reason, for instance, to believe that at the present time, and in the light of the figures that I gave with respect to the 1965 public accounts, that the practise in this branch, road surfacing, and the variety of other branches which are far more lucrative that a similar practise does not still continue? Also, is there any reason why the Minister has not at his disposal some statistical and investigative staff which would be operative and to which he could refer these matters, to the proper authorities in the last analysis, that is to the Department of Justice in Ottawa? I daresay that the Minister does nothing like this, and leaves it completely in the hands of the Ottawa authorities who are short staffed and underpaid. I would ask the Minister to take that under advisement.

The Minister has indicated that the tendering procedures have been altered and that is all to the good. I would think that the—to keep from the other contractors the information that someone else is bidding is absolutely crucial. Also, these tenders should be closed, a good period of days ahead of time, and any information whatever touching them be held secret pending the opening of the tenders, and certainly the practise we just heard about, whether at your level or at the municipal level, that is of people arriving on the scene at the time of the opening of the tenders, with two envelopes in their back pocket, is something that must be thoroughly discontinued. I would like assurances if possible, that the Minister will not only do that with respect to The Highways Department of this province, but in all municipalities of this province where monies from this province are being invested in the highways.

For my further information, and investigation, there is one further thing that I would ask the Minister to do for me if he will. I would like to have information in a single case for the purposes of testing this situation. Would the Minister consider letting me have the surface and resurfacing tenders and the successful bidders for say, the Stratford area for the years from 1961 up to and inclusive of the year 1968?

I have certain suggestions that I would like to make to the Minister, Mr. Chairman. It may not be feasible but at the same time, he might take it under advisement. In many of these contracts, the department has, in the past as has been disclosed, supplied the materials, and taken the whole basis of the supply materials completely out of the hands of the contractors. In the case of the asphalt and bituminous products, I understand, according to The Department of Justice report, that the department supplied them wholly; in the case of stone chips, in certain instances, indeed in the majority of cases they supply it. Why not the stone? The transportation itself, and the sand are sometimes supplied through the department so as to exercise certain controls over the costing and that sort of thing.

Secondly, Mr. Chairman, somewhere in the law reports—somewhere throughout the history of the case—it is mentioned that you operate a separate and distinct department doing your own road surfacing and resurfacing, somewhere in northern Ontario. I am wondering whether it might not, in the face of these practises, be possible for the Crown, for the Minister and his department to set up a separate and independent contracting agency for the purposes of doing just what you have been doing elsewhere, in order, that at odd times, and from time to time, you do the work yourself, so that you may get true and accurate figures of what it costs so to do.

These companies can bamboozle you quite nicely I suspect, despite the fact that you say that you have set up a statistical estimation department. I think that you have always had that.

I do not think it has ever been denied throughout the history of this case that such a department or group existed in your department.

Sir, that is not the answer, I think. If these people do not know how to compete, and sometimes I find ourselves in an anomalous position about these matters on this side of the House, particularly in the New Democrats. I think that we are more free-enterprising than what you are. We would at least introduce methods that would force their hand and make the market really determinatively free.

We would make them go into competition each with the other, if the instrument to that end was the necessity to set up a Crown company to test them, and to keep their prices in line, not operating full time, and not operating all the time, and not really operating in competition, but only as a talisman, or a check on the activities of the

private enterprise section of the economy. What is wrong with that? I would ask the Minister to place such matters under consideration. It has been done in other provinces, and it has worked successfully there, and it certainly was a way to save public money, under the circumstances that have been disclosed in these reports.

What has happened in effect, Mr. Chairman, is that the courts—through no fault of their own, but through the way that the legislation is at the present time—the courts in effect have granted these firms a licence to proceed any way they please in this matter, so far as and so long as they can bring themselves under the umbrella of the statute, or out of the loophole in the statute, and there is no prevention in the world as far as this practise is concerned. Under the law, they have no further fear of the law. There need be, far as they are concerned, no secrecy involved. They might quite openly and brazenly proceed with this practise, what control have you got over it now? You had always the shadow of the criminal code, of The Combines Investigation Act, and now that has been removed, the thing has become extremely dangerous to the taxpayers.

Mr. E. Dunlop (York-Forest Hill): The criminal code has not surely been removed?

Mr. Lawlor: Did you read the case? What we are afraid of, as I indicated earlier, is that while this sort of contract is small potatoes over against the totality, that once this sort of practise is under way, and the restrictive practises committee indicates just what happens in highway work.

Occasionally one of the group would act—this is on page 12:

> Occasionally one of the group would act as a central informant. The tenders submitted were clear to him to provide the selected low bids and the numbers slightly higher. The fictitious bids provided the illusion of competition, so that the local government or DHO would have little difficulty in awarding the contract to the chosen firm. This system to each other seems to have become so commonplace as to have become an accepted routine among some of the firms involved in this report.

If that is the case, and if they are going to do it with the small potatoes, why do they not climb into the saddles of the great? They undoubtedly do so, I suggest. That when the contracts, when the chips are really down—and not just the stone chips—the situation is that the large contracts—and some of the contracts that the Beamish Company has been handling over the past few years are such—in 1961 one of its contracts was about half a million dollars, another one was very close to that—that really makes it worthwhile.

And again, if it can be considered under the combines legislation that they escape through the loophole of services, rather than supply of material, in the transportation, selling or whatnot of the same, every inducement was given to these firms who would carry on in this way in any event, but to carry on even more so.

And with that in mind, I feel that the department should very seriously take up my second proposition, that some kind of independent check through your own department be arranged to keep this down.

Sir, the New Democratic Party in this House are very much disturbed and concerned about the particular nefarious practices involved here. I, when this matter came up, since the matter has been *sub judice* up till now, have not been able to discuss it. In the limited time at our disposal, we have not been able to go through it with a fine tooth comb, as is our responsibility and, for the next estimates, will be our responsibility, as to the allocation of contracts accorded to firms, and accorded to the districts which these firms seem to predominate in, and as to the various ways in which this predominance takes place.

I am giving the hon. Minister fair warning that we intend to make a very thorough winnowing of this chaff. We will cut out any of the chaff and bring it to the attention of this House, so that I would ask you to take this matter under the closest supervision. If the people of this province have been mulched in taxes to pay for collusive practices of which the department is not sufficiently cognizant, and of which it does not make itself aware by breaking down into territorial units various points of contact to watch these boys, then we will do it for them. Thank you very much.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Now answer the question.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Chairman, I might point out a few things to the hon. member. We do a number of contracts with our own forces under the same procedures as we would ask a contractor to operate under. We have

quite an extensive one on now in one of the districts in the north, which we are doing in just the way you referred to. And on all these contracts that we have, we have the independent checks made and a complete breakdown done by our own department.

I wondered, when you were making your speech, if you would be interested sometime, you and some of the other members of the House, in coming up to Downsview. We open our tenders on Wednesdays. I do not say that we could accommodate all the members of the House at one time, but if you would let me know of your interest and the probable time you would like to come, I would like you to come up and see the system which we use, because I think it would be a great help to you.

Mr. Chairman: Is vote 903 carried?

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Chairman, before we leave that vote, I know the Minister has taken into account what my colleague from Lakeshore has said, and I wonder whether or not the Minister could really give us some clear indication that competition is taking place in the bidding for contracts to be let by The Department of Highways. The kernel of the problem was, of course, the fact that by this collusive practice they were able to create for the department the illusion that there was competition.

Now when you look at the area of the contracts which were under consideration in this case, you find a very restricted area in which competition can take place, because if my reading of the particular cases is accurate—

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Pardon me. Do you mean location of the contractors when you say that?

Mr. J. Renwick: No. Then, of course, I want to find out what assurance you can give us that competition does now exist in this particular field of bidding for contracts. Because what I said was that there was the illusion of competition, when in fact there was none. I am not underestimating the difficulties of the problem. I would point out to you that so far as the asphalt, so far as the sand and limestone was concerned, so far as the transportation charges were concerned, they were all fixed.

I assume from the reading of this report that asphalt could not be obtained from any of the major oil companies except at fixed prices, and therefore it did not matter whether the department bought the asphalt, supplied it to the contractor, or the contractor bought it and transported it himself to the site, because of the fixed price.

So far as the sand and limestone chips were concerned, here too the gravel pit operators sold their materials at fixed prices. So far as the transportation was concerned, they were transported by bulk carrier or tanker truck in accordance with standard published tariff rates.

So you had the situation that where the court could not get at the matter because of the limitations of The Combines Investigation Act, and the court held that it was a contract for work and labour, you immediately have the situation where no matter who buys, if I read this correctly, you can only buy asphalt at a fixed price. You can only buy sand and limestone chips at a fixed price; you can only get them transported to sites at a fixed price.

One of the other areas that concerns me is that if they are just contracts for work and labour, then you have the strange anomaly that the only area in which these contractors can outbid one another is by reducing the labour costs. And I would be very interested to know under this type of contract what the going wage rates are that are paid for work on the highways? Because under this type of contract, apparently, it is only at the expense of keeping the wages down as low as possible that the bids can take place and that competition can exist.

I would like to know whether or not the department is doing anything about what would appear in the wording of this case to be a monopoly on the supply of the articles that went into the work to be done under the contract. I know that the Minister has given us—if I may turn to another point —this figure of 132 contracts at $24 million; that these 13 companies were precluded from bidding on during the period from August 10 to November 11, 1964. We still have not gotten anywhere near to the question which I asked and that is:

What is the extent of the penalty; what normally of those contracts would these 13 companies have won in the light of your long experience with these companies, and what would have been the profit of those companies had they been allowed to bid on them and got a certain proportion of them?

I would also like to know what were the number of contracts and what was the value of the contracts referable in the year 1964

to the contracts in 1961, where the conspiracy was operating so effectively that it got 100 per cent of those contracts? We are not interested in holding up the vote for a long period of time on this particular item. What we are anxious to find out, however, is just what, in fact, from the point of view of the public interest, does the department do in order to insure some sensation of competition, in fact, and not the illusion of competition.

What, in fact, are the prices which the department as buyers pay for asphalt, sand and limestone chips and for their transportation, and is it true that you cannot buy these items except at a fixed price? I realize there are a number of items that I have tried to cover. The last item I would like to cover is the question which I asked initially on Thursday night last and that is:

Did the department or The Attorney General's Department give any consideration to whether or not the department had a civil action against these companies for the recovery of the profit which they made as a group and shared as a group at the expense of the public interest?

Now this is not an easy question but it does not depend on whether or not a conviction was registered under the criminal code. A civil action is entirely separate and distinct, and in my view the government of the province of Ontario, if it really wished to do so, could take this kind of action in the court and either recover, or have the benefit for the future of the reasons of the court as to whether or not such a civil action existed. Because if it did exist, then it would be an added weapon available to insure that the public had the benefit of competition in this tremendous department of which you are charged with the responsibility of administering. Our concern is not that you do not do your best; our concern is simply how does such a department, dealing with a limited number of companies in the same field over a long period of time, avoid the collusive practices of all kinds to which my colleague, the member for Lakeshore, has drawn attention? This is what we are interested in, and I would appreciate it if the Minister would comment about those remarks.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Well, Mr. Chairman, I might thank the hon. member for his comments. They certainly are very worthwhile and instructive and we will analyze them very carefully. I may not be able to answer all your questions as they were given across here, but I am very positive, for the system which we use of pre-qualification and calling of contracts, that such a practice does not exist. We also call for bids on the asphalt, sand and stone as you refer to, and we get competitive bids on them. These are some of the things that I felt that if you, or any of the members would like to come up and see how this is handled on the day of the contracts are open or any time like that, that would be the best day for you to come. You would see the great variance in the competition and the bids that come in, and the way they are all handled and checked, and we think we have as foolproof a system as there can possibly be in handling these things now.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, would the Minister answer the one question?

Has any consideration been given to an action to recover from this group of companies the profit which they made by their collusive practices at the expense of the public purse?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Chairman, from our own investigation we could not find that they made a profit, so we did not feel there were any grounds to start any court action on this one case, and I may say we did not consult the Attorney General on it.

Mr. Chairman: Is vote 903 carried?

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, before we leave that, I do not know how credulous the Minister thinks that we can be. As I understand it, in having gone to this elaborate collusive conspiracy to create the illusion of competition, these companies made no profit out of the contracts which they got from the department. Now if that was the case, I would suggest that you look at the quality of the roads that are being built, because no company can remain in the business and 13 companies cannot remain in the business if, having gone to this elaborate façade to produce a profit and to share that profit, they made no profit.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: I meant to say excessive profit.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Chairman, my colleagues have covered this —the substance of it; I just want to make a brief comment. I want to suggest to the Minister that he and the government are not protecting the public interest. If you

have a conspiracy which has been documented to divide the province into areas and to share the contracts, it is certainly for no other purpose than to make excess profits. They are not going to, as the hon. member for Riverdale has just said, go through this elaborate procedure for the fun of it. They are doing it so that they can bleed the public treasury and get away with it, and that you, the protector of the public treasury, should not have seen fit to have examined the possibility of the recovery of that money to the public treasury, I find a bit incredible.

Indeed, Mr. Chairman, it begins to look as though the hon. Minister is not objecting to the existence of this bleeding of the public treasury, and I go back to the comment that was made years ago by Blair Fraser, when he wrote an article on "Our Illegal Elections" and he said "the heart and soul and spinal column of old party funds at the provincial level comes from those who get contracts from the government."

Mr. J. H. White (London South): You are living 30 years in the past.

Mr. MacDonald: I am not living in the past, I am dealing with facts at the moment. I am dealing with the facts as to how politics operate. Is it possible that the Minister was not interested in finding out where the excess profits went because they went into the Tory slush fund?

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): Show us your books.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, Mr. Chairman, do not let the Minister get up and think that we are going to buy his proposition that there were not excess profits. They were engaged in collusion to make excess profits, and if the Minister did not move to reclaim those excess profits for the treasury, he was not doing his job in protecting the public interest, and I am entitled to come to the conclusion that he did not do it because some of it went into the slush funds of the Tory party, because this is the tradition on which it is operated.

Hon. Mr Gomme: Mr Chairman, I wish to state very emphatically that we did examine all these, and for the information of the member, during the three years that the period of investigation went on the prices were the lowest that they had ever been for us.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, Mr. Chairman, my colleague from Lakeshore has documented how, even after this situation had been revealed, the same companies are getting the contracts, and they still have certain geographical areas sewn up. Sure, we need a real investigation into this. This is the underworld of politics; this is where the money comes from. Now, you boys on that side are very, very interested as to where we get our money to fight elections—

Mr. White: We know where it comes from.

Mr. MacDonald: Sure, it is open to the public.

Mr. White: It comes from Jimmy Hoffa.

Mr. MacDonald: It is open; it is not like Jimmy Hoffa; it is open—from the unions and our own members; we want—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: —to find out where the public interest is not being protected. We are entitled to suggest until you are willing to open up your sources to the public, that this is where you are getting some of yours.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): I would like to throw a little more light on it, or try to. The hon. Minister has said a very detailed examination was made for a period of three years. Would he please let the House know how much money was made and what profit was made by these companies during that period of time?

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: I could not give you the amount of profit. But what I said was "excess profit", and we checked the prices, and the prices that were bid were lower than they had been long before that period.

Mr. Shulman: If there is no excess profit, I gather that the Minister's investigation did look into how much profit there was. Is that correct? Or is he just guessing that there was no excess profit?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: No, Mr. Chairman, we are not guessing. Our investigation showed us that the figure for the work that was bid and done was lower than it had been at any of the other times.

Mr. Shulman: Well in that case, inasmuch as he has looked into the profit, would he mind giving us the figures? What was the profit?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Shulman: He said he investigated it. Let us see how good his investigation was.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Well I have tried to point out I do not think it would be possible for me to tell the profit that the contractor made, but from the bid prices, they were lower than they had been at any time previous to that, or since.

Mr. Shulman: I understand from the Minister, that he did not really find out what the profits were then?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: That is right, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Sudbury East.

Mr. Martel: Mr. Chairman, in my opening remarks on highways, I mentioned that I attempted to get the five-year plan of The Department of Highways to determine whether or not the plans were moving ahead according to schedule, with some pattern. I would like to ask the Minister why we, on this side, are not able to see the five-year plan ahead of time to determine this development.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Chairman, I am advised that it has never been the practice to make these plans available to anyone because, for one point, they may not be definite. There will have to be changes in certain lines and so on, but we have plans worked out whereby we take each year's work as it comes and work in sequence, one job after the other.

Mr. Martel: Yes, but how do we determine this is happening, this is the point. I would like to see what is happening. Granted, there are going to be changes and not everything is going through as scheduled, but I think we are still entitled to see this five-year plan in order to determine if progress is being made in a definite pattern.

Mr. Chairman: Does the Minister have any further comments?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: No, Mr. Chairman, only to say that it has not been the practice to make these public, but I will take this under advisement, and see if there is anything that can be done to accommodate the hon. member.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I just want to add a comment. I was most interested to learn from my colleague, when he was preparing his introductory comments, that he had found it impossible to get from the department, copies of the five-year programme.

I remember some seven, eight, nine, ten years ago—I have forgotten the exact date—when this government, with the propaganda flourish that makes Cecile B. DeMille look like a piker, released its 20-year plan as to how you were going to build highways in this province. And I suggest, Mr. Chairman, to the Minister that it is not his privilege to conduct the public business of this province in secrecy. You cannot, in effect, announce a 20-year plan and understandably break it down into five-year plans, and then play games with those five-year plans to suit your purpose.

Let me tell you a story, Mr. Chairman. I was very intrigued, about the second to last election, when I was in northwestern Ontario, that greatest "promiser" of all times—Leslie Frost—had just gone through the area. I think it was in the Fort Frances area that he had promised a bridge, or it was a new stretch of highway or something of this nature.

So I came back, and innocent-like, I called a man whose integrity I respected in The Department of Highways, and I said: "Look, is this highway a priority item? In other words, in your plans, 20-year or five-year, you name it—is this an item that is likely to be under consideration for the immediate future?" And he said, "No". And I said, "Well, Mr. Frost, last week, promised it for the next four years." And he at least maintained his integrity to say: "It isn't in the high priority."

Now, unless you are willing to cease playing games with 20-year plans; unless you are willing to announce a 20-year plan, and then to break it down into such groups as you want of five-year plans and make them public, you are operating the public business in secrecy and you are doing it as it suits your purpose politically, not in pursuit of the public interest. The public has no idea of when you are planning to finish a certain highway or to proceed with a certain area of public works.

The Minister has said that he is going to take it under advisement, but I give him fair warning, to take it under advisement is not just to forget about it, because we are going to look back to this. I think we in the Opposition—not only we in the Opposition, but the people of the province of Ontario—are entitled to know the programme that this government has for the foreseeable future, so

that we know what you are operating on. Bring it out on top of the table instead of under the table where you can play games with it when it suits your purpose.

Mr. Chairman: Is vote 903 agreed to?

Mr. Martel: No, Mr. Chairman.

I must go back and the reason I question this is: There is a highway being built, and all I have heard is that it is being built for aesthetic beauty, and this is Highway 144. Now, if we had the plans we would see where brushing was done many years ago in a different direction altogether; 15 miles of that highway had already been completed back to Lowphos Ore, a route which was much shorter. And, all of a sudden, the highway has changed, completely, rerouted from where people had brushed. I would like to know why. What possesses a department to move a highway 30 miles to the west, making it longer, after work has been done on that highway?

Mr. MacDonald: Who had the timber limits along the new route?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: I am advised that it was changed to better service the area.

Mr. Martel: At what increased cost to the ratepayers of Ontario? There was 15 miles already paved, and you could get to within eight miles of Westree. You could have moved all of your equipment in because there was a right of way. At how much greater cost to the citizens of Ontario, is that road going through now?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Chairman, I will have to get the answers on that relocation for the member.

Mr. T. Reid (Scarborough East): Mr. Chairman, is this the time to bring up the question of the Scarborough expressway? I would very much like to discuss this and have the Minister's views on it.

Mr. Chairman: No, I believe that comes under the capital item. Would that be vote 907?

Mr. T. Reid: Would it be under planning? The reason I ask for this, Mr. Chairman, is it seems to me that some of the items that have been discussed under this present estimate have been fairly wide ranging and I would like to bring this up as a function of the decision-making of the Minister.

Mr. Chairman: Well no, the particular item the member has mentioned certainly does not come under vote 903.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Chairman, that would be a Metro road.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, if I might ask the Minister, does that not necessitate a grant from his department, sir?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: That is right, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. T. Reid: Then is it not our responsibility too?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: It would be under capital.

Mr. T. Reid: Under capital?

Mr. Chairman: Under capital votes. The member for High Park.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, I must ask you a question, sir. When the point just brought up by the member for Sudbury East is answered at some later time and there is something in the answer that requires debate, will we be able to debate those points?

Mr. Chairman: I would say to the member that if the Minister has undertaken to provide any individual member with information and that particular member wants more information or to bring it up again, perhaps it could be placed under the questions before the orders of the day. But it could not be redebated in this particular estimate.

Mr. D. Jackson (Timiskaming): Mr. Chairman, I would protest your ruling. I have asked for some information under vote 902. Now if that information brings out something that is of interest to everyone in this House, we should have the right to debate it.

Mr. Chairman: No, once the votes are carried they are carried; they cannot be re-opened. That is the very reason we are sitting here passing them vote by vote.

Mr. Shulman: But, Mr. Chairman, the Minister says that he does not have information here; he is going to bring it back. How can we then debate it if you rule we cannot debate?

Mr. Chairman: The Minister has suggested that he will provide the individual member the information he has requested.

Mr. Shulman: But this is not just a question of information for an individual member. This is basic information—when a highway is moved at a considerable expense. Extra expense is of interest to everyone in this House, everyone in the province and we should be entitled to debate it.

Mr. Chairman: With respect I would say to the member or his party that when they direct such a question to the Minister in the particular vote with which we are dealing, they should ask for the information to the group, not to the individual. The Minister has indicated that he will give the particular answers to the member who is specifically interested in that.

Mr. Jackson: Mr. Chairman, under my question for information I asked if it would be tabled so that we could all examine it. And I believe that we should have the right to debate that.

Mr. Chairman: Well, once the votes are passed, we cannot debate further anything on those votes.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I am very sympathetic to the points that are being raised here. But I suppose the function of the debate, as you have pointed out, is to vote against the payment of these monies if we find that the Minister's answers are unsatisfactory.

I do not know whether it would be possible in the long run to reopen the points and it is not for me to defend the government. I do not propose to do so. On the other hand, it has already been pointed out that under this vote, which we have examined very carefully, we have had answers which one may consider unsatisfactory or satisfactory, depending upon the area of questioning. The time will soon have to come along, surely, when we can get on to the next vote, maintenance, which is something that is concerning us here as well.

I have no answer to the problem, other than the fact that this is a democratic assembly and if we do not think they are doing a proper job we will have to vote against them and this is what we are prepared to do in the Budget.

Mr. Shulman: But should we not be informed?

Mr. Jackson: Mr. Chairman, we create a situation where the Minister can say that we will put it on the order paper and will give you the answer next month and then we will just have to go ahead without it.

Mr. Chairman: I would say to the member, that was simply—

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. It is my opinion, sir, that the Minister has a responsibility to answer questions as he sees fit. Now, it may be that he will sit there and say, "I do not want to answer any questions." He does that at his own risk. Whether he is exercising good judgment or bad judgment is up to him; whether he answers a question properly or not is up to him.

It is the custom and the rule of this House, by reason of such custom, that a vote continues to stay open as long as an hon. member wishes to speak on it. And once the various members have come to the conclusion of their remarks, I do not think you have any right, sir, to limit that discussion, that once that discussion has come to an end then the vote is voted on either as presented or as opposed by the Opposition. I can understand, very well, the concern of the hon. members on our left here, about getting specific answers to the specific questions they have raised and in the way that they want them.

I would suggest that the remedy is, if they are dissatisfied with what the Minister does, and they undoubtedly have good reason to be dissatisfied with what the Minister does, that they take the appropriate remedies either in criticizing what he does or what he fails to do, or in moving a motion against the particular vote. But there has to be some finality. These votes cannot stay open *ad infinitum*. Otherwise, we would never get through any estimate.

Everyone has the same opportunity to keep these votes open as long as they want to speak, sir, and I would think that we have got to bring finality to this. The custom of the House is, as I say, that members can speak on these particular votes as long as they want to and at the conclusion of all of the speaking and all the debating then the vote is held.

Mr. Chairman: The member—

Mr. Shulman: May I speak to his point of order?

Mr. Chairman: The member for Downsview is quite right and I thank him for expressing the views in this matter. As happened the other night, on vote 902, a

motion was put to the committee that the vote be reduced to the sum of one dollar. We put the question to the committee and as was explained at that time, the vote was automatically carried with the defeat of the motion. Now, this is the right that all members have. If they wish to question the Minister and the Minister makes replies to them, or if he goes further to undertake to provide any individual member with specific information he can do that as well. But any member who wishes to move that the vote be reduced to the sum of one dollar can do so at that time.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, may I speak on this point of order?

Mr. Chairman: Yes.

Mr. Shulman: I would certainly agree with the member for Downsview that if the hon. Minister did not wish to give any information and said, "I am not going to answer that question," that would be the end of it, and the best we could do would be to vote against it. However, the situation is quite different here. He has volunteered to supply the information and inasmuch as he has volunteered to supply the information the vote should take place after the information is supplied.

Mr. Chairman: I would say to the member for High Park that the Minister has undertaken to provide the information to the individual member as a courtesy to him and this is the disposition of the matter as far as the vote is concerned, unless the member wishes to move that it be reduced.

Mr. Shulman: I would like to ask the hon. Minister if he will supply the information to the House.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I will be glad to. I have been advised, since the discussion started, by one of my engineers that the overall line as it was changed was cheaper, but you might ask me to give you those figures which we do not have here, and we will get those for you.

Vote 903 agreed to.

On vote 904:

Mr. Chairman: The member for Scarborough East.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister with respect to item 1 in vote 904 concerning district office administration; the sub-item, warehousing and storage operation. I was wondering if the Minister could supply, either today or later on, some measure of the amount of warehousing and storing space available in his jurisdiction, since we are spending $1.5 million on it, or have been asked to approve $1.5 million on it.

I would like to know the total square footage of warehousing or, if he does it in cubic feet that would be fine too, for the years 1967-1968, 1966-67, 1965-66. And I would also like to know what percentage of the available space was unused for each of those three years, if I could.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: I would not have the figures for that. This figure, warehousing and storage operation, includes the salaries and expenses of staff engaged in handling and storing the materials in 18 districts. It also includes the stock clerks, the operation costs of the warehouses, freight and delivery costs; this is what it is for.

Mr. T. Reid: In that case, Mr. Chairman, I would appreciate knowing the square footage space you do have for warehousing and storage for those three years, and whether or not you have any estimates on the unused capacity for each of those three years.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Oshawa.

Mr. C. G. Pilkey (Oshawa): Mr. Chairman, I notice that the total maintenance costs are up $9 million over last year's estimate; I wonder if there is any answer for that.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Chairman, according to the figures I have, the total is up $1,325,000. I do not have the nine million figure.

Mr. Pilkey: The 1967 total for maintenance showed $105 million, sir; this shows $114 million. I am using the estimates for 1968.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: I see the amount you mean now; I just took the first item when I gave the other figure. It is made up of the increasing labour costs and the overall increase of mileage. Every year we add mileage to it and this naturally brings an increase in maintenance.

Mr. Pilkey: The reason I asked the question is that it appears to me that many of the roads that are built in the province of Ontario, and particularly in the country, seem to be breaking up, and I want to ask this question: What standards are being used in the construction of these roads? For example,

some of the roads that are constructed, particularly in an urban area, are required to have four feet of frost-free material.

In the construction of a provincial road, it seems to me that all that is being done is the putting down of a very shallow base of gravel with the asphalt on top, and then there is a breakup. It would appear to me that if we are building the roads and constructing them properly, our maintenance costs should go down, and not up. Even if we have more miles of road they should go down if they are properly constructed.

When you get into sandy loam areas—and there are many of them in this province—and get this type of capillary action it just heaves the roads. I am not an engineer by any stretch of the imagination, but it appears to me that a much better job could be done with regard to the construction and to the standards of these roads, and we would be saving in the area of maintenance costs in many of the roads here in the province of Ontario.

So my question, sir, is, what are the standards used for the construction of the roads in the province of Ontario, or are there different standards in different areas?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: The standards we use are gauged by the traffic and the weather conditions of the area.

Mr. Pilkey: Let me ask the Minister another question. Would the Minister think that if the standards were much higher that we would be able to construct these roads that would require a minimum of maintenance?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: We find what the member says a good suggestion, but sometimes the cost would be so high that it would be cheaper to build the roads to an average standard and to spend maintenance on them, than to spend that much extra to make them do everything which he would hope they would do.

Mr. M. Makarchuk (Brantford): Referring to municipal subsidies again, can the Minister tell me what rationale or what formula is used to decide the difference in subsidies? In other words, cities get 33⅓ per cent, the boroughs would get 50 per cent. Now, is this based on assessment—industrial assessment or assessor tax per capita—or what is it?

Similarly, as far as structures go, cities will get only a 33⅓ per cent subsidy, whereas a borough would get an 80 per cent subsidy. Now, what is the rationale in this particular case?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Chairman, it started out the way the hon. member said—on account of the assessment of the cities—but as I pointed out once before, this whole matter is under review now with the Smith report.

Mr. Makarchuk: Am I to assume from that, Mr. Chairman, that there will be some changes made in the very near future?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Chairman, it is under study; as to the changes, I cannot give the hon. member an answer, but it certainly will be well looked into.

Mr. Makarchuk: Mr. Chairman, when the department enters into some negotiation or contractual agreement with a municipality—in other words, if it will supply a subsidy of a certain percentage of 75 or 50 or 65 per cent for a particular structure—what guide lines are used, or what are the reasons for that particular decision?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: This is all contained in The Highway Impovement Act, Mr. Chairman, and that is what we base our subsidies on.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Wentworth.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Mr. Chairman, in the light of the statements which have been made that the reason for the increased costs in many areas are for labour and materials, would I be correct in assuming that under "repaving present roads", we are going to do less repaving this year than last year?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: I am advised that it is very close to the same amount of mileage as last year.

Mr. Deans: Is this taking into consideration the increased costs for this coming year?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: It could be a little less. I do not have the exact mileages for last year here, but this is what we expect.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Scarborough East.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, returning to the point that another member mentioned, I would like to ask the Minister how his department decides on the "trade off"—if you like—of the construction of a road and the

maintenance costs of a road. In other words, I know that he has experts in his department who surely take into consideration that the higher the quality of the road when it first goes in, the lower the maintenance costs over a certain period of time, and I would like to have some idea if this is being done on a scientific basis, rather than simply on the result of historical circumstances and practices.

As the Minister is probably very much aware, in most so-called "developing" countries of the world, they look into this matter very carefully and they decide that if they put in very good roads now, they are going to have to have more money now—they might have to borrow it and they might have to pay interest on the money they borrow—but the point is that when they take all the climatic conditions into account, and so forth, they quite often put in much higher quality roads than other countries do.

I would like to have some assurance from the Minister, Mr. Chairman, that this is being done on some sort of scientific basis.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Chairman, it is done on a scientific basis and our engineers work it out on all the very best detail, and we have constant research on all these items, and this is the basis on which it is worked.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Port Arthur.

Mr. R. H. Knight (Port Arthur): Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. Minister whether the subsidies from the federal government, which apply to construction on the Trans-Canada Highway, also apply to maintenance of the highway.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: The answer is "no", Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Knight: My next question to the hon. Minister is for how long will the federal subsidy on the Trans-Canada Highway continue? How long can we expect it to last—to be available?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: I cannot answer as to the length of time it would be, but it has been renewed from time to time and the present renewal is until the end of 1970.

Mr. Knight: But the fact remains, then, Mr. Chairman, that we have no guarantee that it will be renewed after 1970, do we?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: I suppose the answer to that is "no", Mr. Chairman, but it has been up until now, without any difficulty.

Mr. Knight: Well in that case, Mr. Chairman, would it not make sense to elevate the proper construction—to elevate the standard of highway construction on the Trans-Canada Highway, especially where it traverses northwestern Ontario, which seems to be the worst part right now—to top priority and get it done while this particular grant, or subsidy from the federal government is available, because I submit to you, Mr. Chairman, at the present time, that highway from the Manitoba border, even down to Sault Ste. Marie, is a patchwork. Even the lovely segment of highway that we saw completed in 1960, from the Lakehead down to Sault Ste. Marie, is now becoming a patchwork because that highway is heaving. It does not look good, and I am quite sure The Department of Highways itself is concerned about it.

Now I would like to echo the remarks of the member for Oshawa over here when he says that we should establish a better standard of highway construction, so that we will have something that will last.

As a resident of northwestern Ontario, I do not mind saying I am ashamed when I drive from northwestern Ontario into Manitoba, and find the lovely highway construction that there is there, having just left my own area and to hear tourists come into the Lakehead and say, "Well we came through the west and in Alberta, Saskatchewan, Manitoba, the Trans-Canada Highway was lovely, but for some reason, as we come into northwestern Ontario, we started getting the bumps and why do not you people construct a proper highway through this part of Ontario."

So I am just wondering, sir, whether this is not a reason to put this up to a higher priority, the fact that we just do not know how long the federal government subsidy will be available.

I would also like to ask the Minister, sir, when the department or the government of Ontario plans to rename this highway, Highway 1, as it is in most other provinces, indicating that it has indeed attained a number one standard.

Thank you.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Chairman, I have all the standards for the Trans-Canada Highway. It is under capital construction and if you would so permit me to give that at that time, to the hon. member, I can explain all these things to him.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, I was wondering if the Minister could give us some idea

whether the studs now being used on tires will likely result in increased maintenance costs over the next ten years, whether or not he has worked this out, and if he has, whether or not he has discussed it with his colleague who is responsible for the laws relating to these studs in tires.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member probably realizes that last year when this was brought in to permit the use of studs, The Department of Highways and The Department of Transport were very often together on this subject. At that time we did not see that the studs, at the time of year they are allowed to be used, were causing any difficulties to the highways. But this is under constant review and if we find there is, we may have to change the legislation.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, I would like to follow that up. Can I ask the Minister what time period the studs are legally allowable on the cars? My understanding is that one can have them in October when there is no snow, and surely that knocks the roads a bit.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: I am sorry I cannot give you the exact date. That is a matter for The Department of Transport. I think we made it at such a time that there would be snow in the north. You can hardly take it in areas, because people from there might come down here; I think that if you are correct, that is probably the reason October was chosen. But the time was extended, I think, until April 30. As I say, that is under The Department of Transport, not us.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, I would like to know who is doing the research on this. Is The Department of Transport doing the research, or are you doing the research?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Both The Department of Transport and The Department of Highways are doing it.

Mr. T. Reid: So that it is quite proper for me to ask the hon. Minister questions of this sort and I do not have to talk to his colleague, necessarily?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Well, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member has found out one area that I cannot answer. We are only interested in the road deterioration angle of it, and this is the part where we enter into the research.

Mr. Chairman: We have had quite a free discussion and if the Minister can answer it all, I am sure he will.

The member for High Park.

Mr. Shulman: I would like to ask you, Mr. Chairman, is this the proper vote under which to take up matters of safety?

Mr. Chairman: Yes, I think probably safety could come under this. Is that correct, Mr. Minister?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: I would think it would be under capital, Mr. Chairman, because that is where the discussion is.

Mr. Shulman: Perhaps I should—in relation to present highways—does that go under capital? I have no objection, whichever you prefer.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: I could not distinguish the difference. I really do not know what the hon. member's question is. Maybe it would be here.

Mr. Shulman: Perhaps I could put the question and if the Minister prefers to leave it until a later time, he may answer it under the other vote.

Mr. Chairman: I think if the member would take the Minister's suggestion and bring it up under the capital item perhaps it would be better.

Is vote 904 carried?

An hon. member: No, there are other speakers.

Mr. G. Bukator (Niagara Falls): You may recall, Mr. Chairman, that, in the closing moments of Friday noon, when we were discussing these estimates, I said I wanted about half an hour. I would like to discuss with you—

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Chairman, may I suggest that if the hon. member has a long contribution to make the committee might rise and report.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves that the committee of supply rise and report it has come to a certain resolution and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report it has come to a certain resolution and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

NOTICES OF MOTION

Clerk of the House: Private member's motion No. 25 by Mr. Potter.

RESOLUTION:

That, in the opinion of this House, nursing homes should be included in the benefits under the Ontario hospital services commission.

Mr. R. T. Potter (Quinte): Mr. Speaker, I move seconded by the hon. member for Ontario South (Mr. W. Newman) resolution No. 25, standing in my name.

Mr. N. Davison (Hamilton Centre): Mr. Speaker, I have a question to ask on this resolution. Does it also include Resolution No. 14?

Mr. Speaker: Yes, that will be called next.

Clerk of the House: Private member's notice of motion No. 14, by Mr. Davison.

RESOLUTION:

That, in the opinion of this House, the government should immediately extend hospital insurance coverage to persons in chronic and convalescent hospitals or in approved nursing homes who do not require continued medical and skilled nursing care but whose condition is such that, in the opinion of the medical practitioner, they cannot be returned to their own homes or to a home for the aged.

Mr. Davison: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Oshawa (Mr. Pilkey) resolution No. 14 standing in my name.

Mr. Potter: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to introduce this resolution to this House for consideration of the hon. members.

The hon. members in the Opposition over the past weeks have been making strong demands of this government that they should accept the overtures of the federal government, and agree to the implementation of their medicare programme in order that everyone can be subsidized for medical care regardless of their income, their need or in fact, their own wishes. We have been so immersed in the uproar of this campaign, Mr. Speaker, that I think we have all had a tendency to forget the individual a little bit, in whose interests these programmes were introduced. Indeed, we almost seem to have developed the attitude that these people are now doing pretty well. They have their OMSIP paid for them, and perhaps, they may even qualify for some assistance from The Department of Social and Family Services. As I mentioned before in my maiden speech, Mr. Speaker, with he care of the sick today in the province of Ontario, we have several groups. The first group includes those who are suffering an acute illness or accident, and naturally they must be treated in an acute treatment hospital that is properly equipped to take care of this type of patient. Then there are those who require some type of rehabilitation. As I mentioned before, this is the one group that we have fallen behind with in this province. I think that we should have, and we will have, general rehabilitation units attached to each hospital, where most of the patients who were formally in the active treatment hospital, and have been cured or improved to such a state that they need to be rehabilitated, can be helped back to a useful existence.

Then there is the third group who require treatment in a chronically ill hospital. As I stated before, these are the people who are suffering with a progressive or chonic illness that cannot be cured. They have to have some type of care but not the specialized type of an active treatment hospital. But they have proved that it is necessary for these people to have care over a long period of time on a long term basis.

Finally we come to the last group, and this is the group that I am particularly interested in today. These are the people who are not ill enough either to be confined to an active treatment hospital, or to a chronic hospital, but they do require some kind of care that they are unable to get at home. Up until now, these people have been taken care of in nursing homes, and of all the types of accommodation that we provide today, the active treatment, convalescent or chronically ill, the nursing home is the one type of accommodation that we have available that is not covered by medical insurance.

In other words, if a man is sick enough, and he has to go into hospital, he has all his bills paid for him. The bills are paid by insurance. But once the rehabilitation reaches a stage that this specialized treatment is no longer required, then, Mr. Speaker, he must pay his own way, unless he qualifies for assistance from The Department of Social and Family Services. Now, if we go back 30 or 40 years, we find that there were very few nursing homes, and in fact, very little demand for them. In fact, we can also say the same thing for hospitals in those days, be-

cause the only people who went to hospital were those who were very ill.

Mr. C. G. Pilkey (Oshawa): Or could afford it.

Mr. Potter: You are a very smart man. The reason that they did not go to hospital was that they had to pay their own bill. So they found that it was much cheaper to be treated at home, and save on this added expense. One of the by-products of our insurance has been, of course, a tremendous increase in the use of hospital facilities, and I am ashamed to admit that there has been a great abuse of these facilities. This is one of the reasons why we find that it is necessary to increase these rates today. Today, patients expect to be hospitalized for even the most minor complaints, because as they say, "I have insurance, why should I not use it?"

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Who sent them to the hospital?

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): You have given half the story—

Mr. Potter: I will agree with you if you give me a chance. There are even times when I can agree with you.

Mr. R. M. Johnston (St. Catharines): Listen to him, and then you will be cheering him.

Mr. Potter: To tell you the truth, Mr. Speaker, I thought that they talked so much this afternoon, that they were pretty well talked out, but it is amazing the constitution that they have got!

I must say that I was surprised when I got on an elevator last weekend, and I saw this elderly lady wheeled on, whom I have known for many years now, and I said, "My goodness I am sorry to see you here, what is the trouble?"

"Oh," she said, "I am just coming in for a rest." Now this is pretty hard to believe, but this is exactly what happens, and this is one of the reasons why we find the costs of our hospital services is increasing. You asked me who sent them. I agree with you, there are two things that are wrong. In the first place, the people demand this service, and in the second place there are too many doctors who have not got guts enough to say, "I will not put you in hospital," because they are afraid they will go to somebody else.

Mr. E. A. Winkler (Grey South): But the same gang would complain.

Mr. Potter: This is true. But to get back to our nursing homes, Mr. Speaker, or should I say our lack of them. They, too, have become much more in demand, but not for the same reasons. These patients are not insured, and they have not been abusing the facilities that have been provided because they have, in most cases, to pay their own way. But there are two excellent reasons why these nursing homes have become popular. First of all, people are living much longer and they are reaching an age where they cannot look after themselves, and second, social conditions have changed a great deal over the last 30 or 40 years. Formerly many of these elderly patients were cared for in their own homes by their own families. Today, not very many homes are large enough to accommodate more than one generation, and secondly the housewife in many, many cases is working outside the home, and so we see that there just is not anyone available to look after this type of patient in the home. We must admit, too, that the day of the dependent aunt is passed, and so, as the need has arisen, we find that the private nursing home has increased across the province.

Today we have some 511 in operation and these 511 nursing homes contain somewhere in the vicinity of 8,500 beds.

Now I believe that with the exception of one, which is in Dutton, Ontario, all of these nursing homes are privately owned, and some of them have been very well constructed, well furnished, they are well maintained and they do an excellent job of looking after the patients confined to them. But unfortunately, as I mentioned before, there are some of these that are not doing quite as good a job, and they have reflected adversely on the ones that are. Generally, Mr. Speaker, these nursing homes have been filling a very, very great need in our province and as I have stated, practically all of them are privately owned and operated.

Now I want also to say that the financial returns from operating these homes are not nearly as great as many people think. They certainly are not nearly as great as they are in other fields that these people could have put their money into. I am convinced that if the operators of these homes were not motivated by a general interest and concern for the patient, they would not carry on. There just is not enough financial compensation involved to make it worthwhile, unless they really had an intense desire to serve these people. I must reiterate, Mr. Speaker, in the main many of these nursing homes

have done an outstanding job, but as I said, unfortunately, some of them have damaged the reputation of the whole industry. So it was in 1966 that the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond) brought in The Nursing Homes Act. Under this Act, nursing homes are licensed and the quality of care and accommodation can be controlled.

Under this Nursing Homes Act those that are not doing such a good job must be upgraded, or they would have to be closed up, in order to guarantee that these patients get the type of care that they require, is due them. Practically all of these homes cater to the elderly, and I think if any of us were to go to these homes we would find few, if any, in there under 70 years of age, or 65 or so. And so it was last year that The Department of Social and Family Services decided that there was a need also for those in younger age groups, who required some kind of care that they could not get at home. This includes those individuals who have been unfortunate enough to suffer accidents and injuries that have left them disabled, or some suffering from congenital illnesses, or even from some illnesses like polio, and so on, that have left them disabled so that they have to have some kind of care that they cannot get at home. The Department of Social and Family Services came out with their proposition that they established rest homes which to me are just glorified nursing homes. It is the same thing, except there is no age limit, and I believe that anyone over 19 or 20 years of age can be admitted to these rest homes.

The suggestion was that the department would build the homes at the request of a municipality and share in the total cost of construction on a 50 per cent basis and then they would pay 70 per cent of any operating deficit that would be incurred. But again, the inmates would not be covered by OHSC. In some cases they will be covered by disabled persons' pensions and any difference between that and the actual *per diem* cost would be shared with The Department of Social and Family Services, the department taking up 70 per cent and the local municipality 30 per cent.

At the present time, I think there are something like 420 beds of this nature being constructed across the province, but I think the members of this House should be made aware of this—if they are not already aware —and take it up with their local municipalities because I think there are very few areas in this province where homes of this nature could not be of use.

As I said, Mr. Speaker, even in this home, we find that they are not covered by Ontario hospital services commission. If they can qualify they can obtain assistance under The Department of Social and Family Services—in other words if they have not got anything the department will come in and pay it for them. I hope the hon. members have not been confused with my references to The Department of Health and OHSC on the one hand and The Department of Family and Social Services on the other hand. I must confess that I, too, have difficulty determining where the authority of one ends and the other begins. I think that it might be a good idea at this time if I commend to this government for its consideration, the amalgamation of these two departments and perhaps we would break down one more barrier. But, Mr. Speaker, the hon. Minister of Health has, I know, been concerned for some time about this one facet of patient care and I know that he is not happy that a means test is required to obtain assistance from The Department of Social and Family Services for these patients. I believe this is one of the greatest areas of need at the present time. I think this is one of two main gaps in our otherwise excellent health programme. I might say here that I think the other gap is the fact that OHSC has not been subsidized for the lower income groups, and I think this is the other gap that has to be filled very, very quickly.

In conclusion then, Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that the only satisfactory solution to this particular gap is to recommend to this House the inclusion of nursing and rest home care as an insured benefit under the provisions of The Hospital Insurance and Diagnostic Services Act.

Mr. Davison: The 1968 edition of *Canadian Almanac and Directory* contains a table comparing birth and death rates of 20 countries for the year 1966. Canada has the second lowest death rate—7.5 per 1,000 population—second only to Japan, the country with the lowest death rate of 6.8 per 1,000 population. Since we are always in the economic shadow of the United States of America, perhaps, as a matter of national pride, I should point out that the death rate in that country is 9.5 per 1,000 population, so that at least we can say Canadians live longer than their American neighbours.

This means, of course, that our over-60 age group is increasing and I might say it is increasing fairly rapidly. In 1961 the total

number of Ontario citizens 60 years of age and over was 726,584—in 1966 this grew to 811,850 — and estimated figures for 1967 are projected at 830,900. Surprisingly, the largest of the 60-and-over age group is the over-70 age group, where Ontario runs ahead of the national average.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that it does not do much for our national or provincial pride if we keep our people alive but fail to provide for their various needs. I am surprised that this government places so little trust in some of its members. Four years ago, a select committee on aging was established, composed of nine Conservatives, three Liberal and one NDP members. I was the NDP member on that committee and, while I have differed with those other Conservative and Liberal members on many occasions in the past and, while I expect to differ with them on many future issues and, while even on this committee there were points of difference, I say this: The members of that committee were sincere in their efforts to find ways and means of taking care of our senior citizens.

When these members of the three political parties, represented in this House, agreed unanimously on a recommendation, the government should accept it as good and introduce the required legislation. Even if they object to accepting any recommendations of Opposition members, surely they should have indicated confidence in their own party members. More than a year ago the select committee on aging tabled its final report, in which it was unanimously recommended that Ontario hospital coverage be extended to assist aged persons to be cared for, either in hospitals, or in approved nursing and convalescent homes.

One can only conclude that this government deliberately downgrades its own members on committees because, to this date, not one single remark has been made in the Throne speech or by any Cabinet Minister to indicate that the slightest consideration is being given to implement this committee recommendation.

Time after time, Mr. Speaker, members of this committee have been told by representatives of organizations and by elderly individuals themselves that one of their greatest fears is illness, and being unable to have proper care during convalescence.

I made a survey myself, of retired persons in my riding and again this fear was reflected in their replies. I have met numbers of older people who had no one to care for them when they returned to their homes and they are really frightened at the prospect of being released from the hospital before being able to care for themselves.

The committee on aging, set up by the social planning and research council of Hamilton and district, claims the shortage of bed space for chronic cases in Hamilton is creating serious problems. On March 16, 1968, the Hamilton *Spectator* reported:

> Social workers, nurses, doctors and administrators of homes directly involved in the placement of patients in chronic bed and post-hospital institutions, all claimed that not enough beds for chronic cases are available in the city. Elderly people needing long-term rehabilitative care are tying up city hospital and nursing home beds, while non-chronic patients are occupying chronic beds. The committee also found that the present situation creates a problem of economics as well as care. Patients in active or chronic hospital beds are covered by the Ontario hospital insurance, but when moved to a home for the aged or a nursing home, they must pay costs themselves, or receive help from city welfare.
>
> Miss Clark said that at the present time Hamilton has 382 chronic beds, with waiting periods for admission varying from one to six months, usually averaging about two months. With the imminent closure of Resthaven chronic hospital, this number would be reduced by 34, and it would be another two years before the proposed new St. Peter's infirmary would be ready to admit patients—if it is successful in its appeal for financial support to proceed with extension plans.

I recall, Mr. Speaker, the case of an elderly man who was blind, who had lost both legs and who was diabetic. He was discharged from hospital and sent home for his elderly wife to attend, and she was simply not capable of the constant and heavy care he required. They, like many, were able to pay hospital insurance premiums, but were not able to pay daily nursing home fees.

Most of today's elderly people went through two world wars and a major depression, and most have little or no income, apart from the Canada pension. If they stinted themselves during their working years in order to lay aside a nest egg of a couple of thousand dollars for their old age, I do not think we should penalize them for this thriftiness. I do not think they should be required to beggar themselves to pay nursing home costs—and

they could do this in six months or less. But this is the way it goes today, because only then, when they are eligible for city welfare, will their stay in nursing homes be paid. These people want to prepay their stay there, through their Ontario hospital insurance premiums, and they should be able to do so.

Urgent as it is that we provide this kind of assistance for our elderly people, they are not the only ones who find it impossible to meet nursing home costs, when this kind of care is needed.

I have had occasion this past year to visit patients in hospitals quite often, and, because of my interest in having nursing home care included in the Ontario hospital insurance plan, I have taken those opportunities to talk to patients other than those I was visiting.

One case stays in my mind. It was a young, single man in his late twenties or early thirties. He roomed above a store and ate his meals in restaurants. He had no facilities for cooking his meals, and he was a very worried young man. He was about to be discharged, since he no longer required the active care provided by the general hospital.

But, he told me, he had no idea how he would be able to climb the stairs to and from his rooms for each meal and, of course, he was in no condition to hunt for other lodgings. He felt he would soon be right back in hospital. When I asked if he had considered going to a nursing home to convalesce, he told me he could not afford to pay the nursing home fees. There is the problem of a mother of several young children. The extra cost of providing care for the children during the hospitalization of the mother stretched income limits to the breaking point, and certainly it was completely impossible for this mother to have a convalescent period any place where hospitalization benefits did not apply.

Doctors who know that home conditions are not favourable to the patient's continued progress to full health, are faced with the needs of those awaiting a hospital bed. They must decide whether to delay the entry of new patients into hospital, or whether to release a patient when they know they might very well have to re-admit them to hospital in a relatively short time, because they could not afford the kind of care they needed. Sir, we have two kinds of people who are able to take advantage of the services of nursing homes; those who can afford the daily cost of $10 to $16, and those who have no money and are looked after by welfare. I ask you, is it reasonable that those in the economic structure between these two extremes must beggar themselves so they can qualify for welfare assistance?

We are now entering the final year of the period of grace allowed nursing homes to bring their facilities and service up to provincial standards. As these homes are brought up to proper standards, and many of them are far from it, their rates are certain to increase, thus making it even more difficult for those needing their services to avail themselves of it.

The need for this type of coverage is so apparent, not only for the aged but for others as well, that it passes all understanding how this government can so callously deny this protection to the people of Ontario.

The province of Alberta has met this problem by a nursing home plan which provides care in nursing homes for all persons requiring such personal services as help in walking, and getting in and out of bed, assistance with general bathing, help with dressing or feeding, preparation of special diet, supervision over medications and other types of personal assistance of this order.

The Alberta plan is recognized by the federal government as eligible for cost sharing under The Hospital Insurance and Diagnostic Services Act.

Certainly then, Ontario can devise a plan acceptable to the federal government to extend our hospital insurance benefits to include nursing home care to those who might benefit by it.

Even the United States, who are not noted for advanced social legislation, have provided coverage, limited in length of stay, as it may be, in nursing homes for those over 65. We are faced with overcrowded hospitals, with waiting lists of people needing hospital care. We are faced in some areas with a lack of nurses to staff hospitals. Is it not common sense to make use of nursing homes available to those large numbers who can and do pay their hospital insurance premiums, but who simply cannot afford to pay nursing home rates? We would, in one stroke, relieve the congestion of our hospitals and fulfill the urgent need of many of our citizens for interim care between leaving hospital and returning to take up their normal duties and way of life.

It is the responsibility of this Legislature to see that no one in Ontario is denied the services essential to retard the progress of a chronic condition, to restore lost functions and to prevent mental, emotional and physical deterioration.

Mr. Speaker, this is one of the few times when we can have our cake and eat it too. We can, through extending our hospital insurance plan coverage, provide needed services and save money while doing it.

This is rather a charming thought in these days of ever-rising costs. The use of nursing homes would permit the earlier discharge of patients from our active treatment hospitals, thus releasing their beds and shortening the waiting lists. We might shortly find we were keeping pace with the demand for hospital beds, and be relieved of the capital cost of providing more hospital beds. I remind the hon. members that nursing homes are mostly privately owned and built, at no capital cost to government funds.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): Mr. Speaker, I would like to voice my approval of the two resolutions now before the House. I know that the hon. member for Hamilton Centre has had a resolution on the order paper, as well as my colleague, the member for Huron-Bruce (Mr. Gaunt). Both of these men have had a long time and a sincere interest in the cause, and have attempted to see to it that people who require convalescent care should be covered by OHSC.

It is indeed almost refreshing, to hear such a suggestion coming from the Tory benches. He is probably one of the more progressive of the reactionaries on that side of the House. It seems that year in and year out we on this side of the House have been speaking in regard to this most important matter. I know that as a member of the Legislature I get innumerable calls throughout the year, when someone tells me that his mother is being moved from the general hospital and she has to go into a nursing home, that they do not have any money and so what will they do? And the question is, Mr. Speaker, what do they do?

Most of these people are in desperate circumstances and are telephoning their MPP trying to find a place in which they can be located. And they think that because the Queen Elizabeth hospital is in my riding I just have to snap my fingers and I can place them in there, which just is not true. The hospital administration has to do the best they can with the facilities that we have.

This problem has been before this government for so long, sir, and despite the recommendation of the committee on aging, which the member for Hamilton Centre mentioned, still nothing has been done. That committee made 44 recommendations, Mr. Speaker. Hardly anything has been touched. In fact, last year, in order to get publicity for problems that are connected with this resolution and, more particularly, to try to publicize the problems of the aging, the hon. member for Durham (Mr. Carruthers) put a resolution on the order paper suggesting that we set aside one week in June to give the public some idea of the problems of the aging and call it senior citizens' week. Well, not even a simple resolution like that could get by this House, and the unfortunate thing is, I am almost certain that this very important problem is not only going to die on the order paper today, but will not be revived by the government.

I tell my friend, the hon. member for Quinte that the government should not just have him presenting a resolution, but they should bring in a bill.

Sone hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Trotter: Again, the Treasury board, very conscious of money—they spend money on many things but not on our senior citizens. They say that they just do not have the money and that this is going to cost so much extra, and besides, the federal government will not let them because it is federal government legislation. Well, I will not go into that point of it because the hon. member for Hamilton Centre has touched on it.

Simply, Alberta has brought in legislation where these people can be covered and the federal government has gone along with it, so there is no question in my mind that there are kind-hearted people in Ottawa who are willing to help the senior citizens.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Always!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Speaker, we should bear in mind that it costs to retain a patient in a general hospital somewhere between $58 and $64 per day per patient and yet there are some homes that are operating at the rate of from $7 to $16 per day—but even taking the top figure of $16, think of the tremendous saving we would have if we used nursing homes for chronic care and convalescent care.

The government has allowed the hospitalization situation in this province to develop into such chaos that today we have the

University of Toronto hiring three management firms and spending $750,000 to tell them what to do about the great teaching complex that we have here just outside the doors of this House. Fourteen per cent of all the general care bed space in all of Ontario is within two miles of these buildings, and it is found on investigation that if we would spend more money on capital investment in convalescent care—the nursing homes of a private nature or public institutions that were for chronic or convalescent care—we could not only provide care for those people who need it, but we would in the long run save the taxpayer money.

The University of Toronto in order to learn what they can do about the hodgepodge we have in this general area, despite the fact that many of these facilities are needed—is starting to spend close to $1 million in trying to find a way to straighten out our uneconomic administration of hospitals. Yet we can spend money on management firms but we still have, it seems to me, a tremendous impediment to overcome in order to see to it that many of our senior citizens and those who are chronically ill have some place to go.

Now the emphasis is on senior citizens, because obviously the older we get the greater the odds are that we are going to need some type of convalescent care. But there are many people no matter what their age might be, who require this care. In many respects, I do not blame a doctor who does keep his patients in a general hospital because the doctor may know that the person has no money and so where is that person to go? It is all right to send them home, but there is not, in many cases, proper home care, so what does the individual do when the doctor wants to take care of his patient? This is what happens. But if facilities were provided, many of the bed spaces that now cost up to $64 a day could be emptied, and this goes into far more than just chronic and convalescent care. Outpatient services and home care—all these things are really involved, Mr. Speaker, in these resolutions. The basic ill in this province in regard to this problem is that the provincial government simply does not know how to organize its health facilities. I am sure that the hon. member for Quinte is well aware of this and maybe he blushes in private at the mess that this government has allowed these facilities to get into a tremendous high cost, because I know that many Conservatives, although they probably do not say so in public, realize that these health services that are so vital are not being administered in an economic way.

So we have two problems; we are wasting money and, secondly, we are not doing what we can to relieve a lot of unnecessary human miseries, the worry of a person who cannot walk and can hardly talk and is lying prone in bed and can do nothing and go nowhere —and the doctor says that he does not require medical treatment but requires nursing treatment and is not covered by OHSC, and tells him to get out. This is the situation in the province of Ontario and this is the way it has been for a great number of years.

I cannot understand the intransigence of this government and particularly of the Minister. I begin to wonder if they do care. It is hard to believe that a doctor would not, but as men in public life, certainly this Treasury board and certainly this Tory party simply do not care. I would urge the members of this House not to let this issue die today or any other day, on the order paper, but regardless of their party to urge the administration to bring through legislation which will relieve the situation for so many hundreds of our sick in the province of Ontario. You will find that such legislation will find all-out party support from the Liberal Party.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): Mr. Speaker, I, of course, support the resolution introduced by my colleague from Hamilton Centre and of course the one from the hon. member for Quinte. I think that we have to show a lot more compassion for the elderly people in this province inasmuch as there are a lot of things to be done before we extend the hospital insurance commission benefits to the nursing homes. I think there is a need there but this only amounts to money, the fear of payments.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that the question raised by the hon. member for Quinte in regards to the financial position of nursing homes is one of guessing. Some are in better financial shape than others and I have never been able to determine whether the rates they charge for residential nursing care treatment are sufficient. They do not seem to go out of business but keep crowding people in.

Now, it might be for the reason of insufficient income that they keep crowding them in, but when I say there is a great need for more compassion in regards to the elderly in the province I mean it in the sense of giving some incentive to the people who have a desire and a dedication to run a nursing home and give service to the elderly.

We have got to make sure that they have proper facilities, that they are not overcrowded as we find the situation in Hamilton. There should not be a lack of staff as we find in Hamilton. They should have the best that we can provide in regards to all the things they need.

And I would like to point out a particular case—and one might think it is not indicative of one needing this type of coverage. This is a case of one of my constituents who had been in the St. Peter's infirmary for some two years. When the problem arose she was 76 years of age. St. Peter's infirmary patients do enjoy the benefits of the Ontario hospital services commission when they are declared to be in need of active medical treatment and this is all right. But on a decision of the in-residence doctor, this person was told that she no longer could be considered an active case and therefore should notify her relatives, which in this case, were the children, a daughter, that she must now pay for in-residence care, and the rate originally was $17.10 a day. It since has gone up to $19.20 a day. Now this did not seem too bad, because I understood that the daughter had in trust some $5,000 that belonged to the mother, but on further investigation, I found that there was a real hardship inasmuch as the mother's finding out that she would have to leave that place or else pay the $17 a day created quite a flusteration and anxiety—and it started to deteriorate her health. I might point out that this elderly lady of 76 years of age, who was removed from the active list and asked to pay this kind of money, was an amputee above the knee of one leg. She had Parkinson's disease, a weak heart and the other infirmities that flow from one of this age. It seemed to me on investigating and talking with her daughter, that because she had a strong will and was able to move herself from her bed to her wheelchair, and back from the wheelchair to the bed, and look after her own toiletries and this sort of thing, that somebody made a decision right away that she no longer needed active medical treatment, and therefore she was told she would have to pay $17 a day or find someplace else to live.

Now I raised this question with the officials of the Ontario hospital services commission and I was told that it was well within the regulations that they had the notice from the resident doctors that she no longer needed active care, and they could do nothing about it. I did pursue the point very strongly that in my mind it was not just a case in fact that there was $5,000 there, and that somebody seemed to want to get hold of it, but it did raise the serious question of what kind of physical condition does an elderly person have to be in before he or she is declared in need of medical attention—and active medical attention, at that. Subsequently I was notified that this lady was put back on the benefits under the Ontario hospital services commission. I inquired from the daughter, who was pleased that this had taken place and she assured me that the anxiety of maybe having to pay the money had been great. She had already paid $600 by the way, for the 32 or 33 days that she was moved into what they call the "residential" part of the infirmary. Six hundred dollars in some 32 days out of her little bit of savings, but it was because of the anxiety of the daughter trying to convince her that she should move out into one of the other homes that were much cheaper. In the Macassa lodge, of course she could have got accommodation for, I believe, something like $250 per month now. Or go into one of the other nursing homes at the rate of some $4.50 to $8.50, but when she visited some of these homes and saw the conditions, she had to be very plain and very frank with her mother and tell her that she would pay every cent she could raise. She would keep her there and pay the amount, even if she had to mortgage her own home.

We find that it was the anxiety and frustration that was put upon this elderly lady that put her back into her bed and then in turn put her back under the regulations to receive the Ontario hospital service commission benefits. So I heartily endorse the two resolutions that are presented, and I echo the words of both the member for Hamilton Centre and the member for Parkdale that we have to take a real look at the problems that our elderly are facing. We have to make up our minds sometime or other that when we establish committees and spend a lot of time and a lot of money in trying to devise ways and means to make this a better province—that at some time or other the reports need the consideration of this House so that we can prove to ourselves that our efforts have had some worth.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): Mr. Speaker, I rise also to support the two resolutions before the Legislature, the one by the hon. member for Hamilton Centre, and the one by the hon. member for Quinte. The point that was brought out by the member,

my colleague from Parkdale, I think is quite important in this whole matter, i.e. the question of the relative cost of doing this and how it might best be done.

Mr. J. H. White (London South): Well why does the hon. member not persuade his Liberal colleagues in Ottawa?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Deacon: No matter whether the money is coming from Ottawa or from Ontario or from our municipal taxes, it is still coming out of our pocket, and we must always keep in mind where and how we can get these people taken care of, and do it most effectively and at the least cost to our tax dollars.

At the present time a patient is discharged from a hospital. There is no concern on the part of the doctor about discharging to a nursing home. The doctor is operating under the Act whereby he must decide whether the patient can continue to benefit from hospital treatment or not. If, in his opinion specialized care is not going to benefit the patient then he is going to have them discharged. It is up to the patient to find his own way, or the relatives of the patient.

These nursing homes that we have in the province are doing an excellent job and I think that the government is to be commended for The Nursing Homes Act which was brought into force in 1966 and which gave some standardization of operation to these homes.

One of the big problems, though, is that there is not a proper classification of the homes, and some homes are giving fully-skilled care and are getting approved homes and beds under the Ontario hospital services commission for certain types of care. Others are not approved and do not come under the Act and are able, by means of having one or two or three or four beds, to provide care and not be supervised at all.

There are many ways that we can provide care for these people when they are discharged from hospitals, and one of the very interesting ways that has been brought to my attention, by the operator of a nursing home in Markham, is home care. It is her suggestion, and I think a good one, that we use the Victorian order of nurses and homemakers and other means. We could provide fees and payments under our hospital services so that these people can go into the homes and take care and provide good care in the home for these discharged patients.

They do not need constant care in many cases; they need someone around who can see that they are fed. They also need someone to come in every day to clean them up and take care of their personal needs and see that they are making proper progress or not deteriorating in any way. There are also many patients who are able to move about on their own and they can go into homes where the cost of their daily care is much less than the $8 to $16 that have been quoted for the highly-equipped, well-equipped nursing homes.

In this way many of the patients could get care and have care provided for by the province under Ontario hospital services commission at much less than the $40 or more per day that we are having to pay if they are in the regular hospitals. Also there is the matter of nursing home costs. Although some of our nursing homes charge up to $16 or so a day, out our way there is a very fine private nursing home providing care, private bath, two in a room at around $11 a day. Certainly that rate is much less than hospital care. So it does seem to be a matter of classifying the type of care that is required and making provision for it.

It is not necessary for the government to assume that everyone is going to automatically be costing them $40 a day or even $16 a day, if the patients, when they are discharged to nursing care, or a nursing home or whatever are properly classified. In this way, these people will not be neglected, not be left out on their own as the hon. member for Hamilton East has just mentioned. A very pressing matter in the mind of any patient is what is going to happen to him when he is discharged. So often, a patient who could become well again very quickly is depressed and held back in his programme of recovery by this concern over how he is going to be looked after. I suggest that the government do not just consider the matter of extending nursing home coverage, but also take into account the overall care of patients so that they are not just discharged from hospitals but are discharged to some form of recuperative care.

It being 6 o'clock p.m., the House took recess.

No. 44

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

First Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Monday, April 1, 1968

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1968

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Monday, April 1, 1968

Estimates, Department of Highways, Mr. Gomme, continued 1465

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to 1500

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

MONDAY, APRIL 1, 1968

The House resumed at 8:00 o'clock, p.m.

Clerk of the House: The 30th order: House in committee of supply; Mr. A. E. Reuter in the Chair.

ESTIMATES, THE DEPARTMENT OF HIGHWAYS

(*continued*)

On vote 904:

Mr. Chairman: The member for Niagara Falls.

Mr. G. Bukator (Niagara Falls): Mr. Chairman, I would like to take up a problem with the hon. Minister that many of our constituents are concerned about. There were several letters written to the department and possibly to the department heads, and then again maybe to the district engineer, but I think this letter would explain what I would like to say to you better than I can. This was written to Mr. H. Greenland, district engineer of The Department of Highways at Burlington:

Dear Sir:

For a number of years the parents of this association—

and this association is the Drummond Road home and school association:

—has been extremely concerned about the dangerous—

Mr. N. L. Olde (Middlesex South): What does that have to do with highways?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please.

Mr. Bukator: I think maybe The Department of Highways could have an education programme at that. I shall have to start all over again to make sense out of this:

For a number of years the parents of this association have been extremely concerned about the dangerous traffic condition prevailing in the Drummond Road overpass of the Queen Elizabeth Way in Niagara Falls. Our files will verify our concern and will explain the extent of our previous requests.

To counter your claim that this overpass is no more dangerous than any other overpass, may we submit the following figures from our survey of the vehicular and pedestrian traffic using both the Drummond Road and the Portage Road bridges. For comparison purposes—both passing over the Queen Elizabeth Way—the Portage Road figures have been included to illustrate the significant difference in traffic on the two overpasses and subsequently the increased dangers involved in using the Drummond Road bridge.

The Drummond Road bridge at school time between 8:20 and 9:07 o'clock has 490 students coming across this little bridge.

May I lay this out before you. The bridge is on the one side; we have the school over the bridge and on the other side there is a large subdivision with many homes and apartment buildings and the youngsters have to cross this particular bridge, an overpass over the Queen Elizabeth Way. So between 8:20 and 9:07 o'clock there are 490 students and 870 vehicles, at 11:30 to 1:30 o'clock there are 982 students and 1,832 cars crossing at that time, and between 2:50 and 5 o'clock there are 490 students and 1,691 cars. Quoting again:

It should be pointed out that our traffic surveys were only conducted during these hours of the day when students were on their way to and from school, and perusal of the figures illustrates immediately the extent of the traffic hazard present each day of approximately 195 school days annually, with approximately 1,000 cars per hour passing over this bridge and the total apparently increases each year. We are indeed fortunate that an accident has not occurred on this bridge. Unfortunately under snowy, icy and rainy conditions our luck could be easily and tragically changed.

In the light of these statistical findings we may again request that serious consideration be given to some alterations in

> the bridge structure to protect the pedestrians. May we recommend that a protective pedestrian walk along both the east and west sides of the present structure be constructed. If projected beyond the structural limits of the present bridge the present barrier or fence would serve to protect the pedestrians from the vehicle traffic. Your consideration to this proposal is urgently required.

This is signed by Mrs. Dorothy Smith, president. There were letters written to D. A. Weller, maintenance engineer of The Department of Highways; Franklin Miller, the mayor of Niagara Falls, myself, and Mr. McLeod of the board of education. A copy of that letter was sent to me on February 9 of this year.

Mr. Olde: What has that got to do with highways?

Mr. Bukator: That was sent to me on February 9 of this year.

Mr. Olde: Why don't you talk to your Minister about this?

Mr. Bukator: And, if I am beginning to aggravate you now, you can rest assured that before I get through you will have a lot more to say.

Mr. L. C. Henderson (Lambton): That is the stuff.

Mr. Bukator: Matter of fact, I like that kind of interjection because it gives me time to think about the problem and the more I think of it the more I think I ought to be taking more than half an hour.

Here I have a local paper in my hand of March 19, 1968, and the headline says: "While Officials Wrangle Hazards to Children Continue". The city of Niagara Falls had one of your men down to talk with them and it says:

> The city council and The Ontario Department of Highways continue to strain over whose responsibility it would be to erect a protective pedestrian barrier on the Drummond Road bridge over the Queen Elizabeth Way. The Drummond Road home and school association have sought the barrier to protect the school children against traffic using the bridge and The Department of Highways says that the barrier is the city's responsibility.

If the barrier on that bridge is a city responsibility there is something I think many members of this House would like to know, also along with myself. The Department of Highways have built the Queen Elizabeth Way and there are many highways built that way. You have the overpass, Mr. Chairman, to the Minister. When these overpasses are put in there is an area of the approach that is not maintained by the department and the city often says it is not its problem either.

But when you come to the bridge itself there are no barricades or guard railings put up for these youngsters to stay on the right side so the traffic cannot get at them, and when you get 500 children walking across a bridge there ought to be a railing at least to protect them—not on that bridge only, but there are many bridges in this province that are identical to that one. I think the children ought to be protected, and I realize this too, that in many cases the municipality does go to The Department of Highways for approval for certain structures and when it does that the government does give it the necessary grant.

There is going to be some work done on that particular bridge, Mr. Chairman, and because it is going to be built, the sidewalk is going to be reconstructed—it is an old sidewalk. Your people in Burlington and district 4 believe that if there is a railing to be erected then the city ought to put it up. I have never heard of a proposition where any municipality can go out to one of your bridges and put railings up on them without approval, I suppose, of the department. If you have similar problems I would like to know something about them.

But as this continues the people are concerned about the children. The department says, "This is not our problem but the city's." The city officials throw up their hands and they say, "Well, we have nothing to do with that, the department ought to do it." And we find ourselves in a position where no one does a job that ought to be done. Because of that they had this meeting at the city council. They continued with their discussions for two or three columns but I suppose we all come to our wit's end sooner or later, even officials of the department.

Mr. Greenland added that the city would pay a little more attention to the removal of the snow from the sidewalk this would prevent it from freezing and prevent an uneven surface for the passing pedestrian. City engineer, Conrad Eidt, stressed that the bridge belonged to The Department of Highways and provincial approval is impossible. He estimated that Mr. Greenland's reference to the city snow-removal programme was

noted by Edward E. Mitchelson as alderman. He termed the remark, "a side-slight of the city." I do not think we have to get into that kind of discussion.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bukator: If some of you on that side of the House had half the intelligence of that young lady you would not be sitting in the back row. As a matter of fact, I will take it a little further and say a quarter of the intelligence she has.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bukator: In two bills alone she has made a greater contribution to Canada than you will ever make in a lifetime.

Mr. Henderson: That is right!

Mr. Bukator: As a matter of fact, the medicare bill was one of them.

Mr. Olde: That is debatable.

Mr. Bukator: And it will come into effect on July 1 because this great lady took the bull by the horns and did the job.

Mr. Olde: Stick to your business.

Mr. Bukator: You want me to stick to my script?

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Your irrelevant interjections are responsible for these diversions.

Mr. Bukator: I said horns.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bukator: I might get in the newspapers with that. That is the kind of statement that gets into the Toronto papers. If a man tries to make a sensible case, Mr. Chairman, of what I was talking about, he will never get any press in the Toronto papers because they do not think there is any more in the province than just Toronto.

Mr. Olde: Do you want the press?

Mr. Bukator: I could make a statement such as the one that the hon. Minister interjected and it would be headlines tomorrow. It does not make sense, but it will be there

An hon. member: I think we should ask the Premier's advice on that.

Mr. Bukator: Now, let us go back and read another couple of paragraphs. I should start all over again.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bukator: As a matter of fact, it is a very good paper. It sometimes predicts elections and what a good job they do on that, especially in Niagara Falls.

An hon. member: They send good people here, too.

Mr. Bukator: A letter from The Department of Highways' district engineer, H. Greenland, to Mrs. Smith is also placed before the council in which the official conference of The Department of Highways contends that the responsibilities for the work rests with the city.

Mr. Greenland said in the letter that The Department of Highways will renovate the bridge, sidewalk and curbs on the bridge and would allow the municipality or board of education to erect a suitable barrier at the curb and down each approach to the bridge.

I believe, Mr. Minister, and the point that I try to make is, does this apply to that one bridge only.

There must be similar problems to this all over the province. I believe there are and if children cross daily as children do, often pushing each other off as they play along, there ought to be a railing there to keep them away from the cars. There has not been an accident, but these people have continuously made this approach to both authorities and no one wants to do the job. I think it is about time that this government or The Department of Highways should have in their programme that when they build future bridges they put a railing at least on one side.

Mr. P. J. Yakabuski (Renfrew South): What is he doing over here?

Mr. Henderson: That is right.

Mr. Bukator: Well, you can have him. We do not want him over here.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bukator: Now, back to The Department of Highways.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order please! The member for Niagara Falls.

Mr. Bukator: If we would have been in session this morning rather than this evening, being April 1, I could understand why this is going on. I would like the Minister to answer that question, and I have one other item to take up.

The Provincial Treasurer (Mr. MacNaughton) of this day, who was the Minister of Highways of a year or two ago, and I had a little conversation about some progressive steps in that great county of Welland, as my friend from Welland (Mr. Morningstar), would say. This Minister did see fit to do a job for us. This bridge built in that wonderful village of Chippewa, where I live, has a guard railing on one side of it, because this is a modern structure to protect the children.

All I am saying to this Minister is that if other bridges are built and some of the old ones are protected that way, the problem that they have had to wrestle with for years could be eliminated. I would like to know the feelings of the Minister on this particular issue, including the Drummond Road bridge.

Hon. G. E. Gomme (Minister of Highways): Well, Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member would send me that letter I will certainly have it well looked into and we will see what we can do for you.

Mr. Bukator: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, that is progress I hope, that is progress.

Mr. MacDonald: He just said he would look into it, he did not say he would do anything.

Mr. Bukator: I will tell you, we will both look.

Now then, another item that I touch on annually. It was brought to my attention, by my leader as a matter of fact, in vote 904 (6s), the city of Niagara Falls, compensation for loss of taxes, that they get a sum of $12,000. Now I suppose I ought to give you a bit of history on what happened—

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): Do you have to bring that up tonight? We hear that every year.

Mr. Bukator: You have heard; there are 41 new members on this House that have not heard. I appeal to the intelligence of these young men who have not been brainwashed by one party or another. I want, Mr. Chairman, through you, to get them to tell me if they will why this is a fair grant in lieu of taxes—I am speaking now of the Rainbow Bridge—a $12,000 grant in lieu of taxes. If the city council of Niagara Falls issued permits, or the officials of that council issued permits to The Department of Highways to reconstruct a series of stores underneath that bridge, to build a brand new and fancy restaurant, and if they allowed The Department of Highways in their city to reconstruct that bridge without permits to do so, they were not on top of the job.

They should have known that this was happening. At the time when they gave them the $12,000 grant in lieu of taxes, the bridge was just built and they did not know what experience they would have; they did not know whether the bridge would pay or not. But now the problem has been settled, simply because it is a revenue-producing unit, and a lot of revenue. I could touch on tolls on that same bridge too but I am looking for taxes rather than tolls.

Mr. Olde: Go ahead!

Mr. Bukator: For my good friend—he says "go ahead"—I will, I will.

You gentlemen who cross the Rainbow Bridge buy a book of tickets for $2.50 and if you do not use them up in 90 days—if you only use three or four tickets—that particular trip costs you $2.50 to cross that bridge once. A federally operated bridge, the Peace Bridge, sells tickets also. The tickets are 25 cents. You buy a book for $5; they cost you about 17 cents each and you can keep those tickets until they are used up and you can use them indefinitely. Is not that a fairer way than the Rainbow Bridge? Is that not fair?

I am glad that the other day when I asked a question about the apartments, the Provincial Treasurer said he is on that commission. He is a fair man, I think. When he looks at this matter and sees it as I do, I will venture to say that next year that plan will be changed. The local residents ought to be able to use those tickets until they are used up the same as we use the tokens on the bridges over the canal and skyway. There is no time limit on them.

Getting back to The Department of Highways, why would the city of Niagara Falls allow—I will appeal to you doctor; the hon. member is looking very attentively at me; I will appeal to you—why would The Department of Highways be allowed by the city to reconstruct at least 10 or 12 beautiful stores, worth hundreds of thousands of dollars, and not say to The Department of Highways, "It's about time we renegotiated our agreement." For the bridge at the north end of the city this government is giving them grants in lieu of taxes to the tune of $38,000 a year, and there is no comparison in the two bridges. I would suggest that this Minister look into that matter and before this

session is over give me some assurance that they will renegotiate that agreement because they rebuilt the bridge, so I can go back to the city of Niagara Falls.

There may be a reason that the city of Niagara Falls council do not go through my office as a member of the Opposition, because there are some in that council, two at least, who believe you can do much better with this government by the back door. I think they come in the front door, but at least they come to the Minister directly or the Minister to this government because for some unknown reason the former mayor, who is now alderman, does not look at things politically as I do.

Would it be possible that they did not win the election in that riding? I do not know. Leave it with us, we will take care of it; it has not been taken care of. I have talked about this issue since 1959; the figure is still $12,000. I should have been able to quote verse and portion of the Act in whole without even looking at the book. I see the hon. Prime Minister grinning at me a little; I think he is, or maybe with me.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): I'm with you.

Mr. Bukator: Something happened, Mr. Chairman, when they could reconstruct and I say this, it is a beautiful structure. It takes in two city blocks, Oakes Garden theatre; it's a wonderful spot. Most of you have enjoyed yourselves there, but do you not believe that that portion of money should be increased at least as much as the hon. Provincial Secretary's bridge?

He gets about $25,000 for his, and here is the biggest, the best, the best located and the finest structure in the city getting the least amount of money. I do not believe that they as a Council should have sat down with the Minister and said, "before you reconstruct we will issue your permits, but at least give us as much as you are giving us at the other end which would be around $35,000."

Now I will get one more go at this; there is an agreement with the Attorney General's office and I will tell you again, I will refresh your memories on the grants in lieu of taxes to that bridge; they are not paying what they ought to, and in this particular estimate, $12,000 is not enough. I suppose if I have not got through yet, I have good attendance —my friend from Lord-knows-where has left the room, he does not believe me I guess— but the facts are there. This is not a fair portion of money for that establishment. The bell tower alone with those beautiful apartments should be paying $12,000 a year.

An hon. member: Is the Minister to reply?

Mr. Bukator: I would like to know whether he would consider this. I think that once before, Mr. Chairman—if you do not mind my being out of order—I like it in committee because you can say most anything just as long as you stay close to the estimate.

So having stayed close to the estimates a year ago—this Minister just took over the job and believe me I wanted to be fair with him. I did not press him on any of these issues because he did not at that time have his feet under him and was not too well acquainted with his department because they spend many millions of dollars—having had a year, I might say through you, Mr. Chairman, for a man who can flare up very quickly he has done an excellent job during these estimates; he is holding back nicely, being very fair with his answers. All I ask of him is to prove to me that he is as fair as some people think he is on that side of the House. If he is he will come up and tell me that this is not a fair figure and ought to be adjusted.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Of course, Mr. Chairman, I have to tell the hon. member that it is a statutory grant only; it is an annual payment—

Mr. Bukator: Yes, I knew that.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: —set out for the years 1941 to 1980. I may say that in any reconstruction we abided by all the rules and regulations of the city and I suppose there could be some renegotiation, I would not know that. I have never tried, to be perfectly honest with you about it, and I felt that what was done last year for the city of Niagara Falls was certainly a great help to them. They got one lump sum of $144,000 for the other bridge, plus the amount which you say they are getting now. I think your pleas have done a lot for the city. You never can tell, maybe better things will be done.

Mr. Bukator: May I just continue this, to finish this chapter, or this book?

I want to thank the Minister for interjecting in the report that $144,000 was paid for the old bridge. It was a privately-owned bridge and when anything is owned privately, they pay taxes.

This thing went on for several years and then the bridge commission purchased that bridge and the agreement ran out. Instead of them getting their $35,000 approximately, in grants in lieu of taxes, when the agreement ran out again the city council did not follow up on it and say, "look, let us renegotiate and get our money." Finally, three or four years later, they found that they were not being taxed what they ought to be. They came to this government who said, "this is true, we will not only pay you the back taxes, or grants in lieu of taxes for four years, we will increase it a little bit and extend the contract that much longer. This is fair. If all this government and this Minister did was pay their back taxes for four years—had I been there you would have paid interest on your back taxes, like we have to do when we do not pay them on time.

Anyhow, it was not a large grant, it was paying your back portions up to that time and then you are continuing that process. That is good. That is being done at the Peace Bridge also. But this, I would not, Mr. Minister, through you, Mr. Chairman, have allowed you to reconstruct until you sat with us and renegotiated that Act. I think they had a point there that if it is not legal, it is moral. You just cannot build lovely structures and not pay more taxes. Everybody else in private enterprise does, but the bridge did not.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I do not want to intrude into the hon. member for Niagara Falls' pleading on behalf of his own constituency, but I was interested in the Minister's reply. He said that he was not aware that negotiations had ever been opened and he might look into it. I rise because before the private member's bill the other day, we had quite an extended discussion arising on a private bill brought in from the village of Point Edward, seeking an increase in taxes from the Blue Water bridge authority, to bring taxes up to what they thought was a fair level. In this instance it would be coming from the authority and would be drawn from revenues arising from the tolls which the authority is still levying.

But the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. McKeough), who sits at the committee like God and pronounces on what happens and what may not happen on occasion, stated that the government wanted to examine the infinite variety of arrangements with regard to bridges on which a claim might be made from taxes throughout the whole of the province of Ontario.

If that is correct, the Minister of Highways, whom I think would be rather intimately involved, apparently has not heard of it, because he said he did not know of any renegotiations. Maybe I drew the wrong conclusions from the Minister of Municipal Affairs' comments, that they were going to examine and try to get them all agreements on somewhat the same basis, all of these international bridges.

What is government policy? Because the Minister of Municipal Affairs said they were heading in one direction, this Minister has just suggested that he is not aware of negotiations being possible. Is the government contemplating some standard, regularized approach to taxes being paid on bridges to those municipalities that happen to have the bridges in their midst?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. member probably took what I said wrong, certainly. What the Minister of Municipal Affairs told you is right, there is a great variation on these agreements and it involves more than municipal government, and we are trying to resolve the whole issue of all of them.

Mr. MacDonald: May I ask this finally: when this is resolved, is this likely then to be a grant that will come within these estimates of The Department of Highways to the municipalities, or is it going to be dropped into the municipal bailiwick?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Chairman, I would not be able to answer just how it would come because it involves other governments as well as us.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, as a footnote to the hon. member for Niagara Falls—maybe in the renegotiations he will get what he thinks is justice. Maybe.

Mr. Bukator: Thank you for the assist. We tried this in committee the other day, but it did not work—but it might work in the House because there are more people who are listening.

Mr. Chairman: On vote 904. The member for Essex-Kent.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): Mr. Chairman, I have a question with regard to Highway 98 and its shoulders. I will quote from the Windsor *Star* of April 30, 1966:

HIGHWAY 98 BLAMED IN DEATH — ROAD SHOULDERS TOO NARROW

According to the coroner's jury inquiring into the death of a 60-year-old Ruscom woman in a three-car collision earlier this month, recommended Friday afternoon that the shoulders of Highway 98 be considerably widened.

An Ontario provincial police constable at the Essex detachment said that the shoulders of Highway 98 at the scene of the accident just east of Pillette Road were about 6 feet wide on each side of the highway. He said that there were about 20 feet of property belonging to The Ontario Department of Highways on either side of the two ditches which run alongside the highway.

I wonder if The Department of Highways had considered some of these areas where there are very narrow shoulders and considerable space on the opposite side of the ditch; these would be where there is roadside drainage. I am not speaking of municipal drains, because I am familiar with that, but this would be classed as roadside drainage. Some of these shallow ditches could be very easily moved off the road without to much trouble and without too much expense.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Chairman, we are not familiar with the particular jury's recommendation that the hon. member referred to, but we do have highways in the area with a 6-ft. shoulder on them.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister if he plans to amend The Highway Improvement Act to enable municipalities to place signs on limited access roads, so that the motoring public could know of the outstanding features of the municipality as they approach the municipality.

Now if the Minister would not want to put signs on the highways, on 401, close to the municipality, then perhaps he would consider having a park fairly close to the municipality so that the motoring public could get off the highway and, at a roadside park or "lay-by" as they are called sometimes, see the outstanding features of a municipality. There would be a telephone there so that an individual could make calls into the community concerning accommodations, and so forth.

All of this, I understand, would require amendments to The Highway Improvement Act. May I tell the Minister that this is not the first time I have brought this up and this has been, I understand, a recommendation from the Ontario chambers of commerce for well over ten years. It is one, I think, worthy of serious consideration, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: We are considering the problem which the member talks about, but we are not considering changing the legislation to do it. There are telephones, as you know, in every service centre and people have access to those along 401.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Chairman: service centres are not always necessarily fairly close to a municipality. I think they would be much better, say, as you were approaching the city of London from the west. When you are several miles away from the city itself, there was a park or a lay-by rather than a service centre, because not everyone cares to go into a service centre. When they go into a service centre they have the idea immediately that they are going to be taken, that the charges for food and so on in the centre are much beyond their ability to pay and that they are being overcharged.

Now I am not saying that they are being overcharged, but the motoring public have that idea and, in some cases, they actually are. I recall that at some time last year I paid 25 cents for a glass of "coke." This is just a little too much for a family that may have four or five children in the car and stopping at the service centre and then having to pay $1 for four glasses of Coca-Cola.

My thought, Mr. Chairman, is to have a park and it does not necessarily have to be the type of park where the individual could camp, or anything of that sort, but just space to pull over to the side of the road where one could see various types of maps concerning the municipality and from that know exactly where you are and know how much farther you can plan on going for the day. There would be a telephone and washroom facilities and everything for the convenience of the motoring public.

Our friends to the south of us use this to some extent, especially on the inter-state roads. Having travelled them, I find them a real convenience. I think it is a type of convenience that we should provide to the Ontario motoring public.

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent): Mr. Chairman, may I ask a question, or does the Minister want to answer the member for Windsor-Walkerville?

Mr. Chairman: Does the Minister wish to make any comment on the last speaker's thoughts?

The member for Kent.

Mr. Spence: Mr. Chairman: I would like to ask the Minister of all the service centres along the route of 401 from Windsor to the Quebec border which are constructed, what is the revenue derived from all the service centres by the Minister's department in 1967-68.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: The estimated total revenue is $1,931,334, and this goes to the consolidated revenue fund.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Etobicoke.

Mr. L. A. Braithwaite (Etobicoke): Mr. Chairman, what would be the average profit from one of these service stations? That is the total figure we just had, I believe. I wonder what the average figure would be.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: This is based on two things, on the ground rent and the estimated percentage of profit. It runs from $40,000 to $130,000, depending on the service centre and where it is.

Mr. Braithwaite: Is this the net profit that one of these places might make, Mr. Chairman?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: This is the revenue which comes to us.

Mr. Braithwaite: Are there any figures available of the profits which the operator of an individual service centre is expected to make?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: No, I do not have that information, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Thunder Bay.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Mr. Chairman, I have a couple of questions for the Minister with regard to the cost of maintenance.

On the estimates for 1968-69, the total cost of maintenance for King's highways and other roads is $114,593,000. Now if I refer back to the departmental figures from April 1, 1966, to March 31, 1967, I find it hard to believe—and possibly the Minister could enlighten me. At page 289, appendix number 3, it shows the cost of maintenance for Highway 11 from Toronto to Rainy River, a distance of 1,186.5 miles at $3,882,000 and on the same page for Highway 17 from Quebec to the Manitoba border, a distance of 1,285.4 miles, $3,639,000 was expended.

Now they are the two main roads for King's highways from the east to the west and there is just a little over $7 million spent on them out of roughly, I do not know exactly what it is, but roughly say $114 or $115 million.

I think the Minister, Mr. Chairman, made the boast in the House a few days ago that he had travelled on most of the highways in Ontario in the past year and would endeavour to travel over the remainder of them in the time at his disposal. I think what the Minister has said is true; you can go to many roads in northern Ontario, particularly from Wawa to the outskirts of the Lakehead cities on Highway 17, and from North Bay up through Kapuskasing, Hearst and down into Longlac, Geraldton and down into Nipigon where it connects with Highway 17. I do not think he would hesitate for a minute to agree with me that a great deal more money should be spent on the maintenance of those roads.

Granted there is some work under way between Batchawana and Agawa Bay on Highway 17 and there is contract let south of Beardmore down to Lake Helen. But I was wondering if the Minister would be prepared to say that he would be in a position to spend more money on the two main routes for the King's highway from Quebec to the Manitoba border on Highway 17 and Highway 11 from Toronto to Rainy River.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: First of all I want to point out, Mr. Chairman, that in this vote there is $50 million of subsidy to the municipalities. The whole figure is not just for our roads; I think we have always attempted to keep the roads in the very best shape we can. If there is some particular area where you have problems, if you let me know where it is we will see if we can do something better for you.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Kent.

Mr. Spence: How long have these leases gone up for with the gas companies that own and operate service centres along Highway 401 and was there any increase in percentage charged by your department to these gas companies during 1967 and 1968, or do they run the same as our fiscal year here in the Ontario Legislature?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: The leases were drawn up for a 25-year period at the figures which is a percentage of the profits, plus the ground rent.

Mr. Spence: Mr. Minister, could you tell me what percentage; is it percentage of gross take or percentage of net?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: It is percentage of the gross take.

Mr. Spence: Gross take. And what is the average of the percentage of gross take? Or, could you tell me? On an average.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: I would think around 10 per cent.

Mr. Spence: Ten per cent.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Sudbury East.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): I was very glad to hear the Minister say to the member for Thunder Bay that if we could mention a few places that need immediate attention, to draw them to his attenion. I would like to draw to his attention Highway 69 north and Highway 541. I am sure the Minister of Mines would agree, after his jaunt over Highway 541 yesterday, that he saw more patches in that five miles than he did in the 200 miles from Toronto to the French River. This is one thing I would like to leave with the Minister to consider.

What I am primarily concerned with though, and what I got up for was the $1,500,000 spent for hot mix patching. I was just wondering if it would be possible for the Minister to give us some idea on a regional basis how this was spent, or will be spent. On what basis—let us say the four regions, the north, the south, the east and the west—can you give us some idea how they intend to spend this money?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: I would not have that figure here, but I could get it. The hot-mix patching is similar to the resurfacer paving work, except that the area covered is usually a short distance. To cover a long patch, not just the little ones over the holes. The material is mixed in a hot-mix asphalt plant before being placed on the road, and it is usually carried out by contractors.

Mr. Martel: Does the Minister have any comment on Highway 69 and Highway 541?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: As the hon. member said, I have travelled those particular roads, I would think, about six weeks ago. I have to admit that parts of them are in bad shape, but I also want to tell you that I am trying to do something about it.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Etobicoke.

Mr. Braithwaite: Mr. Chairman, just following up. Did I understand that the Minister said the percentage increase in rent based on sales was 10 per cent?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Chairman, there was no increase. It was just that the hon. member asked me if I could give him an idea of the percentage that we got, and I only gave him an average figure of around 10 per cent of the gross take from the service centres.

Mr. Braithwaite: Well then, Mr. Chairman, if I might ask the Minister.

Is he aware that some of the oil companies have an escalator clause in their leases with the lessee? I think it is based on something like 10 per cent of sales. I am wondering if the oil companies can reap such a profit from one of these service centres, and one oil company seems to have more than one service centre, why does not the government or the Minister's department give some thought to putting some sort of escalator clauses in the leases to the oil companies? If leases are for 25 years, it seems to me that these oil companies are making a killing. Although it sounds like a lot of money when the government says they are making between $40,000 and $100,000 on one of these service centres, I would not be at all surprised if the oil companies are making two or three times that from individual service centres. I am wondering if we have not been asleep at the switch here.

Why can we not have an escalator clause in these contracts; or is there some buddy-buddy arrangement between the Minister's department and the various oil companies?

Mr. E. A. Winkler (Grey South): Oh heavens, no!

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Chairman, these are all put out for tenders. All the major companies bid on these and the one that is successful has to bear all the capital costs of everything that is done in the locality and this is the part we get our revenue off, but it is all by tenders.

Mr. Braithwaite: Mr. Chairman, if I may use the example of the modern day plaza—there is not a plaza owner—there is not a

corporation—that does not get some share of the sales. If the government—if the Minister's department—sets the tender forms and the requirements for tender, I can see nothing wrong with making it a requirement that a portion of the sales will go to the government. It seems to me that after this 25-year lease the oil companies are bound to recoup their capital costs.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Ten per cent of the sales and I am using that figure—that is not the exact figure, they vary—

Mr. Braithwaite: Well, what do they vary between?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Some of them are more than that, but 10 per cent, on the average, of these sales does come to the government.

Mr. Braithwaite: The point I am trying to make is, as the sales increase, why cannot the percentage increase? Why can there not be an escalator clause? In all leases these days you find an escalator clause, even if you are talking about taxes. I cannot see why the government cannot make more profit on these.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Sandwich-Riverside.

Mr. F. A. Burr (Sandwich-Riverside): Mr. Chairman, has Highway 18 been mentioned recently? It passes through River Canard and LaSalle and the town council in Sandwich West is concerned about the number of fatalities and the condition of the road at present. I hope you would have a look at that.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: I believe, Mr. Chairman, the question was about reconstruction of that or—

Mr. Burr: Yes!

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Again, all I can say is that we will look into that. I have not the answer to that.

Mr. Chairman: The member for High Park.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): Mr. Minister, can you advise me, when these stations are put for tender, if independents are also allowed to tender? Can you also advise me —because there do not appear to be any independents who have been successful—if the various large oil companies all have, by coincidence of course, an equal number of these stations?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Chairman, from looking at the list I would say they do not have an equal number.

Mr. Shulman: What about independents? Are they allowed to tender?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: I did not hear the question.

Mr. Shulman: Are independents allowed to tender?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Well, we have always stayed with the major oil companies.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please! The member for High Park.

Mr. Shulman: I would like to know the names of the major oil companies that are allowed to tender. How many of them are there specifically?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: It is the members of the petroleum association.

Mr. Shulman: Do you know how many members there are of that association?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: I could give you the names of some of them that have been successful in Ontario—Texaco, Shell, B-A, BP, Canadian Petrofina, Canadian Oil Company, Supertest—

Mr. Shulman: Could the Minister supply me with a list of how many centres each of these companies has successfully tendered for? It is not necessary at the moment, but if he could supply it to me at his convenience.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Yes, we can.

Mr. Braithwaite: Would the Minister be good enough to table the information he has as to the location and numbers of these various stations so that the information would be available to all members of the House.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Certainly, Mr. Chairman, that can be done.

Mr. Shulman: Fine!

Mr. Chairman: Would that satisfy both the members?

On vote 904. The member for Port Arthur.

Mr. R. H. Knight (Port Arthur): While dealing with the matter of service centres, I wonder if I could ask the hon. Minister whether any service centres are planned for the lakehead expressway which will surround the lakehead when it is completed.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Chairman, there are no plans for that area.

Mr. Knight: I wonder, in the same context, if I could bring up another matter that is related to the expressway and service centres. The expressway to the east of Port Arthur will, as it were, cause traffic to by-pass some 15 miles of Highway 17 from the easterly boundary of the city of Port Arthur to the MacKenzie bridge. I understand that businesses along that highway will suffer considerably because of the expressway.

Does The Department of Highways have any way of compensating these people, or giving them an opportunity to get closer to the new highway in order to carry on business and not lose what they have invested there over the years. Does the highway take this into account at all when constructing?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: No, Mr. Chairman, that is a relocation of the road and we do not take any responsibility for that.

Mr. Knight: Mr. Speaker, while I am on my feet, I asked the hon. Minister a number of questions this afternoon pertaining to the Trans-Canada highway and I think he said he would get the answers for me. I thought perhaps I might receive those answers this evening.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Chairman, I might say that we have been off vote 904 for quite a long time, which was satisfactory to me, but I promise to give those under "construction" and when we get to that vote I will have all the answers for you on that.

Mr. Chairman: On vote 904, the member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Chairman, if I may ask the Minister, has the department changed their thinking concerning the use of scramble corners or Barnes' dance corners in municipalities i.e. where the traffic signals stay red for vehicular traffic and then when they turn green, to walk, only pedestrian traffic can cross in any direction, diagonally and so forth. In this way pedestrian traffic can only cross an intersection at that one type of light. This permits vehicles to take a right turn or to go through without any interference whatsoever, because in a normal municipality, if the pedestrian crosses at the same time the light is green as does traffic he does interfere with the traffic moving to the right. Some of the centres in the United States use this and I noticed that Australia and Hawaii have used this and have not abandoned it at all.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Chairman, this would be under The Department of Transport, if the municipality requests that.

Mr. B. Newman: May I ask the Minister if any consideration is being given to the recommendation of the marking of the edges of super highways, both sides of the super highways, as the chamber of commerce recommended as follows:

> Continuing the right hand identification at exits of the lane for through traffic by means of a broken yellow line, and adopting a solid yellow line on all super highways on both outside edges. Not only at kerbs but even on the straightway.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: This, of course, is a relatively new innovation to put it on the kerbs and the turnoffs. The whole area of that is being studied by all highways jurisdictions, and we have not come to a conclusion on whether we should continue it further or not.

Mr. B. Newman: I hope, Mr. Minister, you do not study it too long because it gets more vital each day as our highways become more heavily put to use.

May I ask the Minister if in the erection of signs in a municipality that he simply mention the word downtown with an arrow pointing instead of having the downtown signs set up in your department in municipalities so confusing that the driving public do not know which way they are actually to go downtown.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: If it is on a connecting link it is put up by the municipality. If it is a highway through a city it is put up by us. Do you have some specific point that you would want to tell me of?

Mr. B. Newman: I am simply following from a press release that simply says, why do we not simply say "downtown—this way" or just the miles to the next place to let you know you are on the right road and the route circuiting the city.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Cochrane South.

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): Mr. Chairman, in construction 161671 there is to be some hot-mix patching on Highway 11 from 101 northerly to the west junction of

Highway 67. Now there are some bad stops on Highway 101 itself, west almost up to Porcupine.

Mr. Chairman: Order please! Is the member speaking about new construction?

Mr. Ferrier: No, it is hot-mix patching which comes under—

Mr. Chairman: Are you still on vote 904?

Mr. Ferrier: Yes. I wonder if some consideration might be given to looking at some of the especially bad parts of Highway 101 westwards to Porcupine, especially a bad part around Hoyle, under that particular project. If you could give some consideration to that.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: I will look into that, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Thank you. The member for High Park.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, I intended to raise the problem of the relocation of highways with the problem of people involved under another vote, but inasmuch as a member of the Opposition has already raised the matter and the Minister has answered it, I believe I should go ahead at this time. This is a very serious problem and one which obviously has been ignored by the Minister, and I would like to read a letter here which I have from one person—

Hon. Mr. Gomme: If we could get back on the vote I would be glad to answer the questions. That would be "construction".

Mr. Shulman: The reason I brought this up was that the Minister had already answered one question on this particular problem.

Mr. Chairman: If the member would not mind holding it until we get to the construction. The member for Sudbury.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): A few moments ago my very esteemed friend from Kent, who is an old friend of mine I might say, made reference to Highway 401 which underlines the very point that I want to make about that highway.

It was the matter of some enthusiasm in this province when the first citizen a couple of years ago down at the historic city of Kingston celebrated the 150th anniversary of the birth of Sir John A. Macdonald. During his contribution that night he said that henceforth what was formerly Highway 401 would be known as the Macdonald-Cartier freeway.

Now, I have had occasion to drive for many miles on that freeway, and I must say that there is something less than an abundance of signs that proclaim for the native born and inform the visitor that he is travelling on the Macdonald-Cartier freeway. You see one or two in the vicinity of the city of Toronto, but you can go many miles west or east and the highway signing is almost completely absent.

For example, I watched today coming in from the airport, and from Toronto international airport until you come to Highway 27 there is no sign at all that reveals the name of that highway. I have observed over the last couple of years that the press and the electronic media are almost always consistent in describing that highway as the Macdonald-Cartier freeway.

However, in The Department of Highways I have had occasion to note that the employees of the department invariably refer to it as 401. This may not be an earth-shaking matter, but I happen to be and will remain, I hope for the rest of this natural life, one of those persons who, as I said, greets with enthusiasm such an announcement as that of the first citizen when he called to the attention the contribution of the founders of this country by naming that highway in such a fashion. One remarks as a Canadian that if you go to Turkey you confront the name of Kemal Ataturk at every twist and turning; if you go to Italy you invariably—to get into the modern age—encounter Mazzini. Pardon me Mazzini. I suppose, no the member for Dovercourt is not here, it is all right.

An hon. member: Garibaldi!

Mr. Sopha: And Garibaldi, thank you! I was just about to mention him. If you go to Mexico you can hardly go two blocks without being reminded of Benito Juarez, and in the United States, of course, the remembrances are legion of the great leaders of that country.

But some will consider it to be squeamish and perhaps to be too chauvinistic, or merely to be promoting my constant refrain when I take note of the fact, of course, that they do not fail to get the Crown on the licence plates every year to remind us of another tradition. But apart from the contribution of the first citizen about the great and important place of those two men in the history of this country. Then the announcement was made, and that was about it.

I do not care how many notes the Deputy Minister passes to you, I am going to tell you that for many miles of that highway—many,

many miles—you never see a sign identifying it. Get on the New York state expressway and you will not go more than two or three miles before you are reminded of the name of that highway, unexciting as it is; or the Massachusetts turnpike, and in New Jersey, also, plenty of signing.

I merely say to you and I am not asking you a question—I am merely suggesting to you that this summer you get some students who need a job and get them painting signs —Macdonald-Cartier freeway—and put one up every four or five miles. Every visitor that comes to Ontario will say, "Well, now those are two fine looking names—a Scot and a Frenchman—what did they have to do with this country?" Maybe somebody will be able to tell them of the great part they played; and maybe in the breasts of our people which is more important—in the hearts of our people—where, after all when all is said and done, if this country is to achieve greatness, this country must reside in the hearts of our people— and there, by being constantly reminded of the part played by those two in the naming of that highway, some good will be accomplished. It will make in realistic terms, it will point out in realistic terms, the importance of what the first citizen had to say at Kingston.

I sit down with only the footnote that there was plenty of complaints from this province and its ministry, and the first citizen, that only Ontario, in the whole of this great nation paused to celebrate at that time the contribution of the great man—the native of this province. And by an act of concord enveloped the great French-Canadian who was his helpmate in the building of this country by combining what is perhaps a long name, but an important name, for that highway.

So let 401 be gone. Take down all the signs that identify it as 401 and put numerous ones that describe it by its correct name and your humble servant will be satisfied with your accomplishment.

Mr. Chairman: On vote 904. The member for Windsor-Walkerville!

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Chairman, I wanted to ask the Minister if he is considering amending legislation so that cities, towns and villages will not be required to contribute to suburban or county roads. This resolution was originally passed by the council of the town of Goderich and endorsed by the Ontario mayors and reeves association and the Ontario municipal association.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: We are not anticipating any change at the present time, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 904 agreed to.

On vote 905:

The member for Kent.

Mr. Spence: I believe we argued in the Throne Speech that the government was going to set up a central purchasing agency in The Department of Public Works. Mr. Chairman, I would like to know if this central purchasing agency is going to be set up in public works will all your equipment be bought through this purchasing agency in the province?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: The committee is being set up and they will set the policy either later on to purchase or else give us the directions on how to purchase and what to purchase.

Mr. Spence: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister, does your department buy any equipment for any other department in government here in the province of Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Occasionally we may buy some such items as motor vehicles for other departments.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Essex-Kent!

Mr. Ruston: I believe road signs come under 905 according to my interpretation, is that right, Mr. Chairman?

I was wondering what the basis for having a sign for an area like on 401 or on any highway; does the size of a municipality have any bearing on it? I notice that some have been left off on some occasions and I wonder if you have any basis as to whether a municipality or a town or village has to be any size. We have had a bit of a problem in our own area with no signs pointing to local villages and I would like to know if you have any policy with regard to that?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: We are not quite clear on the question, Mr. Chairman. Is it on 401 that you are—

Mr. Ruston: On 401 or any highway, Mr. Chairman. It is 98 and 401 that I am speaking of. We have had some signs removed with regards to small villages and so forth, and other ones that are smaller villages still have them. I am just trying to figure out

what the basis is and I wonder if you have any criteria as to how large a village has to be before you put a sign that it is on 401?

Mr. Chairman: We are dealing with purchasing and other services, vote 905.

Mr. Ruston: I think signs come under this.

Mr. Chairman: Would this be part of vote 905, Mr. Minister?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: I do not think it is under this vote, Mr. Chairman, but we do put them up on the highways and the incorporated towns or villages if the highway goes through them.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Chairman, in the public accounts on page (i) 27, I think it is, 1966-67, there is an item for Scotchlite of $423,536.39. Why does the department purchase Scotchlite?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: This is for all our signs so that they will show up at night.

Mr. B. Newman: Does the department think that they serve a useful purpose? Are they a safety feature, do they identify?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. B. Newman: They do, Mr. Minister! Well, I wish you could get along with your counterpart in the House—

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Hear, hear!

Mr. B. Newman: —and convince him of the saftey value of the use of Scotchlite because you could come along and have him follow on licence plates what you are doing.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Downsview.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I was very interested in the Minister explaining to my colleague from Kent that he was looking into the whole problem of central purchasing.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Chairman, I did not say that.

Mr. Singer: What did you say?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: There was a committee set up and they would be the ones that would set policy for us, whether they would purchase, or have us purchase our own requirements under their policy.

Mr. Singer: I am glad the Minister elucidated on that. Would the Minister not agree with me that if there is going to be central purchasing as enunciated in the Speech from the Throne that it is only meaningful if the central purchasing agency does all the purchasing for you.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Chairman, I do not think this is necessarily so.

Mr. Singer: If the Minister does not think it is necessarily so, Mr. Chairman, could the Minister tell us what he thinks is necessarily so?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: As I said, Mr. Chairman, the committee sets the policy.

For instance, in the purchase of the type of equipment that we want, maybe we are better equipped to set the specifications and so on than have some other body do it.

Then, of course, there are purchases of equipment which are used all over the province, and it could be a lot more expensive to take them out of some central area rather than have them purchased there.

Mr. Singer: Do I understand then, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister is saying that really the remarks in the Speech from the Throne are not all they are cracked up to be; that he does not really believe in central purchasing? If that is not what he means, what does he mean? Could the Minister elucidate a bit further.

Mr. Sopha: What he means is that ain't necessarily so.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order, order!

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Provincial Treasurer): It is quite appropriate for me to comment on this. Those items of materials that are common to all departments will presumably be essentially handled under the common purchasing services. But I think it is quite appropriate to say also that the specialized items of equipment, if you like, used by The Department of Highways do not lend themselves to common purchasing. That is just a few short words, but I think that summarizes it pretty well.

Mr. Singer: I thank the Treasurer for his intervention. I wonder if the consortium of Ministers, Mr. Chairman, could explain to me how they propose to handle in the future, automobile purchases to which the Minister

of Highways made a brief allusion a few moments ago? Either one or the other, which ever one feels they can do it?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: The policy is set by the purchasing board. This is the central committee we referred to and we will just carry out the mechanics.

Mr. Singer: Well, what are the mechanics, Mr. Chairman? This is what I am trying to get at. It may be that the Minister will recall the studies of the public accounts committee into the purchasing of automobiles and we ascertained, Mr. Chairman, much to our surprise that instead of The Department of Highways purchasing automobiles from General Motors, or Ford or Chrysler or whatever, they purchase them from individual agents, having first made a deal with the manufacturers. It disturbed a number of us.

The Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs shakes his head. I do not know whether he wants to get into this or not, but I would be delighted to hear him.

It disturbed a number of us, Mr. Chairman, on this committee that there was no ability of the province, because of its large purchases, to purchase direct from the manufacturer. No matter how it was sliced, the orders had to be filed through a particular dealer in a particular area.

It occurred to us as well, sir, that the particular dealers in the particular areas could reasonably be identified as Conservative supporters. Now, it would seem to me, sir, that if there was any merit, any merit at all in the idea of central purchasing, that we could do away with the pork barrel in the purchase of automobiles.

There is no reason whatsoever why when the government of Ontario purchases a large number of motor vehicles that those purchases have to be funnelled through individual dealers who by coincidence turn out to be Tories. The purchases could and should be made—and this is one of the reasons why we advocated central purchasing—from the manufacturers. The dealers' commissions in that way could be avoided, which would be a substantial saving to the people of the province of Ontario.

I am very disappointed, Mr. Chairman, in the fact that neither the Provincial Treasurer nor the Minister of Highways has said one concrete word in support of the phrase, the very fascinating phrase in the Speech from the Throne, that you really mean what you said when you wanted a central purchasing agency, which would be a saving to the people of Ontario. I must conclude Mr. Chairman, that we are just going to have more of the same, with a committee on top of a committee. It will be necessarily so if it suits our purposes, but not necessarily, so if we can keep the—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order, order!

Mr. Singer: Oh, you can order till you are blue in the face. This is the fact, and the hon. gentleman who is yelling order sat with me on the public accounts committee and he knows this is a fact.

I had hoped when I heard those interesting words in the Speech from the Throne that perhaps we have seen the government embarking upon a new era—less patronage and more for the people of Ontario. Unfortunately, it is disappointing that there has been nothing like this come forward at all now.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Chairman, I think that the hon. member is misrepresenting the facts because most of our equipment—the purchase of trucks and all that type of equipment—is bought directly from the manufacturer without any commission to anybody. There may be a very, very small percentage of cars purchased some other way, and these are always by three bids from competitive type automobiles, but it is a very small percentage. They are purchased from the manufacturers.

Mr. Singer: Could I ask the Minister, Mr. Chairman, if he bothered to read the report of the public accounts committee two years ago?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: No, Mr. Chairman, I must admit I did not read it.

Mr. Singer: Well, could I suggest to him that he perhaps discuss the matter with his colleague for London South, (Mr. White) who was there and who agreed with me—joined in the shock—

Mr. Sopha: And the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

Mr. Singer: Yes, and the Minister of Municipal Affairs, and they were all just amazed that this practice goes on. I am amazed tonight, Mr. Chairman, when the hon. Minister of Highways just is not aware of what these discussions involve and what the recommendations were. Let me read to you recommendation 17 of the 1966 report of the public accounts committee which was—

Mr. Sopha: The 1967 report.

Mr. Singer: I am sorry, the 1967 report, which repeated the 1966 report.

Mr. Sopha: That was the Minister of Mines (Mr. A. F. Lawrence), Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Singer: Yes. Recommendation 17 of the 1967 report of the public accounts committee recommended that the study of purchasing policies be expedited.

> While the committee has not had an opportunity to examine the results of this study referred to by the Provincial Treasurer in the Legislature on June 6, 1967, we continue to believe that revised purchasing policies might result in worthwhile savings. We believe the public accounts committee must work actively with the appropriate officials in the development of improved purchasing policies.

Mr. J. H. White (London South): On a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: State your point of order.

Mr. White: This is absolutely out of order —this discussion on this particular item.

Mr. Sopha: And it is embarrassing.

Mr. White: Well, there is ample opportunity to discuss it; but this is not the item, this is not the vote and my hon. friend knows it.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, with great respect to the hon. member for London South I just cannot imagine anything that could be more in order than this subject. The Minister talked about his policy of purchasing automobiles, and it comes under this vote. If there are recommendations from the committee, an all-member committee of this House, what could be more in order, and the surprising thing to me, sir—

Mr. White: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, excuse me while I—

Mr. Singer: Is the hon. member rising on a point of order, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Chairman: Yes, the member is rising on a point of order and is suggesting that this discussion is out of order. I would like to hear the member on that point.

Mr. White: Now, sir, I refer you to *Lewis*.

Mr. Sopha: That book doesn't apply because the Clerk is away.

Mr. White: I refer you now, sir, to *May*, page 760.

Mr. Singer: That is not *May* at all.

Mr. White: Subsection B says that these questions—

Mr. Sopha: Which part of the page?

Mr. White: Two-thirds of the way down, the left hand side of page 760—which I will now quote in full.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, may I just mention that on page 760 of *May* there is no point B at all, sir.

Mr. White: On a point of order.

Mr. Chairman: Order, order!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. White: Well, give me just a moment here, Mr. Chairman.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member cannot make a point of order competently, I suggest he should be asked to sit down and let us go ahead with the business.

Mr. White: No, I was confused. I was mixing two previous points of order, but I now state Mr. Chairman, for your consideration, page 736, sub-heading on Civil Estimates and I quote as follows:

> No method had been established for obtaining in committee a general discussion upon the administration of the expenditures sanctioned by the civil estimates, and debate must be kept to the specific object of the grant which is placed before the committee.

Mr. Singer: I could not agree more!

Mr. White: To continue:

> For instance, the grant for the salary of the chief secretary for Ireland was held not to justify a review of his conduct as unconstitutional.

Now then, sir, I make this point to you on behalf of all members of this Legislature. The whole discussion becomes intolerable, disorderly and meaningless, unless we adhere to the rules of this chamber. My hon. friend, the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Nixon), and my hon. friend from Downsview, stood this afternoon, on this very principle. Now I stand on this principle, sir, and I ask you to confine these discussions to the vote and the

item—not because we have anything to fear, not because the subject cannot and should not be discussed. Indeed it can and should, but it must not be discussed when it is clearly out of order.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, if I may reply to the hon. member's point of order.

I am not really interested in the salary of—what was it, the Treasurer of Ireland—I am not particularly concerned at the moment even with the salary of the hon. Minister of Highways. Least of all, Mr. Chairman, I am not concerned with the salary of the member for London South.

Mr. Chairman: Order, order!

Mr. Singer: What I am concerned with, sir, is the item here, 905, which talks about purchasing and other services. I think, sir, that without doubt we are entitled to inquire into the habits of this government insofar as purchasing automobiles is concerned, because the hon. Minister admitted a few moments ago how they purchased automobiles.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): They are all from the factory.

Mr. Singer: If he is not able to explain to us in a reasonable way how they purchase automobiles, or even in a way that satisfies us, surely, Mr. Chairman, it is logical, reasonable and sensible that we criticize him in this regard. Now I say, sir, I cannot pursue this argument any more. The Minister's reply to our questions indicates that the government had paid no consideration at all, not only to the purchasing process as recommended by the public accounts committee, but not even to the pious remarks that were expressed in the Speech from the Throne.

Mr. Chairman: Under vote 905 I see the item, equipment and supplies. It is my opinion that the discussion has been proceeding under this vote on that particular subject. The Minister has answered questions having to do with automobile purchases, which I would judge comes under equipment.

Are there any further questions of the Minister on the subject?

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Minister, I would like to address questions on vote 905 in relation to four items here.

There are a number of substantial increases in expenses under this particular vote. I have been going through The Department of Highways estimates comparing the expenses here with the public accounts, which are two years back. It appears that this is a department where we are able to make a saving of money—where we are more likely to make it than any other department. There are certainly many places where expenses have gone up radically and I would just like to remark that it is very disturbing to me to find, especially from the Opposition, so many members getting up and asking for their own particular highway to be expanded or bridge to be built. I think in this year we should be trying to save money, not looking for new ways to spend it.

The first question I would like to ask, under travelling expenses, why are they up by some 40 per cent compared to the public accounts of 1966-67?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Chairman, I cannot give the answer to that. I see the increase is there, but the travelling expenses are largely in connection with supervisory and inspection staff of the equipment, supply and special services section and the mechanical training schools.

Mr. Shulman: Since the Minister cannot give the answer, perhaps he will look into it and give me the details at a later date.

I have a second question to the Minister.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: I could give that now. The executive section—does the hon. member want to know what each of these people do?

Mr. Shulman: No, I just want to know why it is up 40 per cent in two years.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: More people travelling.

Mr. Shulman: Why?

Mr. MacDonald: We are trying to reconcile your statements with the Treasury plea for cutting down on expenditures.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: I have the figures, Mr. Chairman, on which we based the travelling expenses that we are asking here, and the different sections it comes under. Is this the item you would like?

Mr. Shulman: All I really want is why the expenses are up 40 per cent. I do not want you to break it down. It is not necessary. Perhaps if you do not know the answer, you would look into it and let me know at your convenience.

I have four questions. The second question is, under maintenance, the item of $317,000. Could the Minister explain to me why that item has gone up by 20 per cent?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: It will be the same answer, Mr. Chairman. I have all the details of what we based it on.

Mr. Shulman: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The third question I have to ask is, office furniture and equipment listed for $688,000. Can the Minister explain why that item is up by 40 per cent?

Mr. Martel: Throwing it around like a drunken sailor.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: I think the hon. member realizes that it is over a two-year period that he is talking to, and prices have increased.

Mr. Shulman: Prices have increased by 40 per cent?

Mr. R. M. Johnston (St. Catharines): This is 1968 compared to 1966.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Shulman: I must say that surely the people of this province do not believe that prices have increased by 40 per cent in two years, Mr. Chairman.

Now the final question I ask here is under teletype system rentals and perhaps this would be an easier one to answer. Can the Minister explain to me why this particular item is up by one-third in the two years?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: It is an extension of the service to all of our offices now, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Is Vote 905 carried?

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Mr. Chairman, I want to talk for a moment about the purchasing of gloves. I had a constituent who was reasonably successful in tendering on glove contracts with The Department of Highways. After the election—I do not know whether there is any connection or not—but after the election he put in a tender and I believe that he has not been successful since.

Previously, on occasion, he would call me and he would ask if I could get the successful bid price and find out what company got the contract to supply the gloves to the department. I did that on each occasion on which I was asked. All of a sudden, apparently, the policy changed. On one particular occasion I called up and I was enquiring as to the particular status of a contract, or the tender call, I should say, when I was told that the prices could not be released. The names of the successful companies could not be released. I just could not figure out what had happened in the interim.

After being pressed, the departmental official did tell me the successful bidder, but he refused to quote the price. I did some digging and I was informed that the contract in that instance did not go to the low bidder and I wondered what change of policy took place and on whose direction.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Chairman, I might say there is no change of policy. After the bids are open and tenders let, you can get the name of the successful tenderer and the price.

Mr. Gaunt: Mr. Chairman, I was not able to get the successful price. As I have indicated to the Minister—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Gaunt: Perhaps I should have. Maybe this would be the opportunity for me to say, Mr. Chairman, that the former Minister of Highways has always been very co-operative with me and I do appreciate his assistance on many occasions. Perhaps I, in this instance, should have called the Minister and inquired about this particular matter but I did not do it.

It was a form which I had followed on a number of occasions previously and I could not understand what had happened but, I repeat again, that when I asked for the price I was told that those figures could not be released.

I was also told that they could not be released for another department—Reform Institutions, Mr. Chairman, if you are interested. I wondered why this was so because I always presumed that these were public figures after the contract was let. Now, having said that, I presume that when the Minister said that these figures can be made public he means all of the figures of all of the people who tendered on the particular contract.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: I mean the successful tender is the one that we give out—price paid.

Mr. Gaunt: Right, and do you indicate if that tender was the low tender?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Yes. These are all opened in public too, I may say.

Mr. MacDonald: Then all tenders are available, I presume.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Wentworth.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Yes, Mr. Chairman, through you—

Mr. Chairman: Is the member for Huron-Bruce finished?

Mr. Gaunt: Are all tenders public knowledge and available to the public?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Anyone who bids on a contract can go when the tenders are being opened and see the whole bunch of them.

Mr. P. D Lawlor (Lakeshore): With several sealed envelopes?

Mr. Gaunt: Yes, but can I call up the department and say would you mind giving me those figures? Under those circumstances can I get them; that is what I want to know?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: I am sure the member realizes that there would be hundreds and hundreds of calls on these things; if any member of the House wants these figures, certainly he can get them. I mean, we are not trying to hide anything and if you do not get them the next time you call, you ask me and I will certainly get them for you.

Mr. Gaunt: Indeed I will, Mr. Chairman, thank you.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Wentworth.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Chairman, through you to the Minister, in this matter of insurance and claims, would the Minister inform me as to whether we do not carry sufficient insurance to cover all claims, or do we deal with some claims individually?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: This provides for the cost of insurance coverage on automotive equipment, ferries, traffic counters, and so on, and bonding of employees and public liability and property damage claims.

Mr. Deans: We do then, in fact, carry sufficient insurance within the fund to cover all these things? We do not pay any claims out of provincial funds as such?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Not to my knowledge, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Deans: Can I continue from there? Do we call tenders on the insurance for The Department of Highways?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: This is all handled by the insurance committee of the Cabinet and I would not know about that.

Mr. Deans: Would it be possible to find out whether the department does in fact have insurance, or whether the government, as such, carries insurance to cover all these things with a fund? In other words, are we self-insured or do we have insurance through individual insurance agencies?

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Chairman, on this very subject—

Mr. Chairman: I wonder if the member would mind, the Minister is waiting—

Mr. Sopha: On this very subject, if the Minister cannot answer, may I answer?

Mr. Chairman: Order, please! I think the Minister should be given an opportunity to answer before—

Mr. Sopha: I am a man of immaculate fairness. Now I am able to tell the member the answer to his question.

Mr. Deans: Thank you very much.

Mr. Sopha: I am not speaking lightly, Mr. Chairman. We have looked into this in the public accounts committee in the two years my hon. friend from Downsview cited and the matter is a disgrace. It amounts to a disgrace, the method of insurance. And I might tell my friend from Wentworth—

Mr. D. Jackson (Timiskaming): On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, there are others who wanted the floor before the member for Sudbury.

Mr. Sopha: We will finish this subject, perhaps, Mr. Chairman. And I make a brief comment that—

Mr. Deans: Could I have an answer first from the Minister? Then I will be quite happy to hear from my learned friend.

Mr. Sopha: All right, fine!

Mr. Chairman: I think that all members should remain seated until the Minister provides the answer to the question directed to him.

Mr. Sopha: On a point of order, after three or four days, are you saying that on every single subejct, however important or inconsequential it is, that the House has to wait for the Minister to inform himself from his deputy in front of him? Because that has been

going on for three or four days. He does not know the answers to the simplest questions directed to him.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please! I would say to the member that if inconsequential questions are directed to the Minister, that if he wishes to reply to them, and he is obviously looking up the answers to them, or getting the answers, that the courtesy should be afforded to him to let him provide the answers.

Mr. Deans: On a point of order—

Mr. Sopha: Just so there will not be any question of a rude interruption—

Mr. Deans: May I ask if the Chairman considers this an inconsequential question?

Mr. Sopha: On the point of order, may I make this point? Just so there will not be any question of an untoward interruption; the Minister's reply to the hon. member for Wentworth was that this matter is looked after by the insurance committee of the Cabinet. It was at that point that I intervened, merely to inform my friend from Wentworth that this department insures itself with private carriers and pays a fantastic premium every year to meet its liability under the law, under The Highway Improvement Act as well as its responsibility for the ownership of vehicles.

Mr. Gisborn: That is what we were leading up to but you could not wait.

Mr. Sopha: The premium apparently is distributed among the faithful in the insurance industry.

An hon. member: Glory pork barrel.

Mr. Sopha: And I have complained about another aspect of the question.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order!

Mr. Sopha: This is the facility with which they hire downtown lawyers.

Mr. Chairman: Order.

Mr. Sopha: But I am speaking on a point of order.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Mr. Deans: If I direct the question to the Minister I would very much appreciate it if the Minister could be allowed to answer my question.

Mr. Chairman: I was going to point that out to the member who spoke last that—after the interjections—after the Minister answered the first question, the member for Wentworth asked another question and the Minister was in the process of getting the answer for the member for Wentworth, at which time the member for Sudbury rose on a point of order. Now, I would ask the members if they would remain seated while the Minister provides the answer.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: I could give the hon. member the policies. What I attempted to say was that we cover our vehicles and automotive equipment, ferries, traffic counters and all those things, but we self-insure the building that we have. The fleet policy on autos, trucks, trailers, from public liability and property damage claims is with the Dominion of Canada Insurance Company. Fire and transportation, which is the protection of vehicles from loss by fire or damage while being transported, is with the same company. And then owner-operated trucks and cars have protection from the Crown from third party claims, not covered by the Dominion General Insurance Company; house moving policy by the Dominion General Insurance; road liability policy the Pearl Assurance Company; water craft liability, Pearl Assurance Company; the Rainbow Plaza policy by the Commercial Union Insurance Group; and the schedule bond policy for casual employees only covered as requested by the Fidelity Insurance of Canada.

Then we have the Amherst Island ferry, which is quite a group of agencies: The Continental, the Phoenix, the Lombard, Hartford, Fireman's Fund, Switzerland General Insurance, Ocean Marine, and several others.

The Quinte Loyalist is the same way, with a group of companies: the Niagara Fire Insurance, the Continental, the Sun Insurance the Norwich Union, and the Union Marine. The Quinte ferry, the Union Insurance Society of Canada; the St. Joseph Islander is covered by the group of companies: the Western Assurance, the Continental, the Ocean Marine, the Sun Insurance, Union Marine, and General Insurance. The Upper Canada is covered by a group of companies and the Wolfe Island ferry the same way.

Mr. Deans: Were all of these policies allocated by tender? And if so, were the lowest tenders accepted; and if so what was the amount per thousand paid in each case?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: They were allocated through the insurance committee Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Chairman, I missed that. Could I ask the Minister to repeat that? I am sorry.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: They were allocated through the insurance committee.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Sudbury.

Mr. Sopha: Now, can I legitimately get into this thing?

Mr. Chairman: The member for Sudbury may quite legitimately enter into the debate at this moment.

Mr. Sopha: Right, I will try to be legitimate throughout.

My friend from Downsview referred very trenchantly to one of the problems that bothered the public accounts committee when he spoke about central purchasing and he was a man when he dwelt on that, who knew whereof he spoke.

I refer to this problem of insurance in the light of the several years of attendance upon the public accounts committee, where he and I and my friend for Parkdale (Mr. Trotter) endeavoured to get this system changed.

The system of insuring in The Department of Highways and their two major heads of liability, the highway improvement on the one hand and the ownership liability on the other hand under The Highway Traffic Act, section 105, is open to objection on very serious grounds. The fee, I just forget what it is, it is a fantastic fee that they pay for the insurance annually.

We secured and insisted upon figures, and were given them, showing the total amount paid out by the various insurers in comparison to the fee. I can tell you that it is a very handsome reward that the insurers get. Apparently this fee is split among all sorts of agents throughout the province who do no work in respect of providing the coverage at all.

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): They have to be Tories though.

Mr. Sopha: Yes, my friend for Parkdale points out a very real indication of politics with this government when he says that.

The other major objection divides naturally into two parts. One is dealt with in the final chapter of volume two of Mr. McRuer's report when he discusses the function of The Attorney General's Department.

He says, as we have said here, and I am not saying that we are the originators of the things that Mr. McRuer took under review, however by coincidence, many of the matters that he dealt with are also subjects that have been raised over the years from this side of the House, and this is one of them.

Mr. McRuer says that when the government of Ontario is in the courts, the Attorney General should be there to represent the government.

It is not so with this department. The insurance companies who insure these heads of liability under The Department of Highways, hire their own lawyers. We have revealed on occasion, where Her Majesty the Queen, and the right of the Minister of Highways, or the right of the Minister of Transport have been involved in the courts, and the government does not even know about it. Nobody in the government or in the Ministry knows that the Queen in the right of the province of Ontario is a defendant in litigation downtown or in the court of Appeal, or in the Supreme Court of Canada.

It comes as a bewildering surprise to the Minister of Transport, and to the Minister of Highways that some case involving tens of thousands of dollars is presently at bar.

All right, there is one thing we have said, my friend from Downsview and I have said on occasion. Every time the government of Ontario is in the courts the Attorney General and his staff should have full charge of direction of the litigation and be responsible for its presentation. That is one thing.

Then I want to tell my friend from Wentworth a story, a very poignant one, that will point up the ludicrous nature of this business when I tell him the story of Perepelytz. Poor old Perepelytz went to the Supreme Court of Canada, and here was his cry.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order! Will the member for London South please state the point of order.

Mr. White: I remember vividly, seven or eight years ago—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order! We must put a stop to this nonsense.

Mr. Sopha: It is under item 5.

Mr. White: I remember vividly about seven or eight years ago attempting at some stage of the departmental estimates to get up and give a one- or two-minute speech to be ter-

minated by a question and at that time I was ruled out of order. The Premier of the day, Mr. Frost, concurred that I was indeed out or order. Now then, sir, I point again to *May*, whose authority the member for Sudbury cites from time to time, and whose principles he elucidated earlier today, and I quote again from page 736:

> No method has been established for obtaining in committee a general discussion upon the administration of the expenditure sanctioned by the civil estimates, and the debate must be kept to the specific object of the grant that is placed before the committee.

Now, sir, in fairness to the members, in fairness to all of the members here, and in fairness to the Opposition who spoke on the subject this afternoon, will you please confine the members in this debate to the subject at hand?

Mr. Sopha: A total of $330,000 is being spent for insurance, and I am speaking about that expenditure and I am complaining about its method.

Mr. White: You are giving a long and general debate on the subject, not going by the rules.

Mr. Chairman: Order please!

Vote 905, item 5, includes insurance and claims. In my opinion the member for Sudbury is talking about insurance. I believe we should be permitted to continue this debate.

Mr. Sopha: I did not mean to instil a spirit of levity when I talked about the travails of Perepelytz, because he was a man who was hard put upon by this government.

The man issued a writ under the terms of The Highway Improvement Act and his lawyer by inadvertence in looking at the appropriate section apparently did not read far enough down it. There are about ten subsections. Had he read right through, he would have seen the style of cause to be used in the writ, but he only read four or five, and the first four or five said the liability was imposed for non-repair of a highway upon The Department of Highways.

So he issued the writ. Perepelytz against The Department of Highways. And when that came into the hands of the insurance lawyers, they had read the whole section, the style of cause was supposed to read: "Her Majesty the Queen in the right of Ontario as represented by the Minister of Highways." They drew this to the attention of the plaintiff's solicitors. He applied to the district court judge at Sault Ste. Marie, the Attorney General's riding, and Judge McDonald gave an *ex parte* order amending the style of cause in the writ to read: Her Majesty the Queen as represented, and so on.

Mr. Chairman: Perhaps if the member would avoid so much legal terminology and tell us his point—

Mr. Sopha: Well I am sure it is comprehensible.

Mr. White: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. Am I to conclude that you accept that these remarks fall within *May's* injunction—debate must be kept to the specific object of the grant?

An hon. member: It is insurance. It is The Department of Highways.

Mr. Chairman: I would say to the member for London South that in my experience here in this Legislature I have observed during the discussions on the estimates there has been no restriction to any two-minute talk prior to the questions put to the Minister. Frankly, I can see nothing different taking place than has taken place during the last four years in my experience. Regardless of any printed rules that the member for London South produces, I think procedure and practice and tradition that has been followed in this House should prevail.

Mr. White: On the point of order, just so I will be very clear. Am I at liberty to stand up on any vote and give my views, providing they touch, however remotely, on the vote or the item concerned? Is that the way we are now running this chamber?

Mr. Chairman: If it is too remote, the member presenting such views will be ruled out of order.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Have we got a ruling?

Mr. Sopha: All right, Where was I?

He got an order amending the writ of summons to use the proper style of cause. The insurance lawyers appealed to a high court judge. He reversed the order of the judge in Sault Ste. Marie, saying that since they had not used the proper style of cause, the writ was a nullity, the year had gone by. He was out of court.

Perepelytz appealed to the court of appeal. They upheld the high court judge. He was still out of court. He went to the expense of taking it to the Supreme Court of Canada. Now up there with the nine good men, they looked at all this foolishness below and they said, everybody knows what The Department of Highways is. Their judgment occupied about two inches in the Supreme Court reports.

Mr. Olde: I do not go along with that.

Mr. Sopha: They reversed all the previous—

Mr. MacDonald: The Supreme Court of Canada versus Neil Olde.

Mr. Sopha: They reversed all the previous orders that put poor old Perepelytz out of court, restored the writ as amended and then the insurance lawyers settled with him. The total amount about which they were fighting was the repair to his car and I think they were something like $1,500 originally. I wrote to Mr. Vannini at the time — now Judge Vannini—who was solicitor for Perepelytz and asked him how much were costs. The costs came to about $6,000, through all the courts for the man to get justice.

My complaint is that by hiring the insurance lawyers downtown, all the prerogatives of the Crown are bundled up as in a suitcase, so to speak, taken down to those offices by the lawyers and they are able to use every technicality, every trick, every delay that is open to them, as if they were the government. They are not the government. They are not the Attorney General's lawyers. They are private practitioners, hired by the insurance companies.

I cannot put it better than Mr. McRuer puts it, and he points out, in consonance with what my friend from Downsview and I have been saying for years, the practice ought to stop. How do we stop it here in this department with respect of this vote for $330,000?

I am not prepared, as a matter of irresponsibility, to move that it be reduced to $1, if this is the way the department wants to do business. But I am prepared to say that when you are dealing with something like $463 million, The Department of Highways should be totally self-insured.

It is not that we have not got the money and we could meet all the claims for compensation for which the department is liable in any one year. I suppose—I am guessing but it is a pretty shrewd guess estimate—there is more liability in terms of dollars and cents attached to The Department of Highways than any other department of government because of the large numbers of vehicles that this department owns.

Here is a good place to stop the practice of insuring the government in all branches of the public service. I say to the House Leader, let the consolidated revenue fund meet the responsibility involved.

It is not often, I dare say, that the department is going to run into the large item of liability as they did a couple of years ago, when a judgment of something like—well, more than—$100,000 attached to them as a result of that case where the children changed the signs on Hallowe'en night at the site of repair. I think that judgment was well in excess of $100,000. But it is a very unusual one and I would not expect that more then one of those would be encountered in a number of years.

The principle of liability is good and sound. The Crown ought to be as liable as any other person in the community for damages occasioned as a result of its negligence. But I feel, and we have said at the public accounts, that there is no rationale for the continuance of this system on the ground that I have stated.

Intelligence demands that the Treasury board—I suppose it is their responsibility finally—should have a good hard look at this in order to see whether a better system along the lines perhaps that I have suggested might be adopted in this province. I hope all of that will commend itself to the hon. member for Middlesex South, whose constituents probably talk about little else than the liability of The Department of Highways.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Wentworth.

Mr. Deans: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, it is indeed unfortunate that I have to breath between questions.

I would like to continue with my line of questions.

Could the Minister inform me what percentage of this $330,000 is actually insurance and what percentage is set aside for claims purposes as a fund of the province of Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: This is all insurance, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Deans: Would the Minister then inform me who sets the rates since he has no jurisdiction over this matter apparently.

How does the insurance committee of the Treasury board set these rates and decide which department should pay how much?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: I am not able to answer that question, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Deans: One final question, Mr. Chairman.

If this $330,000 is insurance then why do we have such a thing as insurance and claims? What has the claims part got to do with this particular request of $330,000?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Chairman, I have a breakdown of this; $265,000 is for insurance and $60,000 is for the damage claims paid by the department.

Mr. MacDonald: A moment ago it was all insurance.

Mr. Deans: On this matter then, would it be possible to inform us on what items these claims are paid?

Mr. Olde: Who are you, say your name?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: We will have to get that answer, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Deans: While the Minister is getting that answer, I wonder if he would be kind enough to get the answer also to the question of why, if we are paying out some $265,000 in insurance premiums, it is necessary for us to also insure other liabilities of the province to the tune of $60,000 in direct claims money?

Mr. G. A. Kerr (Halton West): Well, why not?

Mr. Martel: Why so?

Mr. Kerr, Well, why not?

Mr. Jackson: Well, why the insurance?

Mr. Kerr: Because we were not covered!

Hon. Mr. Gomme: We will have to get those details, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Thunder Bay.

Mr. Stokes: I have a question for the Minister, Mr. Chairman, under item number 4, equipment, $3,335,000. I would like the Minister to inform me as to how the equipment is purchased. I am talking specifically about vehicles such as station wagons, trucks and anything of that nature.

We had some trouble a short while ago in our riding with regard to the purchasing of The Department of Lands and Forests vehicles. There were a very small proportion of the dealers in the area who were given the opportunity to bid on certain items of equipment. I was just wondering if we could have the assurance from you, with regard to the purchasing of vehicles for your department, that if, in fact, they are put out on tender for use in a particular area, whether all dealers are allowed to tender on them.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: The tenders are put out to the manufacturers, where they are purchased.

Mr. Stokes: They are purchased directly from the manufacturers.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: That is right.

Mr. Singer: Well, now, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Shulman: You may go ahead; I will follow you.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Sandwich-Riverside.

Mr. Stokes: Does the dealer get a commission?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: I did not get the question.

Mr. Stokes: Does the dealer get a commission on this? And what dealer, in fact, would get it?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: No one gets a commission on it. The only thing that is purchased outside of going directly to the manufacturer is probably about half a dozen cars in the year; but for the rest the bids are asked from the manufacturer of the equipment and no commissions are paid.

Mr. Stokes: You would make quite a substantial saving in buying in that way then? There would not be the dealer's commission to be taken into consideration in the cost price?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Right!

Mr. Chairman: The member for Sandwich-Riverside.

Mr. Burr: Mr. Chairman, would it be in order to—in item 5, the last line—to move that the words "insurance and" be struck out? In the last line of—

Mr. Chairman: I am sorry I did not hear what the member—

Mr. Burr: In the last line of item 5, insurance and claims—would it be in order to move that the words "insurance and" be struck out?

Mr. Chairman: I would say that the member should introduce a motion to that effect if he wanted the motion put to the committee.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman!

Mr. Chairman: The member for Downsview.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I am sure the hon. Minister did not mean to deliberately mislead the House, but we investigated this whole matter of automobile purchases so thoroughly on the public accounts committee three years ago and I can bring the news reports relating to it.

I remember, vividly, one article written by Scott Young, who commented and sat in on the committee meeting when my colleague for Sudbury and myself wrestled with this problem at substantial length. The column is there and I have it in my files and if the Minister persists in his statement, I will bring it and we will get back into this thing again. The policy was that you deal first with the manufacturer; the manufacturer allocates to the individual dealers; and commission is paid to the individual dealers. The excuse was that you do it because there is some sort of a warranty arrangement.

We tried desperately, Mr. Chairman, to find out how the individual dealers were chosen. At that point we bogged down, because there was not an admission at that committee that the dealers were chosen because they were Conservatives, or because of their loyalty to the Conservative Party. But those facts are obvious.

An hon. member: You are right.

Mr. Singer: I would ask the Minister to carefully reconsider what he just advised the House, because if it is necessary, we can get back to the proceedings of that committee which were transcribed, we can get back to news clippings which were there. Those admissions were made at the public accounts committee some three years ago.

Mr. Sopha: The Provincial Treasurer will verify that I am quite sure. He was there.

Mr. Singer: The Provincial Treasurer nods his head and he remembers.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman on that brief, I am quite confident that what the Minister had to say to the House was not misleading. I am sure he—

Mr. Singer: Deliberately!

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: No, I am sure that he meant that, as far as The Department of Highways or the government is concerned, no commissions are paid, but I will substantiate that. I recall the meeting before the public accounts committee very well, because I was there, as the hon. member for Sudbury and the hon. member for Downsview well know. I also recall stating to the committee at that time—and I believe it is probably in *Hansard*, as it was stated to the House—that the policies of the automobile manufacturers, as far as I was concerned, are quite their own. And I seem to recall saying, that we had no intention of interfering with their internal policies as far as the payment of commissions were concerned.

Mr. Singer: Well, let me follow that up now that we have the Provincial Treasurer in. There was the admission then, Mr. Treasurer —or Mr. Chairman, through you to the Provincial Treasurer—that there was an arrangement made by the manufacturers so that the deals were funnelled through private dealers and your role—the then Minister of Highways and not Provincial Treasurer's role—was, or his reasoning was, that he knew nothing about it, it was done by someone else. Am I correct in that?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I think, Mr. Chairman, that is just about what I finished saying.

Mr. Singer: All right. I respect the hon. Provincial Treasurer for stating it in that way.

Let me return to the charge that my colleague for Sudbury and I made at that time and that I repeat tonight. There is an arrangement whereby individual private dealers get a commission, the details of which are sufficiently vague that we have never been able to track them down. It is my suggestion that it is more than a coincidence that the dealers who seem to get the commission are Conservative supporters.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Windsor West.

Mr. H. Peacock (Windsor West): Mr. Chairman, I hope that some of the members will forgive me, because I was not here three years ago when this matter of commission was

discussed, but I want to move on just a little bit to another aspect of the angle and this is this. If the province is purchasing directly from the manufacturers, I would like to ask the Minister if the province enjoys from the manufacturers the same level of discount that a high-volume dealership enjoys.

There are a number of levels of dealership discount, depending on the volume that that dealer enjoys. The province should be enjoying the same kind of saving and if it is not, then it is obviously paying something like the manufacturers suggested retail price. Even the private buyer can beat this down a few bucks, even without a trade-in. I wonder if the Minister will say under which price structure the province is purchasing this equipment?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Chairman, these are under public tender which we put out to these people.

Mr. Stokes: To the manufacturers?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: That is right.

Mr. Stokes: So in effect it does rebate to the dealer?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Not that I know of, sir.

Mr. Stokes: How do you know that you are getting the best deal for the equipment you are buying when you just accept the manufacturer's price?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Chairman, we compile a set of specifications and we send them to all the manufacturers. We know that we are getting the best price, the same as we do with any bids.

Mr. Peacock: My question directly is: does the province enjoy the same kind of discount that a high volume or medium volume dealership enjoys from the manufacturer?

Mr. Trotter: The answer will be, "I do not know."

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Again I repeat, Mr. Chairman, we put these out for public tender on specifications to the companies that make the equipment here, and this is how we get the best prices available. There is no discount on that.

Mr. Singer: Did you ever inquire, Mr. Minister, as to whether commission is paid to the dealers?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: No, I have not, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Singer: Do you not think that it would be in the best interest of the people of Ontario if you made such an inquiry?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: I could do that, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Singer: Will you?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Yes.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Wentworth.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Chairman, perhaps I am misdirecting this question, perhaps it should go to the Provincial Treasurer, but does it not seem logical that if the province were to have one central agency purchasing authority the motor vehicles that we would be able to acquire could be bought at much better prices than if each department was to purchase on its own?

Mr. Chairman: Would the Minister care to make any further comment on that?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: This is what we are working towards, Mr. Chairman, as I stated earlier.

Mr. Deans: Could the Minister then inform me how long the process might be likely to take? Would I be likely to see it within the next ten years? Could he perhaps enlighten me?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Of course you will. The arrangements for common purchasing are well advanced, there is a director already engaged, there is a policy committee already working on these matters now. I would say within the matter of a few short weeks or months the policy lines will be laid down and they will be made available to all purchasing departments by this group.

It will be a branch of The Department of Public Works. The policy lines will be well laid down and will be interpreted to all departments.

Now as far as common purchasing is concerned, in terms of heavy equipment, in effect that is what takes place in The Department of Highways now. The Department of Highways probably uses 75 per cent or more of all the heavy equipment that is used by the government, and to that extent they probably not only buy their own equipment they act as purchasers for many of the other departments. This equipment ranges, as any hon. member would know, from small motor vehicles to four-wheel-drive trucks to graders, to snow plows. There is no other depart-

ment of government that is capable of providing even the required specifications for this sort of thing. So in effect common purchasing at that level takes place now.

As far as the common purchasing policy is concerned I speak with some authority, Mr. Chairman, because this was orignally a function of the Treasury board, it emanated following a request from the public accounts committee to pursue common purchasing.

A year ago in this House I stated that we were getting on with it, so I can tell you the stage to which the programme has advanced at the moment. The directorate of the branch is engaged in the process of staffing at the moment. So some of these questions that have been asked and answered here also belabour patience a little bit too far. The hon. member for Downsview has been through this exercise before. He has been through it in public accounts and he has been through it in this House since time immemorial. The statements that have been made here tonight are no different than have been made on all those previous occasions.

Mr. Singer: That is the point!

Hon. Mr. McNaughton: That is the point! Now what do you expect? Consistency or otherwise, because this is consistency!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order, order.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I repeat once more, Mr. Chairman, now that this whole matter has been raised, and I emphasize. I repeat it—and I emphasize it, as I did when the hon. members for Downsview and Sudbury made reference, shall we say, to the situation two or three years ago when they referred to Scott Young's article. I remember it very well because he made reference to myself.

But the situation has not changed. Internal policy of the automobile manufacturers is their own business. If they elect to pay some form of commission to their dealers for the service that they are obliged to perform, a warrant that they are obliged to respect and so on, who can quarrel with their policy, who can say that it would cost any less if this modest commission, or whatever it may be, I do not know, were removed?

But in any case it is an internal policy of the automobile manufacturers. I do not think that it would represent any material saving to The Department of Highways or the government. I do not think that you can ask any department of government or any purchasing branch to do more, than to provide the specifications for what they require, advertise for bids, open the tenders in public and make the award to the lowest bidder. I would suggest to my hon. friends over there who raised the question that it is quite probable that the prices obtained this way are substantially less than fleet prices or the prices that are made available to large dealers or buyers.

I recall as a former Minister of Highways that the prices were very substantially lower in some respects than I would have ever expected. So there is no reason to believe that The Department of Highways is not getting the best value for the public's money by these methods.

Mr. Deans: I might say, Mr. Chairman, that the Provincial Treasurer has very well enunciated exactly what I felt, that over the last few years the question has been raised a number of times and it is unfortunate that it has to be raised again.

Now from the point of view of the Provincial Treasurer, could I assume that before the next estimates come up we will no longer be faced with this problem of dealing with the purchasing of motor vehicles in each individual estimate.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I would not like to promise that this will or will not solve it, Mr. Chairman. It may well be that after the policy of this common purchasing branch is developed, they may very well find that they cannot do any better. In terms of common purchasing in this field it has already been done by The Department of Highways, and I would suggest that this might very well continue to be the case. There might not be any change.

I mentioned earlier in this debate, if I recall it correctly, that those items of supply or requirements that are common to all departments such as automobiles in some circumstances—

Mr. MacDonald: Then why are you hedging?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, let me just suggest to the hon. member not to go too far because the purchases that are made by The Department of Highways from the automobile manufacturers are largely trucks; very few cars.

Mr. Chairman: To the member for Wentworth: Do you want to pursue the same point?

Mr. Deans: I was going to discuss the insurance, which I was discussing previously.

Mr. Chairman: All right then!

Mr. Deans: Thank you.

Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister would be kind enough to inform this House just how much in claims is paid out on those vehicles under the jurisdiction of The Department of Highways during the last year?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: I cannot give the member that figure. I gave him the figure from the estimates that we are dealing with now, the breakdown between the insurance and the amount we are setting aside for claims. This is a long list of small claims and we can get you that list.

Mr. Deans: I am not sure that we are dealing with the same thing. I am interested in finding out not the premiums but what was paid out in actual insurance claims by the variety of different insurance companies which presently carry the insurance for The Department of Highways. I would be interested—I might as well go further—I would be interested in knowing whether this exceeded —in the last year—the $330,000 that is presently set aside for claims and insurance premiums.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: We can get that figure, Mr. Chairman, with some research.

Mr. Deans: I wonder then, Mr. Chairman, if before we were asked to deal with this—it is a matter of some major importance, it is a matter of deciding whether the government should in fact be self-insured or whether it should in fact deal with insurance companies. I think that we could not really deal and vote sensibly on this particular item until we understood the answer to that question.

Mr. Chairman: Is the member suggesting the vote should be held up until such time as the Minister gets all the details?

Mr. Deans: I am requesting that the vote should be held up until we know whether the amount of money that is being spent on premiums exceeds, or is less than, the amount that is paid out in claims yearly.

Mr. Chairman: I would say to the member that I think it is practically impossible to provide every minute detail on every item in the estimates before the vote is put to the committee. Now if the member is not satisfied with the information provided by the Minister then he has the privilege of moving an amendment to the amount of the vote but I do not believe that we should hold up every little item in every vote until the Minister has complete and exact little detail on every item. The member for High Park.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, this will not require a great deal of work because as the member for Sudbury has already pointed out the public accounts department has studied this particular matter. Apparently those figures are readily available; therefore I do not think it is an unreasonable request that we ask a minor delay in the vote until these figures are made available to us.

Mr. Chairman: Does the Minister believe it can be obtained without any great deal of difficulty?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: No, it will take some research, Mr. Chairman. As you realize this is up until Saturday last and it is not available in our books without going completely through all the records.

Mr. Chairman: This would take considerable amount of research, in other words, to find the detailed information for the member?

The member for Sandwich-Riverside.

Mr. Burr: Mr. Chairman, I move under vote 905, item 5, the last—

Mr. Chairman: Will the member please prepare a written motion.

Mr. Burr: It is written.

Mr. Chairman: Fine!

Mr. Burr: That in the last line, to strike out the two words "insurance and" thus, in effect, asking The Department of Highways to adopt self-insurance. I am not suggesting that the amount be changed. Then at the end of the year if we have $30,000 or $50,000 left over that would be the margin of saving for the year.

Mr. Shulman: May I rise to speak in favour of this amendment?

Mr. R. J. Boyer (Muskoka): Mr. Chairman, on a point of order may I submit that the hon. member's motion is out of order.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please! Wait a minute until I read the motion.

Mr. Boyer: Mr. Chairman, are you going to read the motion to the House? I will wait until you do that.

Mr. Chairman: The motion is debatable.

Mr. Boyer: Mr. Chairman, I submit to you that the omission of two words from a vote which amounts to $330,000, providing for insurance to a certain amount and claims to a certain amount would, if you omit the two words and leave this amount of $330,000 to be expended on claims only, have the effect of raising the amount of moneys for claims.

Now I submit, sir, that there are many precedents in this House that indicate that it is not permissible for a private member to introduce a resolution to provide for expenditure of money and therefore it seems to me that this resolution, worded in this way, does fall within that particular category of motion and should be declared out of order.

Mr. Jackson: This is not a resolution, it is a motion.

Mr. Chairman: Yes. I might say to the member that the motion as submitted to me is entirely out of order. I will read it if the committee wishes:

> I move that vote 905, item 5, last line, to strike out the two words "insurance and" thus in effect asking The Department of Highways to adopt self-insurance. At the end of the year we may have $30,000, or $50,000, or even $100,000.

In my opinion this motion is not proper at all.

Mr. Burr: Mr. Chairman, may I withdraw it?

Mr. Chairman: Yes.

Mr. Burr: Thank you.

Mr. Chairman: The member withdraws his motion.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, I move an amendment to vote 905, section 5, subsection referring to "insurance and claims" that this item be reduced to $1, and may I—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: The member for High Park moves that vote 905, section 5, subsection "insurance and claims" be reduced to the sum of $1. Those in favour of the motion will please say "aye". Those opposed will please say "nay".

In my opinion the "nays" have it.

Call in the members!

Those in favour of the motion will please rise.

Those opposed to the motion will please rise.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order, order!

Clerk of the House: Mr. Chairman, the "ayes" are 16, the "nays" 61.

Mr. Chairman: I declare the motion lost and vote 905 carried.

On vote 906:

The member for Halton West.

Mr. Kerr: Mr. Chairman, dealing with GO transit, it is almost a year now that this great system of public transportation has been in existence. It is no secret that it has been a great success. Patronage has exceeded the greatest expectations and the commuters, certainly between Oakville and Toronto, are very happy with the service they are getting.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. Kerr: There has been some discussion about extending this service to the north, particularly to some northern municipalities around the Metro fringe area. In my town, Burlington, there is some criticism about the existing service. It amounts to just two trains in the morning and two in the evening.

I was wondering if there are any plans in the immediate future, or in 1968, to improve the service to and from Burlington. At the same time, at the request of my hon. friend, the member for Hamilton West (Mrs. Pritchard), the Minister might include reference to the service for Hamilton as well.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Chairman, the pattern at the present time does not indicate the need for increasing the service to either Burlington or Hamilton, but we are purchasing some more coaches so that we can run longer trains. We are watching all these different things that take place so that we can provide better services as soon as possible.

Mr. Chairman: The member for York Centre.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): Mr. Chairman, I, too, congratulate the government for having brought in GO transit last year. I think it was a very courageous step

in that for the first time, perhaps in North America, highway revenues are being used to make better use of the rail rights of way and thus move more people. But there are many things about this budget that bothers me, and particularly the item of a deficit budget of $3.5 million.

It is very difficult for me to compare this operation with any other operation in North America, because almost without exception across North America commuter trains are going out of business. They just cannot do well. But it is interesting to note that there was a railway ten years ago that was almost going out of business and it decided that the way to get into business was to get into the commuter business, and that commuter business it has gotten into has been the secret of its tremendous recovery and success—a very profitable success.

It was facing in 1956 a deficit annually of more than $2 million. It had a debt of more than $200 million. It had mostly steam equipment, and the equipment was falling apart. Its cars were very antiquated and it had practically no freight revenues to help it along. It had to decide between ending its business, surrendering its charter and liquidating its assets, or getting into the commuter business and the suburban business. It was the suburban business, or die.

Sometimes from desperation comes inspiration, and that railroad invested more than $50 million through borrowing and through the sale of assets. Six new cars carried the same number of people as ten of the old type. It sold transportation by the month and not by the ride. It had to attract customers from a 12-lane freeway running alongside it, and it had to do all sorts of things to persuade the public that the way to ride conveniently to and from the suburbs was by their train.

But look at their budget today. Their budget today shows that they are paying interest costs of over $1 million. On our budget we do not have an item for interest. Their budget shows that they are allowing and providing for depreciation of nearly $2 million. We do not have any item to provide for depreciation. Their budget shows that they have taxes of over $1 million. We do not have any taxes to pay. Yet they are coming through with a profit of $2 million and here we are budgeting for a $3.5 million deficit.

They operate three lines that go into one single city. They do not have a line that runs from east to west, as we have and we do not have to worry about turn-arounds in the centre of the city as they do.

One line has 51 miles, another line has 63 miles, and another line has 35 miles—a total of 149 miles of lines. We are operating a total of 60 miles of line. They are operating 75 trains on one line; 75 on another and 60 on another—a total of 210 trains. We are operating 95.

They have 60 stations that they are serving, compared to our 14, and a distance between stations averaging around two miles on one line, 3.5 on another and a little over three on another. We are between three and four miles between stations. Their average operating speeds are a little under ours—they are running between 30 and 32 miles an hour and we are running 34 to 35 miles an hour on the average, but they have a lesser distance between their stations.

Their monthly fares on a per mile distance covered runs between 1.5 cents a mile; for the farther distances out to 3.5 cents a mile. Ours are based on 3.5 cents. Daily passengers number 80,000, compared to our 18,000. Their investment is $95 million compared to our $17 million.

Their operating costs are maintenance of roadways, $1.4 million; equipment repairs, $2 million; operating expenses, $6.3 million, a total cost of $9.7 million, compared to ours of $5.4 million. They are not double our operating costs and they are carrying over four times as many passengers over many more lines and over greater distances.

Their traffic costs, including advertising, welfare and all sorts of extras that they have, are almost identical to our GO transit costs.

Why can we not do as well in Toronto in the GO transit as they do in Chicago?

An hon. member: Thanks for telling us.

Mr. Deacon: We, in effect, are subsidizing the Canadian National Railways to the extent of about $3 million, if you look at these comparative figures. I do not see how The Department of Highways could have done much investigation in the operating costs of railways to have entered into an agreement whereby we have to pay the CNR this very large amount of money—$5,277,000—for railway operating costs.

They are completely out of line with a comparative operation under private enterprise in the city of Chicago. Our operation shows the need of comparing one service with another and being sure that we get down to a proper basis.

No wonder that there is no movement on the part of The Department of Highways to

extend GO transit services if they are facing the taxpayers of this province with such a huge deficit, instead of going after a better agreement with the CNR so that we are not paying more than our share of these operating costs, and that our GO transit operation is operating as efficiently as another company, which, in order to survive, had to operate well.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Chairman, I would like to say first of all that I disagree with the Minister on the matter of whether they should extend this GO transit to Hamilton. I feel that if he would travel on the Queen Elizabeth highway as I do, he would recognize that with proper advertising it would no doubt become a paying proposition.

I would like to ask first of all, did we last year encounter a great number of claims against the GO transit, and is this the reason why this year we have budgeted for liability insurance?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Chairman, the liability insurance was put on when the system was started May 24 last year.

Mr. Deans: What does this liability insurance cover at the present moment?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Liability insurance is limited to claims in excess of $500,000 for any one accident. Disaster insurance. This is in keeping with the practice of other transportation agencies. Total coverage is very expensive.

Mr. MacDonald: You are self-insured up to $500,000?

Mr. Deans: Is it considered then that the province is in effect self-insured for the majority of claims?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Up to $500,000, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. W. Hodgson (York North): Mr. Chairman, I am really surprised at the hon. member for York Centre. As the saying goes, he is talking out of both sides of his mouth tonight. We were just to a meeting with the hon. Minister and a delegation from the GO north committee and he was in favour of it going north at that time. Surely, before he said he was in favour of it, he would have investigated these things.

I just want to assure the hon. Minister of highways that there are 2,000 people in the north who, at such time as you may extend this service to the north, are willing and waiting and will accept it and are very anxious that it goes north.

Mr. N. Davison (Hamilton Centre): Mr. Chairman, I have a few questions for the Minister.

I would like to point out when the GO transit was finally brought into Hamilton it was two trains a day each way and at that time it was only a five-day service. The CNR at that time cut off their two trains each way to Toronto, which was a six-day service. Is there any possibility of getting the Saturday service back to Hamilton again?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Chairman, at that time we just replaced the CNR commuter service, which was five days a week.

Mr. Davison: They also ran on Saturdays, according to their schedule at that time.

Also, Mr. Chairman, I wonder if there has been any survey taken at Oakville station to find out if it would pay to run the service more regularly to Burlington-Hamilton? According to the union, the running trades of the CNR claim between 35 and 40 per cent of the cars that are parked at Oakville station are from the Hamilton and Burlington area.

Has there been any survey of any type taken on this question?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: We had a complete survey made as of the end of the calendar year and the report of that should be ready within two weeks.

Mr. Davison: Now the other question—and here is the place where I think we can, Mr. Chairman, double the service to Hamilton at no cost, or at very little cost, to the commuter service.

At the present time, we have two trains leaving Mimico each morning, running deadhead into Hamilton, which means they are carrying no passengers. They run into Hamilton and they start their run from Hamilton into Toronto. They get to Mimico and they have only got one more station to go until they reach the Union station.

At night, they also run two trains from the Union station into Hamilton at 6.30 and 7.30 and then those two trains turn around and run deadhead back to Mimico, again with no passengers at all. Would it not be possible to run that service both ways? This way would give us trains running into Hamilton in the morning and running out, and trains running into Hamilton in the evening

and running out again. It would double the service, and really at no more cost to the railway.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: The railways themselves have trains operating at approximately those times you refer to and our agreement with them was only to replace the commuter trains, which we have done, two each way.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, the member for Wentworth asked a question of the Minister and I would just like to make sure I heard the answer correctly. Am I to understand that the liability insurance that is carried is for individual claims in excess of $500,000?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: It is called disaster insurance, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Shulman: Is it for individual claims in excess of $500,000?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: I do not understand the member's question, but if there are claims of $500,000 for any one accident, it takes in those over that amount.

Mr. Shulman: What I am saying is, if there is an accident and some ten people are injured—

Hon. Mr. Gomme: That is one accident.

Mr. Shulman: That is one accident, thank you.

Now I would like to come back to this sum of $85,000. I would like to ask which insurance company or companies are given this particular present.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: It is covered by Reid Shaw and McNaught Agencies.

Mr. Shulman: Is this put out to tender?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: This was placed through the insurance committee.

Mr. Shulman: Was it put to tender?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: I am not able to answer that, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Shulman: Perhaps the Provincial Treasurer might oblige us.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, who is responsible for this mysterious insurance committee? The Minister says he cannot answer the question. The Provincial Treasurer shakes his head. Is it a secret committee; a Cabinet committee? Who operates it? What Minister is it responsible to?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Chairman, I might say that I was in Cabinet when this was discussed and it was the former Minister of Municipal Affairs who chaired the committee. I remember him bringing in a number of recommendations and this was the most reasonable one we could get for the coverage required. I do remember that.

Mr. Sopha: Maybe that is why he was defeated.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Maybe.

Mr. MacDonald: Is the most reasonable one the lowest tender?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: That is right, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, there is still some doubt obviously. May I inquire under what estimate we will be allowed to ask the question as to whether or not the lowest tender was accepted, or whether there was tendering?

Mr. Sopha: Why do you not ask under the Prime Minister's estimates?

Mr. Shulman: We have a new Chairman.

Mr. Sopha: That would be a good place for it.

Mr. Chairman: Is the member for High Park referring to the insurance committee to which reference was made by the Minister? His question is who, or what department, gives information pertaining to the insurance committee.

Mr. Shulman: No. My question is who, or what department, will give information as to the specific $85,000?

Mr. Chairman: Which will be, as the Minister has said, a decision of the insurance committee. Therefore, the member from High Park, wants to get the answer from the insurance committee pertaining to this $85,000.

Mr. Shulman: I do not care who I get it from.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. Can the Minister inform the committee under what estimate or where we will look for the insurance committee?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Mr. Chairman, this information will be made available to the House with respect to the placing of the insurance. Our department would have knowledge of it.

Mr. Chairman: In any event, the information—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I think I can help you Mr. Chairman.

You will recall in other years we have gone into the question of placement of government insurance; how it was done. There was a committee that dealt with this and was chaired by the former Minister of Municipal Affairs, that is, perhaps, how his name got into this discussion tonight. Since last October this committee has been chaired by my hon. friend to the left. I am quite certain he would be quite happy, when the time comes, to tell you how it functions, because we have been through this, in this House, many times before. I do not think really it is functioning any different than it has for the last several years.

Mr. Singer: That is our concern.

Mr. Shulman: It is of great concern to everyone here.

Mr. Chairman: The member for York Centre.

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Chairman, I would gather that my remarks were misunderstood by at least one member of the House and I think that at the beginning of my remarks concerning the operations of GO transit, I mentioned how pleased I was that the government had undertaken this work of converting highway funds into making available these rights of way on our railways and enabling people to move on them. I also was very happy with the service that we are providing but what I am trying to bring out is the high cost that we are paying for this in relation to others in Chicago on comparable service availability and under perhaps worse conditions.

They are able to have their GO transit—so-called—put aside nearly $4 million for interest depreciation and taxes which we do not have to provide for, and still make a profit of $2 million. We show a loss of $3.5 million. I would ask the Minister if he would look into the matter of the arrangement with the CNR on the use of the rights of way and the operation of the GO transit trains and give us comparative figures or the basis of the arrangement for arriving at this very large operating cost of $5,277,000 for the service that is being provided in the coming year.

Mr. Chairman: Does the Minister have any response to that comment?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Of course, Mr. Chairman, we are operating on other people's lines and the volume of traffic and the density of population which the hon. member refers to in Chicago is much greater than ours. I understand they also have an express service and such other things as that that supplement their income a good deal over what ours is.

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Chairman, I would add that over 97 per cent of the revenues of the Chicago concern are from their commuter service. They are also operating substantially more trains than we are, well over double the number of trains we are; they are operating over two and a half times the amount of track that we are. They are paying all their operating costs virtually on that track by means of this commuter from what I can see here. The evidence before us is that we are in effect subsidizing the CNR to the extent of about $3 million.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if I could comment on that.

One of the reasons there is a cost factor, of course, is the use of the rails that are owned by somebody else. I would point out to the hon. member that the rails that are used are the subject of a joint running agreement between the Canadian Pacific and Canadian National Railways. The cost of the service provided by the Canadian National Railways, I am speaking from some recollection myself, was worked out on a pro rata shared basis.

They call it wheelage, I guess. The number of wheels that are put over the track over any given period of time is computed and the cost is shared that way. But it is all subject to joint agreement, the cost factor that exists between the two railroads that have joint occupancy of this section of railroad.

The hon. member made some other comments which are a little difficult to share. I accompanied a group of departmental people to Chicago when this whole matter of the commuter rail operation was being studied. We spent a day with the Chicago Northwestern people. We rode their trains. We were very much impressed and one thing we did learn was the fact that they charged substantially more per mile than the hon. member made reference to, because it was on this information that our own fare structure largely was based.

There are a number of other mitigating factors I would point out to the hon. member

and to the House and that is, of course, that the trip distance factor over the lines operated by the Chicago Northwestern Railroad commuter services is much longer than the trip distance factor over the short 60-mile section that GO transit operates. It is at that point there is a break-even point. I suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, and to the hon. member and to the House, in terms of the trip distance factor, there is an average trip distance factor on any line where you probably may reach a break-even point.

These are things the hon. member failed to mention and if he has made as close an investigation of the operation of the Chicago Northwestern commuter service in Chicago and its environs, these are the things he would have found out because this is what we found out from them.

They made it quite clear to us that until we did reach that average trip distance factor that it would be difficult, if not impossible, to ever operate in anything but the red. I do not know what the average trip distance factor on GO transit is right now; I suggest it is probably somewhere between 10 and 15 miles. As I recall it, the information given to us from Chicago was that we would not even come close to the break-even point until we got at least to 20 or probably in excess of 20 miles.

These factors, I think, all mitigate in favour of the operation, of course. It has also been pointed out by the Minister that they own their own rights of way; they own their own tracks; presumably they own their own signalization and equipment, although they did have to modernize their equipment. I would point out to you, sir, that GO transit not only had to acquire all its equipment, in terms of locomotives and coaches, it had to undertake the share of the capital cost of providing extra rails; it had to provide for stations that did not exist; it had to provide for parking lots that were not there and it also had to provide for signalization.

So all of these capital costs had to be entered into and certainly these are things that the Chicago Northwestern Railroad never had to contemplate from the onset. They had these facilities to start with.

So, Mr. Chairman, it is understandable that there would be a deficit like this and I suggest to you the annual deficit is still substantially cheaper than the capital costs of providing roads to accommodate the same number of cars. I do not think there is any question about it. It is providing an execellent facility for the people of the province of Ontario.

Mr. Chairman: The member for York Centre.

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Chairman, I certainly agree that this way of moving people is far cheaper for the people of this province than it is by building these large expensive expressways which are not carrying the number of people required to be carried. But I am looking at the new fare schedule of Chicago which was approved last November and the rates, which I quoted, were quoted from that, Mr. Chairman. I also note that we are not dealing here with depreciation of equipment that we have already provided for. The new equipment comes under capital outlay. I am talking about the agreement with the CNR which, in my view, indicates that we are paying far more for the maintenance of rights-of-way than should be paid.

For example, the total cost of maintenance of roadways and of equipment repairs and of operating expenses over their 149 miles of track, is $9.7 million. That includes the operation of their trains. We are paying $5.5 million for a much shorter distance and far fewer trains. It indicates to me that we should be reviewing this agreement with the railways and determining whether or not we are paying far more than our rightful share of the cost of operation.

Please let me assure you, I am completely behind GO transit. It is the answer to suburban movement in the areas around this city. But I do think that before we get very much farther we should carefully re-examine our agreement with the railways and see if we are not paying far more than we should have and therefore burdening the taxpayers of this province unnecessarily, and also, perhaps, discouraging immediate initiation of GO transit facilities into other areas than are now being served.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Wellington South!

Mr. H. Worton (Wellington South): Mr. Chairman, I would just like to ask the Minister—he may already have explained this—but has he any plans for west in the Brampton-Georgetown area of this GO transit?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: This GO transit was part of the entire study of transportation over the whole area. This is one phase of it that has

been introduced and I believe the report is being prepared now for the further operation of a system such as this.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Oshawa!

Mr. C. G. Pilkey (Oshawa): Mr. Chairman, I agree with the theory of the hon. Minister when he said that this GO transit was to really save in road construction and to get a great number of cars off the roads. This, in turn, would save the people in regard to transportation.

I also want to say that I have received a number of inquiries from the people on my riding wondering if the government was going to extend the GO transit system to Oshawa. I just want to quote from one of the letters, the most recent one I received, which went on to say:

> No doubt you are aware of the big success of the GO transit rail commuter service operated by the government of Ontario between Hamilton, through Toronto, to Bay Ridges. Prior to its commencement we were given to understand that if the period of experimental service proved beneficial, it would be promptly extended.
>
> It has now been operating for almost a year, during which time it has proven profitable, as well as beneficial, to the communities being served. As yet there have been no further steps taken to extend it any nearer to Oshawa.
>
> In the first we were wondering why it should extend 39 miles to Hamilton, and only 25 miles to the east. Oshawa is only 33 miles from Union station. Is it the case that Pickering township and points west are better represented in Parliament than Ontario county and Oshawa?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Pilkey: If this was the yardstick that was going to be used to determine whether GO transit was going to Oshawa, and this is no reflection on the members from Hamilton, I would think that it would probably immediately go to Belleville on the basis of representation. But I am sure this is not the yardstick that is going to be used.

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Cornwall!

Mr. Pilkey: Cornwall; okay, that is good enough.

I want to say also and I want to quote just a little from a document that I have here. I understand it was a Conservative election leafllet and I know that this really should be the gospel truth. So I want to quote from it just a little to remind the government of what they said. It says:

> This GO transit is serving more than 15,000 persons daily. It makes them less dependent on the need to live closer to work, where housing costs are likely to be higher, and gives more freedom to those choosing a place to live.

I think that that is a point. I suspect that it is much costlier to establish a home in the environs of Toronto than it is say, in Oshawa. I think it would be a little cheaper to purchase a home in Oshawa than Toronto, so they may have a point there. They also go on to say there is that important saving in municipal taxes, and I suspect that that is right too. They went on to make other statements. It says:

> Aside from the comfort and relief from traffic jams, GO transit actually saves most commuters money. Its fares have been set a half a cent lower per mile than car operating costs.

Let us assume for a moment that that is a fact. Then they go on with some more statements:

> The work now in progress includes a detailed analysis of the success and effects of the GO transit and traffic and economic projections up to the year 2000.

Maybe I should read the other paragraph:

> These findings will guide planning of transportation facilities to areas from Guelph to Oshawa and north to Barrie, and also other urban areas.

So there is a suggestion in this leaflet that went out to the electorate during the campaign that this government was going to do something in addition to what GO transit is today. They were going to extend it.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: We will.

Mr. Pilkey: You will? I hope it is before the year 2000 because that is 32 years from now, if my mathematics are correct. We need to do something as far as Oshawa is concerned and other areas which need this GO transit system prior to the year 2000.

My question to the Minister is this, is GO transit going to be extended in the near future to those areas that could use it with the result in the savings that this document indicates in terms of housing, in terms of

cheaper fares, in terms of road construction—the whole business? If this leaflet has any meaning, then I think that the government should immediately extend these GO transit systems into these various municipalities.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member had been here at the introduction of the system, it was very clearly stated that the—

Mr. Pilkey: I could not get the nomination before.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: —period of experiment would probably be two to three years until we would get the answer as to the benefits of the operation. You realize that it was last May 23 that it was started. We have not had a year of operation yet; we have only been able to examine the figures up until the end of the calendar year. We are, as I say, preparing a report. On the basis of the findings that we have, we certainly will be prepared to recommend whatever changes we think should be made in the system.

Mr. Pilkey: Well, I just want to—

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Now, in your reference to Hamilton. The reason we went that far was because there were the two trains which were operated night and morning by the CNR and we replaced those by agreement with the railway, subject to the control of the board of transport commissioners, that is why they are in operation.

Mr. Pilkey: Mr. Chairman, to the Minister, I do not know what detailed examinations or analysis are necessary to suggest to you, sir, that the GO transit would be just as economical for those people in these other areas without this detailed analysis and matter of fact your election leaflet says that this is one of the greatest steps forward in transportation in our lifetime. Now if it is, then let us get on with the job. Let us have more of this "greatest step forward."

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Pilkey: Surely, if you made that assessment at the time you instituted this transit system, surely the analyses that are necessary are not going to take any great length of time. As a matter of fact, in using the present use as a yardstick, surely we ought to be extending it immediately and those analyses should be forthcoming immediately.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: I can tell the hon. member that we are in the process of trying to work that out. We have to work with the railways, because it is their lines, and these are the things that we are doing in examining the possibility of extension to Oshawa or to the north.

Mr. Pilkey: Surely the way the railways are crying there should be a line for almost no cost.

Mr. Chairman: The member for York Centre.

Mr. Deacon: I notice the Minister—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: May I interrupt, please?

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves that the committee rise and report certain resolutions and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report certain resolutions and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow I would like to call second readings, included in which will be order number 13 on the order paper, which is second reading of Bill 44, An Act to amend The Secondary Schools and Boards of Education Act.

After we have finished second readings we will resume the estimates of The Department of Highways.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 11:20 o'clock, p.m.



Legislature of Ontario Debates

No. 45

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

First Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Tuesday, April 2, 1968

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1968

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Tuesday, April 2, 1968

Final report, standing committee on private bills, Mr. Meen 1503

Highway Traffic Act, bill to amend, Mr. Young, first reading 1503

Statement re the Don jail, Mr. Grossman 1504

Question to Mr. McKeough re the Windsor investigation proposal, Mr. Nixon 1506

Questions to Mr. Davis re educational television, Mr. Nixon 1506

Questions to Mr. Grossman re the Don jail, Mr. Shulman 1507

Questions to Mr. Brunelle re land holdings, Mr. Stokes 1508

Questions to Mr. Brunelle re open seasons for hunting, Mr. Knight 1509

Questions to Mr. Haskett re the motor vehicle accident claims fund, Mr. Worton 1509

Questions to Mr. Stewart re the Canadian Dominion Sugar Company, Mr. Spence 1510

Secondary Schools and Boards of Education Act, bill to amend, Mr. Davis, on second reading 1510

Recess, 6 o'clock 1538

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

TUESDAY, APRIL 2, 1968

The House met at 2:30 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are always pleased to have visitors to the Legislature and today we welcome, as guests, students from the following schools: in the east gallery, from St. Christopher's separate school, Clarkson, and Millbrook high school, Millbrook; and in the west gallery, Winchester senior public school, Toronto, and William Treadway public school, Scarborough.

At 3:30 we will be joined in the west gallery by pupils from the Chapleau high school, Chapleau; and this evening by the 23rd scout troop and girl guides, Toronto, and Westminster lodge, Scarborough.

I am also pleased to note in the Speaker's gallery and welcome here several members from the Quebec Department of Education who, I understand, are here to interest themselves in and learn from the debates which we anticipate will take place this afternoon. I am sure we welcome them too.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Mr. A. K. Meen, from the standing committee on private bills, presented the 11th and final report of the standing committee on private bills which was read as follows and adopted.

Your committee begs to report the following bills with certain amendments:

Bill Pr5, An Act respecting the city of Sault Ste. Marie.

Bill Pr29, An Act respecting the city of Niagara Falls.

Bill Pr44, An Act respecting the Toronto city mission.

Bill Pr51, An Act respecting Janbi Holdings Limited.

Bill Pr52, An Act respecting Walbi Holdings Limited.

Your committee would recommend that the fees less the penalties and the actual cost of printing be remitted on Bill Pr44, An Act respecting the Toronto city mission.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Introduction of bills.

THE HIGHWAY TRAFFIC ACT

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Highway Traffic Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Young: I am today reintroducing a second bill to amend The Highway Traffic Act. This one calls for regular twice-yearly inspection of all motor vehicles on the highways of Ontario. Last year we killed 1,400 people on the highways of Ontario, we injured 67,000 and smashed up $80 million worth of property. How much of this carnage is due to impaired cars is difficult to say.

However, we do know that in jurisdictions where there has been substantial experience in regular inspection procedures the death toll has been drastically cut. Last year the Ontario garage operators' association reported that in Texas 15 per cent of its accidents were due to unsafe vehicles before inspection started and that this figure dropped to 5 per cent after the programme got underway. In New Jersey the first year of inspection brought a traffic fatality drop of 32 per cent while states conducting safety inspection programmes show that up to 55 per cent of all vehicles inspected are rejected as unsafe because of one or more parts requiring immediate attention.

This report is backed up by a study recently conducted by Dr. Robert C. Buxbaum of the Harvard medical school and Dr. Theodore Colton, also of Harvard. Dr. Buxbaum says that automobile inspection exerts a preventive effect upon mechancial failure and that the states where such inspection is required have considerably lower motor vehicle death rates. He went on to say that the death rate is even lower in states requiring two inspections a year.

The investigation showed that among nonwhites, where the greater proportion of people own older automobiles, death rates fell from 64.2 per 100,000 in non-inspection states to

37.9 in states inspecting once a year, and to 27.2 in states with two inspections a year. For whites the comparable figures were 38.2, 25.1 and 22.5 respectively.

It is true that some inspection lanes are now being operated in Ontario, but they touch only the fringe of the motor vehicles being driven. One of the fundamental problems here is that owners of older cars which have obvious defects steer clear of the inpsection lanes. Many people, too, are driving cars which have defects of which they are completely unaware until catastrophe occurs. Regular inspections would catch many of these before death results. Then, too, the very threat of regular inspections will ensure that most people will not delay repairs as long as they otherwise might.

There is no question that it will be a major job to set up adequate inspection stations across the province. But this can be done in stages. In the meantime, both the garage operators' association and the automobile dealers' association have offered their facilities on a licence basis to assist in implementing an inspection programme. The Minister can license and bond reliable operators and authorize them to issue windshield stickers good for a six-month period. Proper procedures can be set up to make sure these stickers mean what they say.

Where and when the Minister sets up provincially operated stations, the private operators can be phased out, and, if necessary, staff can be transferred after proper consultation among all the parties concerned. The cost of such inspections could be added to the licence fee and it would be infinitesimal in relation to the saving in life and property and in relation to the greater peace of mind of the driver who knows the highway is much safer because of the inspection procedure.

The rising death toll in Ontario makes the passing of this bill imperative. Mr. Speaker, this bill would mandate twice-yearly inspection of all motor cars using the highways of Ontario.

Mr. Speaker: Before the orders of the day, I would like to draw the attention of the members to the material which has been placed by the Clerk of the House on their desks. This is an innovation this year and should be very useful to the members and their constituents. I think the Clerk and his staff are deserving of some commendation for this innovation.

The Minister of Reform Institutions.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): Mr. Speaker, on March 25, the hon. member for High Park (Mr. Shulman) issued a press release in which he charged that persons suspected of mental illness have been held in the Don jail for several months. It is a somewhat unusual procedure for an hon. member to issue this kind of release while the Legislature is in session. I was immediately pressured by the news media to answer the hon. member's charges. I felt it was necessary to clarify these matters. Therefore, as soon as I received the facts from my staff, I replied to the charges.

The following day, March 26, the hon. member rose in his place on a point of privilege and quoted me as follows:

> Dr. Shulman's assertion that some persons suspected of mental illness are confined to the Don jail for periods up to several months is not true.

He then went on to say, and I quote him this time:

> I wish to inform this House that the governor of the Don jail stated, in the presence of the member for Lakeshore (Mr. Lawlor) and myself, that some prisoners were confined in the cell for the mentally ill for periods up to several months. In the light of the Minister's statement and the fact that two members of this House have no reason to doubt the governor of the Don jail, it is apparent that the Minister has misinformed the public.

Mr. Speaker, it is somewhat illuminating to note the decision arrived at by the hon. member, that is, and I quote: "It is apparent that the Minister has misinformed the public."

It seems to me that if it appeared to the hon. member that there were conflicting statements made as between a Minister and a member of his staff—the proper and honourable approach would have been for the hon. member to ask, during the question period, for an explanation of the "apparent" difference in such statements, rather than charge that "the Minister has misinformed the public". However, let us look at the facts and establish who, in fact, did misinform the public. At the same time I will answer question 218 from the hon. member for High Park which at that time I took as notice.

The records at the Metropolitan Toronto jail indicate that the courts remanded 299 prisoners charged with criminal offences between April 1, 1967 and March 31, 1968, with a request for mental examination. These 299 prisoners were each seen by two duly qualified medical practitioners; in 95 of the cases, the persons examined were certified as "mentally ill", four awaiting disposition this week.

It is normal practice when the court remands a prisoner for mental examination,

for that prisoner to reappear before the court within eight days of the remand. The records show that this was carried out in all cases, that is that each of the 95 prisoners, in addition to the other 200, appeared back in court within eight days. The records further show that in all except 21 of these 95 cases, those certified mentally ill were then remanded directly to a mental hospital on the same day they appeared back in court, or on the following day.

Of the 21 cases previously cited, 19 remained in the jail for a further 15 days or less, either because of the lack of bed space in a psychiatric facility or because the jail doctors had requested an extension of the observation time. Only two persons were returned to the jail for a period of longer than 15 days beyond the original remand of eight days, and in one case where the person was held for 25 days, a deportation order complicated proceedings.

The following indicates the number of days these 21 persons were kept in observation on subsequent remands by the court: 2 days, 1; 3 days, 2; 5 days, 2; 6 days, 3; 7 days, 1; 8 days, 3; 9 days, 4; 15 days, 3; 20 days, 1; 25 days, 1.

As can be seen from the above, the longest time spent under further observation, and this was in the case of the deportation order, was 25 days. It can be seen now, Mr. Speaker, why I denied the accuracy of the press release issued by the hon. member for High Park in which he contended that, and I quote again:

> Each of these suspected mentally ill patients is sent to the Don jail where they are confined in a common cell with absolutely no amenities, sometimes for periods up to several months.

I repeat, therefore, unequivocably, that not one—not one—of these patients has been confined for even one month beyond the original remand of eight days, let alone for several months. I denied that persons remanded for mental examinations were confined in the jail "sometimes for periods up to several months". I denied this was true on the basis of information provided by the governor; I still deny it, and in the light of the figures I have just presented to this Legislature, it is apparent that the hon. member's statement was incorrect, and that he, in fact, misinformed this House.

On Tuesday, March 26, the hon. member stated that he and his colleague had visited the Don jail and had drawn a different inference from the governor's comments at that time. The hon. member further stated that he had no reason to doubt the governor of the Don jail—that "it was apparent that the Minister misinformed the public". In reply, I will quote this letter received by me from the governor of the jail:

March 28, 1968

Dear Sir:

As a result of the visit to this jail by Dr. Morton Shulman and Mr. Patrick Lawlor on March 23, 1968, a statement made by Dr. Shulman regarding the detention of mentally ill prisoners indicated that I as governor of the jail stated that they were kept here for months.

The visit of these two gentlemen lasted two and a half hours and many aspects of the operation of the jail were discussed.

I did not and would not tell Dr. Shulman or any other person that the mentally ill are kept in the jail for months. This simply is not true as there are available complete and accurate records to substantiate that all prisoners sent to the jail and ordered a mental examination, are examined during the one-week remand, and then returned to the court as being certified mentally ill or not mentally ill. Frequently, on my own initiative, I arrange with the courts for a prisoner to appear before his date of remand, when he is certified as mentally ill, to accelerate his admission to a mental hospital, because of his distressed state.

During the course of the visit I was asked by Dr. Shulman why the jail did not experience the suicides which had occurred during the past year in police stations. I told him in one word—supervision—the observation ward being an integral and main feature in preventing suicides. I am extremely careful in the terminology I use. I always refer to those that are certified as mentally ill and those that are not certified as emotionally disturbed. Dr. Shulman expressed interest in the manner in which we handled suicide attempts and I did in fact cite the case of—

And here, Mr. Speaker, I move from my text and replace the real name with the name of John Doe.

> —John Doe, who attempted suicide on two occasions, did in fact go to the Ontario hospital, Penetanguishene, twice after being certified as mentally ill. Subsequently on both occasions he was returned by the hospital on the authority of the court, for a

hearing and to stand trial (not certified as mentally ill).

Those prisoners that attempt suicide, or it is suspected will attempt suicide, are placed in the observation ward for their own protection, and are seen by the medical officer at the first opportunity when they have made an attempt. In the case of those where suspicion is aroused that they may attempt suicide, they are presented to the medical officer for his examination and the medical officer is given all relevant detail.

I feel that Dr. Shulman may have been confused in this area and this may have caused him to make the statement he attributes to me.

One further observation I wish to make is that under no circumstances would I ever refer to the OBS—

That is the observation section.

—as a cell. Such terminology would be foreign to me or any other member of the staff. The observation ward is called the OBS by every member of the staff instinctively from the governor to the newest staff member.

Yours very truly,
G. P. WHITEHEAD,
Governor

Mr. Speaker, it is therefore evident that I did not misinform the public. However, to give the hon. member the benefit of the doubt, I can only assume that he was confused by the procedure and explanations given to him by the governor. This will become even more apparent in a few minutes when I answer other questions from the hon. member of which he gave notice to the Speaker in my absence, which was due to illness. Perhaps having learned this lesson, he will, in future, establish his facts before making a statement which cannot be substantiated, particularly such a serious one as that "a Minister had misinformed the public".

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as I had entered questions—

Mr. Speaker: Order, order!

Mr. Shulman: Inasmuch as I have already given notice of questions on the subject perhaps the Minister would answer them now.

Mr. Speaker: Not at the moment. The leader of the Opposition has the floor.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I know we will continue with this matter in a moment but until then I would like to ask the Minister of Municipal Affairs:

Does the Minister agree with Judge S. L. Clunis that The Municipal Act does not provide for municipalities to appoint and pay for the kind of investigation proposed by the city of Windsor?

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I have no indication that in the opinion of Judge Clunis, The Municipal Act does not provide for municipalities to appoint and pay for the kind of investigation proposed and underway by the city of Windsor. A news item in the *Globe and Mail* this morning quotes Judge Clunis as saying, that, and I quote:

> It is questionable whether the city is legally responsible for expenses of the inquiry.

As of yesterday, I referred this matter to the law branch of my department for a report. On receipt of the report I will undertake to inform the council of Windsor, and his honour the judge, as to what course the department now recommends.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Education.

Does the federal government's proposed domestic satellite communications system include possible provision for educational television facilities that could be available to Ontario, similar to those negotiated by the province of Quebec for facilities through a European satellite?

Hon. W. G. Davis (Minister of Education and University Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I think it is obvious that we are very interested in the announcement of the federal government with respect to a proposed domestic satellite communications system for this jurisdiction. We have been in touch with Ottawa and the information that we receive indicates that, like any other user—the user being the proposed educational authority—we would have to approach the corporation that is to be established and negotiate for the use of the facilities.

This is as we understand it at the moment, and depending on the eventual decision of the federal government regarding educational broadcasting, it might be—and I emphasize this, it might be that the proposed federal authority would wish to negotiate on behalf of the province.

As we understand it, there will be a separate corporation probably for the satellite

communications system, and as possible user, the province of Ontario educational television authority—or whatever name is used—would make the application. But it may be that the federal agency that we understand may be established to handle all educational and other broadcasting, apart from the board of broadcast governors and the CBC, might negotiate on behalf of the provinces—we do not know. We also have received—

Mr. Nixon: We will read that carefully in *Hansard.*

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes, we will read it very carefully in *Hansard.* We have also received information that this is to be a purely domestic system and this would presumably preclude the reception of programmes from Europe, although I am not sure of this, but this is the information we have received. The newspaper accounts of Mr. Drury's statements indicate that there will still be a need for at least three types of earth bound stations—large terminals to transmit and receive, and smaller regional receivers.

It should be pointed out, Mr. Speaker, that our own plans within the province of Ontario for educational television in the network to be established, are based on the modular concept. That is, we can use whatever pattern is developed to fit in with the facilities that we are planning and, as I have stated previously here in the House and also before the committee of the House of Commons, we can adapt our system to the use of satellites if they become available.

Mr. Nixon: Just further to that, Mr. Speaker, if I may. The educational television branch of The Department of Education is a part of the federal technical planning board board, is it not? Is there not a technical planning board associated with the general oversight of these developments?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, I do not believe there is an official technical planning board. There have been very many discussions between personnel within the branch and the federal authorities but I do not believe there is any, shall we say, legal planning board *per se,* but I shall check this out for the member.

Mr. Speaker: The member for High Park now has the floor.

Mr. Shulman: Will the Minister allow a supplementary question?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No.

Mr. Shulman: Well, we see how interested the Minister is in producing the truth here.

I have two questions, notice of which has been given previously for this particular Minister.

1. Are the "orderlies" at the Don jail "mentally ill" cell appointed from prisoners convicted of drunk charges? What training do these orderlies receive?

2. How long did Richard Hardy spend in the cell for the mentally ill at the Don jail this past year, and how long did Clarence Dean spend in the cell for the mentally ill at the Don jail this past year?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The "orderlies" in the observation ward at the Metropolitan Toronto jail are usually, although not invariably, appointed from prisoners convicted of breaches of The Liquor Control Act. I notice in the question that the hon. member quite appropriately puts "orderlies" in quotation marks because, in fact, what these men do is to spend two hours on duty and eight hours off duty as what might be termed "trustees", doing such useful chores as messengers, watchmen, cleaners, and so on. They are dressed in blues just like the other inmates. A correctional officer is, of course, in complete charge of the "observation ward" 24 hours a day; the "orderlies" usually sit in the ward and are a double check if the correctional officer's attention is distracted.

The term "orderly" has been adopted both by staff and inmates, but it is hard to say how it originated. It is not hard to say why it originated. Men in this position naturally like to add a little to their self-respect and perhaps the title implies a little more than the work involves. But they are a part of a system, a system which, over the last 15 years, has a record of no suicides in this observation ward. So one must respect those concerned, and if this title helps them, I see no reason to downgrade their services. We should give these men full credit for the job they do. The title gives them an identity and a feeling of usefulness to their peers, something they sadly lack when on the outside.

Having dealt with what these so-called "orderlies" do, I should advise this House that we have eight nurses at the jail, seven of whom are registered nurses. They, and they alone, are the "nursing orderlies"; they, and they alone, administer medication prescribed by the medical doctor.

In the light of this explanation, I think the hon. member will agree that the second portion of his question is irrelevant.

The first person mentioned by the hon. member was at no time suspected of being mentally ill. He was in the observation ward about three months in order that he could be kept under constant supervision for his own protection. The second person was twice remanded with a request for a mental examination. In each case, he was examined by two doctors and within seven days, returned to the court as not mentally ill. He spent two periods in the observation ward, one of five weeks, and one of four weeks, with a period of bail in between.

Mr. Shulman: Oh, shame, shame!

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Now the full story unfolds.

Mr. Shulman: Well, well, well!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: He was in the observation ward under constant supervision for his own protection. Both of these inmates have received sentences of imprisonment. One is awaiting the disposition of further charges, and one is on his way to reformatory. Now, Mr. Speaker, I am loath to go into any further detail in public concerning these people.

Mr. Shulman: We can understand that.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I will advise the hon. member in private of any details that he feels it is important to have, but I do not want to prejudice the future of either of these men by going into further discussion in public.

Mr. MacDonald: The Minister professes always to be worried about that.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It is the policy of The Department of Reform Institutions that the public discussion of individual inmates' cases in which they can be easily identified can only work to their detriment. I would ask, therefore, that unless it is clearly in the person's interests, that they should not be so identified. In addition, open discussions of this nature may antagonize those persons identified, including their families, and could easily result in some form of retribution affecting the safety of others. As I said, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member wishes to have more detail regarding these two cases, I will be pleased to advise him in private.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, will the Minister allow a supplementary question that does not involve the details of the two particular cases?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No.

Mr. P. J. Yakabuski (Renfrew South): He said no.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Timiskaming.

Mr. MacDonald: At least the hon. Minister did not run out this time.

Mr. D. Jackson (Timiskaming): The hon. Minister is not in the House.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. The member for Thunder Bay.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests. Under what circumstances has Anaconda Iron of Canada been given exclusive occupancy of a strip of land two miles wide and 140 miles long stretching from Melchett Lake north of Nakina to Kama Bay on Lake Superior? What is Anaconda Iron paying for this privilege, and how long will the company be permitted to have exclusive rights to this land?

Hon. R. Brunelle (Minister of Lands and Forests): Mr. Speaker, in answer to the hon. member for Thunder Bay, Anaconda Iron Ore (Ontario) Limited has expressed interest in developing an iron ore property at Melchett Lake. The company also has under consideration the shipment of ore from the property to a terminal at Kama Bay at Lake Superior.

My department has reserved from disposition, a strip of Crown land connecting Melchett Lake and Kama Bay along the probable route of either a railway or a pipeline. Reservations of this type are not uncommon, and are used for the purpose of restricting the disposal of land until such time as the precise location of the facility is known. It is the policy of the department not to charge a fee for reservations of this type.

The company, in 1967, expressed continued interest in this right of way between Melchett Lake and Lake Superior, and my department concurred in reserving a strip of land in question for a further period of three years from April 1, 1967.

Mr. Stokes: Would the Minister accept a supplementary question?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Yes.

Mr. Stokes: As the Minister knows, there has been a road built by public funds from Nakina to Terrior Lake—at the expense of the taxpayer—and from that point on, it was constructed by Anaconda. They have issued a key to the gate across the road to one

specific person, and he has got a virtual monopoly of that whole area up there. I was wondering if you would make representations on behalf of the public to have the top end of that road opened?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Speaker, I would be pleased to look into the question raised by the hon. member.

At this time, may I reply to his question of yesterday? The question yesterday was: Will the Minister assure Messrs. Bill Astrom and Roy Warne of South Porcupine, who cut timber for the clearance of the rights of way on Highway 129 between Chapleau, and Thessalon, that they will be paid cutting fees for work done under permit number 6095?

Mr. Speaker, under procedures established by The Department of Lands and Forests and The Department of Highways, timber cut on a right of way, and not required in road construction programmes is the property of The Department of Lands and Forests. Thus spruce and jackpine cut by The Department of Highways contractors on the right of way for Highway 129 was sold by The Department of Lands and Forests to Kormack Lumber Company. It is my understanding that The Department of Highways contracted for the clearance of the right of way with a Mr. Cain, who in turn subcontracted this to a Mr. Champagne. It appears that the latter in turn subcontracted the cutting to Messrs. Warne and Astrom.

The Department of Lands and Forests was not involved in any of these matters and thus have no responsibility to Messrs. Warne and Astrom for payment concerning the clearing of the right of way. They should deal directly with the contractor or subcontractor for any payments due to them.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Port Arthur.

Mr. R. H. Knight (Port Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests. In view of the provisional summary of 1968 hunting regulations which announces the dates for hunting in the various areas the province, will the Minister provide an earlier hunting season for residents of the counties in the four schedules, because of the annual influx of American citizens?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Speaker, in answer to the hon. member for Port Arthur: The dates for residents and non-residents have already been established. We do not feel that an open season for residents in advance of non-residents can be justified.

Mr. Knight: Will the Minister accept a supplementary question? Will the Minister please explain, inasmuch as the people who live, let us say, in northwestern Ontario sustain and pay taxes to the area, why it should seem so unfair that they should have a few days' head start, even if it were three or four days, in view of the fact that the American hunters come in well-equipped and have time to stay and hunt whereas the local residents only hunt on the weekend? What are his specific reasons for being against this?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Speaker, I first say that there will be ample opportunity to discuss this under my estimates. However, may I in turn ask the hon. member this question. Has he asked the local tourist outfitters and the people who cater to the tourist industry if they are in favour of this suggestion?

Mr. Knight: In answer, Mr. Speaker, I have had representation made to me, as the representative for the riding of Port Arthur, from the Thunder Bay fish and game association, which also has hunting outfitters amongst its number, and the general consensus—

Mr. Speaker: Order! The member has asked the question, and the Minister has answered his question.

Mr. Knight: May I answer it to my satisfaction, Mr. Speaker? I would like to thank the hon. Minister for the opportunity to go into this question a little further, because it is certainly a thorn in the side of our resident hunters up there.

Mr. Speaker: Order! We are getting into matters that would be best taken care of in the estimates or in another question.

Mr. Knight: I think that I will take the Minister's suggestion and take this up further with him in the estimates. Thank you.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Does the Minister ever do anything for Canadians?

Mr. Speaker: The member for Wellington South.

Mr. H. Worton (Wellington South): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Transport. How many motorists are paying the $25 fee in lieu of insurance to obtain their licences, and how much money was paid out of the accident claims fund in the years 1965, 1966 and 1967?

Hon. I. Haskett (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, during the calendar year of 1967, 143,505 uninsured motor vehicle fees of $25 were paid by uninsured motorists. Payments from the accident claims fund for the last three calendar years, were: 1965, $3,467,454.16; 1966, $4,136,050.87; 1967, $4,819,365.79.

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I have a question to ask of the hon. Minister of Agriculture and Food of which I have given notice.

The question is as follows: Is it true that the Canadian Dominion Sugar Company is growing 25,000 acres of sugar beets in the state of Ohio, in the area of Oakwood? Mr. Speaker, as there are two Oakwoods in Ohio, this is Oakwood North. This company, we understand, is going to move the machinery from the Chatham sugar refinery at Chatham to the state of Ohio in the year 1968. If so, Mr. Speaker, would the Minister tell us the reason why?

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): Mr. Speaker, I was somewhat startled when I received the question. I had no knowledge of this rumour that has been referred to me.

Inquiry was made, however, of company officials and it was learned that the company have no intention, nor have had any intention, of growing any sugar beets under contract in the state of Ohio or anywhere else.

An exploratory trip was made to the state of Ohio by representatives of the company, on request, to determine whether or not, in the opinion of the company officials who had had experience in growing sugar beets, the land, soil and climate conditions were suitable for growing sugar beets in the area, and to explore the possibilities of, perhaps, moving to this area some of the equipment that is available in Ontario, where the industry has ceased to exist at the moment.

That is all that we could determine and I think it is right to inform the hon. member that this is the result of the inquiry that was made.

Mr. Spence: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Minister if he would investigate this area at Oakwood a little further to find out if this is true?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: We have no authority in the United States to do any investigating, Mr. Speaker. However, I have no reason to doubt the word of the official of the company who gave us this assurance.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The 13th order.

THE SECONDARY SCHOOLS AND BOARDS OF EDUCATION ACT

Hon. W. G. Davis (Minister of Education and University Affairs) moves second reading of Bill 44, An Act to amend The Secondary Schools and Boards of Education Act.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, the background of the amalgamation of educational authorities in Canada is a very interesting one, and while there is apparently a study going on by the Ontario institute for studies in education in this important matter, it either is not completed or it is not available for those of us in this House who are particularly concerned about the course such amalgamation is taking in this province.

Many of us were present in this Legislature in 1964 when the bill to provide for the minimum size of a board of education or an educational jurisdiction to be a township was approved, and we, of course, in the Liberal Opposition were in favour of that extension and commented at some length when it was brought before the House.

Since then, there have been some other school amalgamations take place in other jurisdictions in Canada. We know that the government in New Brunswick took some very far-reaching, very progressive steps as far as their requirements were concerned, in changing the whole governance of education in that province. Another example was in Manitoba where by means of a local option vote, the government which had attempted to do something similar to what the bill before us this afternoon would accomplish, was turned down almost across the board by the citizens in that province, who when they had an opportunity to express their own views, were not as progressive as perhaps the government of the day in Manitoba had expected.

Now this government is approaching the same problem from yet another tack, and it is interesting to note that representatives from the province of Quebec are here today to examine this government's activities and how well it would be accepted in this Legislature and, of course, across the province.

So our position in the Opposition, and as Liberals, has been made clear. We supported the position that the government took in 1964. If you had gone to the trouble of looking at our election manifesto, you would know that we felt that even at that point the government had not gone far enough in extending the jurisdiction of the school boards to an area that would be efficient and that would provide equality of opportunity and a basis for a proper grant system that would be understandable and equitable.

As the Minister knows, in the election just recently passed, we stood foursquare for the combination of elementary and secondary responsibilities, and where practicable, that these responsibilities would be applied at the county level.

Now the Minister, in bringing in his own bill here today, is simply following the lead provided by the Premier (Mr. Robarts) of the province who, on his own authority, announced that the government policy would be as we now find it in the bill before us. He made this announcement in a speech in Galt, I believe, last November, but he did not undertake to take the citizens of the province into his confidence during the election campaign. At no time during the campaign, as far as I am aware, did he mention this. Nor did the Minister of Education, nor anyone else associated with the administration, bring to the attention of the people of Ontario that this, in fact, was in the future if the government was re-elected.

I would say to you that you have not the confidence in the people that you so often express. You have treated them undemocratically and unfairly. We on this side were the only ones that endeavoured to bring this forward as an issue. You will find it in our campaign literature, and if you do not have it available, I will be pleased to send you a copy so that you can refer to it.

The Minister, in bringing forward the legislation a few weeks ago, said that he felt there were five principles in the bill. I want to refer briefly to each of the five that he has underlined and go on to find two more that I believe are in the bill and which are of great importance.

The first one, of course, is that in his view —and in mine—the extension of the area of school administration would bring about at least a better approach to equality of opportunity. Certainly, there is no one in this House who would be against that goal, and in our efforts—partisan and otherwise—we have tried to bring this about in Ontario. We have tried to point out to the interested citizens at election time and on other occasions, that Ontario falls very far short of even approaching this goal. The Minister will know, as well as I, that the Lake Erie region development council undertook a careful survey of the area, including the counties under their particular jurisdiction, and they found that the difference in dollars available per student per year varied between $200 and $400 for the purposes of providing adequate education.

As I remember the statistics—I looked them up again but they have been put on the record here previously—the main difference existed between the fairly large urban centres such as London and some of the smaller centres such as Port Dover, and these were the two outstanding examples. The difference, I understand, approached $400 per student per year, and this is the measure of the inequality of opportunity that the Minister is endeavouring to correct by the introduction of this bill. But surely we are all aware that the elimination of this inequality is going to cost money —equality costs money, and there is no alternative.

The imposition of the county boards of education as are contained in principle in this bill will mean that a good many of the costlier services for education are going to be changed, not toward any median or average, but to the highest level, and certainly this will be true of the teachers' salaries; it will be true of the provision of special services such as kindergartens, which are not now normally available in rural areas; it will also be additional cost with regard to bus transportation. The Minister knows that there are many areas where a doubling of bus routes has been accepted by the people in the smaller jurisdictions as an economy measure, and these people, I can say to him, will not be prepared to accept it when the costs are going to be spread over a large area, including the major metropolitan centres in these counties. There will of course be an addition to the expenses related to supervision, because once we get into the area of the larger jurisdictions, with students numbering in the thousands, it will be necessary that the type of jurisdiction that is characteristic of the larger centres be available to all schools.

In my view, this is what equality of opportunity is all about, and it brings to me to the second principle that the Minister enunciated

—it was number five in his list. I prefer to put it at the second level, because he says that it is the responsibility of The Department of Education to meet these extra costs associated with true equality of opportunity. There is no way at my disposal even to estimate what these extra costs would be, but if the Minister means what he says, he is implying that the school rates as they presently are, in the school boards as they are organized, will be frozen or fixed and the additional costs associated with the upgrading that I have just brought to his attention would be met from a richer grant system.

This is what we would favour. We in the Liberal Party and in Opposition in this House have been urging the government that their best way to participate in an equality of opportunity programme is by virtue of having larger areas, as this bill provides, but beyond that to assume a much richer, much fairer, certainly much larger share in the average cost of education across the province.

We believe that the aim should be 80 per cent, that is the immediate aim and goal. Beyond that, we do not know really what grant changes would follow, but surely this is the way that equality of opportunity must be achieved, not by simply putting an additional burden on the taxpayers in the larger centres in the counties that certainly will be a significant increase to the cost of education if the bill that is now before us goes forward without amendment or without additional grant assistance that really would accomplish the second principle that the Minister has brought to our attention.

The third principle is one that involves the integration of the supervision of the education system in the province from kindergarten to grade 13. In my view, Mr. Speaker, the Minister was very slow in accepting this principle. He will remember in the investigation that he ordered into the training of teachers in the province, that over the objection of many reasonable people in this House and elsewhere, he saw fit to divide the investigation into the training associated with elementary teachers and a special commission for those teachers at the secondary level. The point was well made by the report on elementary school teachers, which really ignored the terms of reference that had been laid down for them by the Minister, and extended the ambit of their investigation of teacher-training from kindergarten to grade 13 and made recommendations which, while they have been accepted by the government, are still a very long distance from fulfillment.

Still in the Act that is before us, the wording tends to emphasize the separation that may have existed, and certainly does exist in the legislation of the province and still exists in the mind of the Minister, when we see things in the bill that the divisional board shall be deemed a high school board and shall be deemed a public school board for various of their responsibilities.

I believe, sir, it is obvious that this is to bring the application of the statute into line with the requirements of the separate school statute that we presently have in the province. Here is a further objection that we feel on this side to the method by which the government is attempting to implement the reorganization of the school system. While they have made some pious pronouncements about changes in the separate school system, these have not been brought before the House in accompanying legislation, nor even brought before us in any statement of principle.

The separate school boards themselves have been concerned that their jurisdiction is cut short at the end of grade 8 or grade 10, even though most educators, including now the government authorities, accept the need for integration of the school system from kindergarten to grade 13.

In my view it should be quite in order for the Minister to indicate the principles that would permit the democratically elected separate school boards to have a continuing responsibility on the county boards, if these in fact come about, through a committee of the separate school board itself; and beyond this, to have statutory ability and power to name a committee of the separate school board which is democratically elected to have some responsibility, if the private Catholic secondary schools wish them to have it in the ordering and integration of the affairs and the curriculum in this area of private education.

I see no objection to this as long as it is put before the people concerned—the separate school supporters who elect the separate school boards, and beyond them those citizens who see fit to use the facilities of the private Catholic secondary schools. I see no reason why there could not be, among men of goodwill, and those people who are interested in the improvement of this system, some legislation that would permit this type of integration.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister, as his fourth principle, says that the bill would bring about direct election of those members of the county board that would have very great responsi-

bility indeed, not only to implement this new approach to the governance of education, but to direct their affairs in the future. We see that this could correct, in a sense, some of the present difficulties. The Minister is surely aware that many of the people across the province send their children to schools with which they have no direct democratic connection whatsoever.

There are many instances, particularly in the provision of secondary education, where townships buy their secondary education from an adjoining township which, in fact, has none for sale, and they in turn buy it from a nearby city. So there are at least two buffer boards in between the parents whose children are going to these schools, which may not even be very distant, as measured by miles, but in which they have no democratic interests or powers or rights whatsoever.

Believe me, we on this side, and I personally would favour any amendment which would do away with this difficulty and yet it remains in the bill that is before us. By inflexibly imposing county boundaries, the Minister and his advisers know full well that many students will be required to migrate across county boundaries, and there will be of course transfer payments involved in the provision of this education. But not transference of the democratic authority that could well have been achieved if the Minister, or the Premier, had not fixed themselves on the inflexible county boundaries, but in fact had brought before us a bill which could have rationalized the education communities that have developed in the past and which certainly will develop in the future.

The Minister has been quick to assure the citizens of the province that any convenient changes would be accomplished, but without redrawing the school division boundaries themselves. I would say that this is a serious shortcoming, that he is really not correcting the situation that has provided a considerable amount of difficulty in the past.

The last principle that the Minister brought to our attention on the introduction of the legislation had to do with the salutary effect of having separate tax bills. This, of course, is supported on this side of the House. It, too, was in our election programme as it was related to the recommendations of the Smith committee. We feel that this, if it does bring home directly to the citizens and taxpayers of the province their special responsibility for education, would be in the best interests of all concerned.

The real advantage is that when the government does accept our contention—and they will—that the costs of education must be borne to a far greater degree by the provincial treasury, then these direct billings will assure that the savings can in fact be passed on to the ratepayers and not be swallowed up in some other municipal responsibilities that should be financed entirely separately.

So I would say that these principles are good ones and they are principles which we support. There are two in addition, however, to the five that the Minister has mentioned that I want to deal with in concluding my remarks. The sixth one is the inflexibility of the approach taken by the government in the imposition of county boundaries. Surely if research had been done in any effective way, the Premier, before he had made his announcement, would have been very much aware of the fact that the counties, while they are sometimes regarded as reasonable units of administration, vary tremendously one from the other.

While 40 per cent to 50 per cent of them may, in fact, form viable units for the administration of education or other municipal responsibilities, many of them—probably half of them—bear little or no relationship to the education community that has grown up during the last 20 years. The boundaries that this bill imposes, in fact, disrupt the natural development of these communities to the detriment of community involvement in this important responsibility.

I know that my colleagues will want to put before the House, Mr. Speaker, some specific objections. But one that I believe is obvious to everyone lies in the county of Waterloo, which has grown tremendously in recent years and all the predictions indicate that it is going to be one of the major urban centres of the province. In that particular, it is estimated that there will be 40,000 students coming under one board. I ask you to compare this with some of the other less populous counties which will have jurisdiction over less than 5,000 students—as low as 3,000 in one case. In the particular case of Waterloo county we see that the populations of the major urban centres are as follows:

Kitchener—93,000; Galt—33,000; Waterloo—30,000; Preston—13,000; Hespeler—5,000. There are other organized centres that would fall into the urban population—with a rural population of about 25,000.

It seems incredible that the same statute which would meet the requirements, let us

say, in a county like Brant—which is more compact with only one major urban centre and another town of 6,000—would be required to apply to a county like Waterloo.

The inflexibility of the approach here is to be condemned and has been condemned by reasonable citizens across the province. Surely the government cannot persist in their view that the county boundaries must be imposed in all parts of Ontario, because I would say to you, sir, that it will not work effectively; it will not provide the community involvement that all of us look for in a modern system of educational jurisdiction.

There have been a number of reports, associated with the efficacy, or the need, for larger areas of school jurisdiction just as there have been many associated with regional government. There are several hon. members in the House who took part in the select committee on The Municipal Act and related Acts, chaired by the former member, Mr. Beckett. Their recommendations favoured the use of the county as a centre, a nucleus, for the provision of regional government.

This really was a compromise. Most of the submissions put to the committee called for regional government of the type that has been recommended since by the Royal commissioners involved in the Smith report. The Smith report took a more objective view of the needs of regional government and recommended boundaries which were not related to the county boundaries themselves. As a matter of fact I have a quote that I will take from the Smith report in a moment that indicates they felt that even using the counties as building blocks would really be a very difficult approach, since they would tend to maintain their primacy down through the years rather than being dissolved in an entirely new approach to regional responsibilities.

During the Galt speech of the Premier he indicated that the use of the counties for areas of education jurisdiction was in no way related to his thinking in regional government. I find it very difficult not to believe what he said, but to agree with what he said, because all of the experts in regional government have told us that regional government, to be workable, should have school jurisdictions with the same boundaries. The decision of the Premier has been that he is going to start out with larger areas of jurisdiction centering on the counties, and it cannot help but come to pass that when the government does find it politically possible to proceed with some means of regional government, he is going to light on those same boundaries based on his experience in the development of these school jurisdictions.

So the two must be related, and for that reason I could say to you, sir, that the inflexibility of the boundaries is going to be of poor service in the province of Ontario as we move into changes in local government some time during the next three or four years.

I would like to read an excerpt from the Smith report found on page 517 of volume 2, in which the Royal commissioners have reference to this particular matter. It is paragraph 65 and I quote directly from the report:

> The Beckett committee noted that the delineation of suitable regional boundaries would require careful study in which account was taken of a variety of pertinent conditions. They came to the conclusion also that Ontario cities and separated towns could not be excluded from the regional units of an effective regional government scheme. Yet, despite these reiterated points, the committee's recommendation suggested that as a practical start, the county in whole or in part, or with additions thereto, be adopted as the basic unit of regional government.
>
> Our concern is with the manner in which this dictum might be interpreted. We see the units that provide the practical start for regional government remaining as these units, with very little possibility of fundamental change if particular counties singly or in combination are given the status of regional units. Despite inadequate qualification from the balance criterion or any other standpoint, they are likely nevertheless to remain part of the system, and to detract from its effectiveness for as long as the regional government arrangement remains in being. We believe that before the lines are drawn the proper relationship of metropolitan and remaining regions must be worked out. It cannot be dealt in later.

I think this points up from the most recent studies that are at our disposal that the basis of the county unit will have some effectiveness in many areas of the province, but that it cannot be applied as a rigid rule of thumb in the imposition of the new boundaries that are found in the statute or the bill that is before us.

I think that one of the important points that was found in the comments that I just read from the Smith report is that these balances must be worked out, and this surely

involves the kind of consultation which in many ways is the seventh principle in this bill: That the government simply did not recognize and did not undertake to accomplish—before putting the bill before the Legislature and before the people of Ontario—a means of modernizing the grant system, except for the few crumbs of improvement that the Minister has thrown to the taxpayers in recent months, that would have made it possible to base the representations on the school board on something other than the basis of assessment that is found in Bill 44.

Surely it is reasonable that if we are going to involve people in the direction of a modern system of education, the basis of representation would far better be on a balance in population rather than assessment. The only reason the Minister and his advisers have been forced to take this other alternative was because of the high cost of education and the need to ensure representation across the board in the new county boundaries that they are imposing. If we had had a reform in the financing of our education responsibilities it would have been possible for the Minister to bring before us a bill that would have been based upon representation by population. If members look at the county of Waterloo, they will surely see that the urban-rural balance is eight to one, but in many of the counties—and the ones where the system will work probably with very few hitches—there is a balance, urban to rural, of closer to one to one, or in some cases two to one.

The development of representation by assessment would not have been entered into if the Minister had not imposed the inflexible county boundaries but had left some room to manoeuvre in the situations as exemplified by Waterloo county, or if he had given some more consideration to the better effects that representation by population would have had on the involvement of the community in education. So I believe that this is directly related to the lack of consultation that went into the development of the thinking and the decisions behind this bill.

I often am surprised that the Premier, in making the announcement, has been criticized for not even consulting directly with the Minister of Education. There have been those who have said that—

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Complete nonsense!

Mr. Nixon: —if his speech had not been so carefully prepared and printed in many thousands of copies, they would have thought he had made the decision in the back of his car on the way up to Galt that night. I guess the Minister was out of town. While the Minister will surely be able to state otherwise, there has been every indication that he was not prepared for the announcement and that it came as much as a surprise to him as it came as a surprise to the president of the teachers' federation. It came as a surprise to the chairman of the trustees boards across the province and certainly it came as a surprise to the electors of Ontario who had never heard the Premier mention it before in the weeks immediately preceding the election.

An hon. member: Was it a surprise?

Mr. Nixon: So, Mr. Speaker—

An hon. member: Does the Minister want to answer that?

Mr. Nixon: When we refer to the need for consultation, this is often a bone of contention with those interested in education. Nobody on this side says that you must get the approval of the trustees, that you must get the approval of the teachers or any other special interest group in education. But surely, the modern approach to far-reaching changes in education involves taking the experts into your confidence; to tell them what you have in mind for the year following; to find out what their views are and base your decision on what they have to say.

Of course, we accept the fact that this is responsible government and that you people sitting opposite are responsible for your decisions. But we believe your decisions would be better, that they would better fit into the needs of this province, if you would not simply confer with two or three unknown people and come out with a course of action upon which the straitjacket of politics is imposed in this House.

Your own members in the back benches, while they have objections that they are prepared to voice privately, will, of course, vote down the line to impose on the province this sort of an inflexible approach that is out of date and inadequate.

I am sure that the Minister and the Premier have received the objections from across the province that have come into my office. As a matter of fact, the objections that I receive are normally copies of the letters that have been sent to the Minister and the Premier, and these objections have been well documented and believe me they

have been very adequately and strongly put before all members of the Legislature.

They come not only from teachers, but from the presidents in the leading authorities and the professional organizations—trustees, board members—those people who have municipal responsibilities in townships and counties. Municipal resolutions have come in in large numbers. But there is a definite indication that the Minister and the Premier have not even consulted the $9 million Ontario institute for studies in education, in this regard.

Here is this great establishment that is supposed to be undertaking research into things educational, and still the Premier and one or two advisers take these far-reaching decisions without even that kind of consultation.

If the consultation is available to him, it is not available to anyone else interested in this particular matter, and if he has access to information that is not available to the standing committee on education or any member of the Legislature, then I believe that this situation is inadmissible. We should be apprised of the facts that are available to the government so that we can take part in these discussions in as effective and useful a way, as would be possible.

In the past, the Minister has shied away from the involvement of the members of the Legislature in the important decisions relating to his responsibility. He has heard me, on many previous occasions, being critical of his unwillingness to have the standing committee of the Legislature take part in these important discussions, or to even give some responsibilities to select committees having to do with education matters.

He obviously has no more confidence in the advice that he might get from the Legislature than his boss has in the advice he might get from the people of Ontario. He prefers to make these decisions on his own. If he imposes the partisan straitjacket that he counts on to maintain his position and he really destroys the democratic process as it is supposed to work in the province and in this House.

There is one further point on this consultation matter that I think is a serious one. We have been awaiting the report of the Royal commission on the aims and objectives in education in this province for many months. I believe it was about a year ago now that the Minister indicated that the Hall report might be available at the end of 1967, but we have not heard from him since.

This is another area where advice—the best possible advice—has been ignored. The Minister has not even received any advice from them. He should really have broadened the terms of reference if they are not already included in the terms of reference in this Royal commission, so that this particular body of people who have been hearing representations from top educators in this jurisdiction and elsewhere, would have an opportunity to give him an objective assessment of what would be in the best interests of changes in education.

So, our objections to the bill centre on two or three points. The first one is, the inflexibility of the Minister's position with regard to county boundaries. These obviously will not meet the needs across the board. They will not meet the needs of the people of Ontario from Ottawa through to Windsor and into the north. Beyond that, we are very wary of the basis of representation being associated with assessment rather than population. We believed that there would have been some other accommodation that would have improved the situation that the Minister has taken.

More important than anything else, we are prepared to condemn the government for not having entered into adequate and proper consultation before taking the decision that is inherent in the bill that is before us this afternoon. The Minister has got all of the facilities for consultation and as a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, these facilities remain even before we give the approval of this House or we make our decision on the principles in this bill this afternoon because there is ample precedent. You may well recall some of those precedents, Mr. Speaker.

When a bill, before it comes to second reading in this House and examination in principle, is introduced as this bill has been and then is sent to the standing committee for its close examination and for the hearing of the views of those people from across the province who would have some special right to be heard—either by reason of their elected position or by reason of their expert knowledge of the material contained in the bill—so, we on this side are providing the Minister and the government with a reasonable alternative, as is our responsibility in this regard.

With these things in mind, Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. member for

Downsview (Mr. Singer), that all the words after that be struck out, and the following substituted:

> Bill 44 be referred to the standing committee on education for its report so that those citizens across the province who have special knowledge and concerns in these matters will have a proper opportunity publicly to state their views to the committee in the presence of the Minister, his departmental advisors, as well as the members of the Legislature, before this House is asked to decide on the principles of the bill.

Mr. W. G. Pitman (Peterborough): Mr. Speaker, if I might comment very briefly on the amendment which has just been placed before this House. I think that it is a general feeling that the Minister has already indicated his willingness, in fact his desire, to bring this matter before the education committee. Although we would certainly support this amendment, I do not think that the amendment will have very much cutting edge so far as the debate is concerned this afternoon.

In rising to make a comment on this legislation one feels oneself in somewhat of an ambivalent position. I think most of us, on both sides of the House, have been involved in the implications of this piece of legislation for many weeks. Indeed, we have been, I would hope and I would expect, on both sides of the House, dealing with township councils and county councils and boards of education, and seeking to provide information—and sometimes with the greatest of difficulty—and also trying, I think, strangely enough, to bring forward the results of this legislation. I think that the Minister has every reason to believe that this legislation will be helped on by the members of this House, that we will do the best we can to see that there is the least amount of abrasion and the least amount of confusion possible in the implementation of the larger units of administration.

Now, I want to make an opening comment, because the comments which I make from this point on will be of a critical nature. In the long run, all of us on both sides of this House will be concerned with the best possible system of education for every young person in this province, and I think this should be recognized on all sides of this House.

There is a feeling abroad in the world of politics, Mr. Speaker, that the end always justifies the means. I think this is a distortion, an untruth, and one which has to be sorted out in a Legislature such as the one we sit in today, because the end never justifies the means. The means is always related to that end.

The means, indeed, can distort and undermine the end, and this, I suggest, is what has happened in this particular piece of legislation here this afternoon. Why, Mr. Speaker, have we been bringing in this legislation in this back-stairs, back-hand kind of way? Why was it not laid before the people of Ontario in an election campaign which, sir, I assure you, lasted from June to October in the past year? There were weeks and weeks when this could have been brought to the people of Ontario and they could have made their choice. Instead, the Premier of the province decided that he would bring it forth in the festivities associated with the opening of an addition to the secondary school in Galt. Then the people of Ontario heard about it in the morning paper.

It is this legislation by *Globe and Mail*, I think, that people do get a little bit tired of in this province. One is reminded of the way in which what has been called the Robarts plan, and is now called the reorganized programme, was brought in, in very much the same way. Then the teachers and the trustees and everyone else were asked to get behind the movement when they were presented with this *fait accompli*.

It is this presentation of a *fait accompli*, I think, which has worried and concerned the people of this province. I think they have every reason to feel this way, because I suggest to you that we are going to pay for this. This government is going to pay for this, because one of the things which I think is obsessing this Legislature and this government, is the whole question of regional government. Over the next number of years this government is going to be going, month after month, and year after year, to the township councils and to the county councils and to the various municipal governments of this province and asking them for co-operation—asking them for a means by which they can reorganize the whole municipal system.

Surely, if the Smith report says anything, it says this. I do not know, and I am sure the leader of the Opposition does not know and for sure the government does not know, what this region is going to be, or what kind of regional government we are going to have. But I am sure that we will pay a very heavy price by the way in which we have gone about

bringing forth this important piece of legislation—one of the most important pieces of legislation, the Minister has assured us and we are ready to agree, that this province has seen.

We are going to pay and we are going to pay heavily, because we are just wondering, you know, if the Premier is going to announce the regional government organization at the opening of some city hall in some obscure corner of the province at some future date, instead of the kind of openness, candour and negotiation and dialogue that can be one of the most heavily and obviously important aspects of a democratic government in a province such as ours.

But instead, the Premier announces it just a few weeks after an election, after a long campaign. We look in vain to the Minister for previous elucidation. I read over a very long and a very detailed and a very excellent account of all the things that The Department of Education was doing in the estimates of last session. I think that one could, indeed, regard this document as a definitive one of all of the activities going on in the Minister's department, and in one of his announcements to this House, Mr. Speaker, he indicated that for the last two years his department had been preparing for this piece of legislation. Yet how much is there in that account of the direction in which we are going?

In reply to a question a few weeks ago, the Minister indicated that really the trustees knew that the larger units were coming and they were prepared for them. Well, from the howls that we have received from every corner of the province, the message has not gotten across and I think that communication, in the past, has not been one of the strong points of the Minister and I would suggest, in this particular case, that communication was not only lacking, it was non-existent.

We have, I think, just two small paragraphs in that long 115-page document which covers many pages in the *Hansard* record of May 17, 1967. In these two paragraphs there is a very indifferent reference to the fact that The Department of Education is looking into the advantages of larger units. I suggest to the Minister and to the Premier, particularly, that we will pay. We will pay heavily because of the lack of communication which has gone on in this province in bringing forth this piece of legislation.

We are all agreed on the ends. The leader of the Opposition has indicated what these ends were, these five guiding principles which the Minister has outlined in his announcement of the legislation. All of us, on all sides of the House, would want to see an educational system which would provide equality of educational opportunity. I would suggest that we have gone a long way and I am sure that the Minister will probably agree on this. The foundation plan has attempted to bring up the level of educational opportunity in some of the areas which have less assessment and less opportunity and where the facilities were not equal to those in urban areas. We have not been able to bring equality yet, obviously, but I think if one goes across the countryside of Ontario—and I want to suggest to you that the foundation plan originated in this corner of the House, Mr. Speaker. It was brought forward into this Legislature and, further, I want to suggest to you, too, Mr. Speaker, that the foundation plan on municipal financing recently presented by our leader will also come about in very much the same sort of way, and they also originated in this corner of the House.

As I have said, as one goes across the province one can see district secondary schools replacing the small, inadequate, secondary schools which existed in the 1940s and 1930s. One sees very few one-room elementary schools, we have gone a long way toward this equality of educational opportunity.

I want to suggest to you, sir, that this piece of legislation in itself is not going to solve the problem. There is nothing in this piece of legislation which deals with the main difficulty. One only has to read any newspaper in this province and see the agonizing that is going on in every school board and in every board of education in every part of this province. In Metropolitan Toronto, with all of its wealth and industrial expansion, or if it is a smaller city like St. Catharines, or Peterborough or Brantford, or if it is a rural area, then you have a township board attempting to find the resources to support the one or two schools within that jurisdiction.

No matter where you go, you see only one problem, the fact that the educational needs of this province cannot be supported by the property tax of a municipality. There is only one way that we can provide equality of educational opportunity. I hope that before this debate is concluded, the Minister will rise and graciously indicate to the House that a new plan has been arrived at and these new large administrative units will receive a higher degree of grants from the province and these will go up 5 per cent, perhaps, each year, to the point where they finally reach

the needed amount, the 80 per cent, which this party has already indicated to be a sensible amount on which the province of Ontario can be expected to support education.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Pitman: Mr. Speaker, if I might be alowed to carry on while members are discussing the originality of this proposal—

Hon. A. F. Lawrence (Minister of Mines): What corner of the House actually did it?

Mr. Pitman: No corner of the House has actually done it—but you have the responsibility. This is the very problem we are faced with at the present moment. We are still trying to operate an educational system on a horse and buggy financial system and we will not get equality of opportunity until this business is solved.

I know, for example, that in my own community of Peterborough, the board had to cancel a programme of computer education simply because they could not find any way of paying the amount of money which would be necessary to operate the educational system and include that kind of a programme. This is the kind of a programme which I am sure the Minister would assure this House is the type of education needed for young people who are going out into the modern world today. But this problem will not be solved by this piece of legislation, sir.

He has suggested really only one thing; that this legislation will provide financial stability and predictability. In other words, what he is suggesting is that we are going to take the impoverished resources of the rural society and try to secure the resources from the impoverished urban society.

I would suggest to you, sir, that what you may very well find is that there will be a lessening of services, unless this government is ready to place the kind of flexible resources which this government has at its disposal. In spite of what the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. MacNaughton) told us some weeks ago about the inflexibility of his resources, they are nothing compared to the inflexibility of the resources of the municipalities as every member in this House realizes.

I suggest to you one way in which we can secure equality, as the Minister has suggested, is by equality of special services and he has identified special services—the need for greater psychological and psychiatric services, obviously the need for providing services to those who have learning difficulties, and, of course, the special courses and opportunities which have not normally in the past been regarded as the fare of the student in Ontario.

How does this legislation provide for special services in these outlying areas? Well, Mr. Speaker, it certainly is not provided through this legislation. The Deputy Minister of Education, when he was speaking to a group of people some weeks ago, told a harrowing story, an extremely poignant story, of going to a school in an outlying area and finding a young boy lying on the floor in the hall and kicking the door. When he asked the teacher what the situation was in relation to this lad, the answer was, "He is emotionally disturbed. I cannot do anything with him. He disrupts the entire class. There are not enough people in this area to provide for a class of emotionally disturbed children or to provide psychological, psychiatric services; what do I do?"

I suggest to you, sir, that this legislation will not provide a class in a rural area. The problem is that it is rural and unless there are going to be substantial and generous grants for special services under these circumstances, then these types of services will not be able to be provided in that kind of a setting, unless—and I am sure the Minister would not suggest this as the proper solution of a problem such as this kind of special service—they are going to transport emotionally disturbed children, or those with learning difficulties, right into the larger centres. The problem is that in the sparsely settled parts of this province it will demand a massive infusion of resources from the province if we are going to provide those kinds of special services.

One would also think, Mr. Speaker, that the province has been dragging the various communities along by the scruff of the neck to provide these special services and I think this is a distortion of the truth. I suggest to you it is a very real distortion. For example, one of the things that the Prime Minister has made a great deal of in this session, and rightly so, is the fact that Ontario is providing itself with the means of becoming a bilingual province, although he drew back a little bit from that phrase.

One community, the community of Peterborough has attempted to provide French in the elementary schools. Now most of the experts in language would indicate that young people can especially learn language facility at an early age. They can learn to speak a language even if they may not be able to learn very well the grammar and the writing of the language. And so with this kind of

information and this kind of impetus, some years ago, before the Confederation year brought about so much emphasis, this community decided to give French teaching at the elementary level. Are there grants for this? No, there are no grants for this. The community has to pay 100 per cent of providing that kind of special service.

Hon. Mr. Davis: They do not pay 100 per cent.

Mr. Pitman: For that special service they do. The Minister is quite right. I am not moving in on all the other costs which are involved in this.

Mr. P. J. Yakabuski (Renfrew South): The member is just kind of twisting it.

Mr. Pitman: Not so far as that particular special service is concerned, I think the Minister would agree that they are paying the full extra cost of providing that kind of service. The Minister agrees with me.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The member agrees with me, so we agree together.

Mr. Pitman: We agree together. All right. Now as I said, there is a great possibility that we may even lose out on special services as we move to larger areas. For example, since 1965, since the development of the township areas, I would suspect there may even have been a loss in the number of psychologists and psychiatrists who have been involved in the school system in Ontario. I would suspect there might have even been a loss since that era, so the enlarging of units of administration does not naturally—not necessarily—mean there will be an extension of special services in any way.

Mr. Speaker, one of the other ends and the other guiding principles which the Minister brought to the attention of the House when he introduced this piece of legislation was the hope and the expectation that the larger unit would provide for the continuous and integrated process which should go on between kindergarten and grade 13. Sir, I think that all of us in this House would agree, as the leader of the Opposition has pointed out, there have been some very real doubts expressed in this House and outside this House about the chopping up of the investigations, not only in their relation to teacher training but also in relation to the committee on youth, the committee on the Hall commission —the fact that the proposed commission on post-secondary school education does not seem to be going down in the secondary schools. We have been concerned about the studies which have tended to chop up the educational process. But one would have to admit that the emphasis has been—within The Department of Education, certainly over the past number of years—towards seeing education as a continuing process.

But I suggest to him that this piece of legislation will not solve that problem. I have had the privilege of working in a number of jurisdictions in this province in the secondary schools. I have worked in jurisdictions in which the board of education has control over both the elementary and the secondary school. I have worked in jurisdictions where, in the beginning they controlled the secondary schools and took over the elementary schools. I have worked in a jurisdiction in which the board controlled only the secondary school, and I would suggest to you, sir, that it matters not, this will not solve that problem. It is solved by other solutions which are largely in the hands of the administration of the secondary and the elementary schools—namely, the individual boards who control these systems—and this legislation will not be a solution although it can be a united means to that end.

The other guiding principle which the Minister brought forward is the fact that through this legislation—and I would suggest to the members that we would not need this legislation in order to secure this principle—the fiscal responsibility will become obvious and a county or municipal council will not find themselves in the situation of having to impose taxes for educational purposes and find themselves being berated and being belaboured by the electorate where they had absolutely no control over these taxes.

I am sure the member for St. Catharines (Mr. R. M. Johnston) would indicate his concern over this matter, as someone who has been involved in municipal politics for some time. It seems to me, sir, that this is not something which needs this legislation; it can be done immediately, and it can be done simply through the proposal which has been put forward that bills will be sent out indicating the cost of education as against the cost of other municipal services.

What I hope will happen, Mr. Speaker, is this, that when the people of this province see those bills and see how outrageous it is that the cost of education should be placed on property in 1968, they will rise in wrath against the government which has been so backward in continuing this kind of financ-

ing for education services in the province. In the 1860s, Mr. Speaker, it may well have been a very good reason for placing educational costs on property. After all, education at that time was a log cabin on the concession road and the resources of the community could support that kind of an educational service.

But to suggest that in 1968 we should be supporting an educational system of tremendous expense, of tremendous sophistication, with all the needs which the Minister himself has indicated is absurd. One found oneself quaking at the financial collapse of the entire province as suggested by the Minister just a few weeks ago.

Mr. Nixon: What was he trying to do there, anyway?

Hon. Mr. Davis: He did not really suggest that.

Mr. Pitman: In view of the comments that were made in a well-known Toronto paper—

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Your communication was bad again, because you certainly scared everybody.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): It slipped badly in the last several months.

Mr. Pitman: But nonetheless I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the result of this very action may very well bring about all the needed—at least some of the needed—reforms in the area of taxation throughout this province.

Now we come, Mr. Speaker, to what is perhaps the most absurd aspect of this piece of legislation, and that is the use of the county unit. A few weeks ago I made a contribution to the Throne debate which, on reading *Hansard*, seemed perhaps a little harsh; perhaps I exaggerated to some extent the lack of involvement and perhaps the lack of appreciation and understanding of this government in the whole complex area of regional government.

However, apparently, Mr. Speaker, I understand the case completely. I find that in my efforts to try to explain to myself what was meant by the Premier's design for development and his blueprint for development that really I had given him a degree of, you might say, sophistication in this area which does not exist at all. I was reading just a few days ago a speech which was given by the Provincial Treasurer in his new role as the man who is now Minister of Regional Development in this province; he could not have described in more disparaging terms the record of this government in the area of regional government.

You may wonder, Mr. Speaker, why I am bringing up regional government, but I suggest that the difficulties of the Minister of Education in this area cannot be divided from the chaos of this government in relation to regional government. They do not know where they are going and they have thrown the Minister of Education into the sad and pathetic position of having to try to create a reformed system of education when he has not a clue as to where the rest of the government is going.

Mr. MacDonald: Did the Minister nod his head affirmatively?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I always know where I am going.

Mr. Pitman: I want to read to you the remarks—

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): What did Lin Piao have to say?

Mr. Pitman: Mr. Speaker, this is a speech by the hon. Provincial Treasurer—I do not think he was able to make the speech, but I think he would still take responsibility for it. This is his description. And I think it is an excellent description of regional development in Ontario:

> Our programme for regional development, then, cannot be a series of cobwebs spun across Ontario to catch flies aimlessly drifting into the four corners of the province.

An hon. member: Isn't that poetic?

Mr. Pitman: I could not have found a better description.

Mr. MacDonald: I do not know who the scriptwriter is.

Mr. Pitman: To continue:

> We cannot wait like spiders hoping for prey to flit into our trap and provide us with sustenance and well being wherever we may live.

Mr. Sopha: No wonder he did not give this speech. Where was it made?

Mr. Pitman: It was made by an assistant to the Minister; he had to be here in the House.

Mr. MacDonald: It was in his name.

Mr. Pitman: Mr. Speaker, I am quoting here:

> To be effective, our regional development programme must be alive to economic, social and technological trends which dictate and provide our future opportunity.

Mr. MacDonald: There is the beginning of wisdom.

Mr. Pitman: There is a sort of "our future is before us" kind of statement.

> We must be fully aware of the kind and shape of development which is taking place. We must have a solid base of information about the forces which are dictating the changes in our communities. Then we must develop our plan.

I do not know if he is making this speech to the Premier or to his own government, or who he is making it to.

> We must develop our plans to serve and complement these changes, adapt them to our resources, modify them to the needs and desires of our people.

Now, listen to this, Mr. Speaker, I quote again:

> In short, instead of flimsy cobwebs wafting in a breeze of hope—

What a wonderful description of this plan.

Mr. Nixon: We have had that for ten years.

Mr. Pitman: To continue quoting:

> —we need a firm framework of plans.

"We need"—I thought we had a firm framework of plans.

Mr. MacDonald: We have had four versions of them every year.

Mr. Pitman: And now the Minister says we need a framework of plans directed at maximum development.

Finally, he got around to what he was proposing and this is what we found out. "But where do we go from here," he asks. "Where do we go from here?"

Mr. Sopha: Sort of a plaintive cry in the night.

Mr. MacDonald: Turn on the light; we are still in the dark.

Mr. Pitman: Quoting:

> Now we must put together the nuts and bolts of the programme. The provincial government cannot do this job alone, neither can the regional development council.

This speech, incidentally, Mr. Speaker, was made to regional development councils.

> We must work together and we must start now.

What has been going on the past four years? We must start now. And then what was the answer of the Provincial Treasurer? May I suggest that he at least is doing exactly what the leader of the Opposition is suggesting—he is taking into his confidence the people of Ontario and what does he say? He turns to these councils and says, "We want you to tell us what you think the regional development programme is. You tell us."

Mr. MacDonald: Turn on the light. We are in the dark.

Mr. Pitman: That, perhaps, is not a flattering description of the Minister's speech.

Mr. MacDonald: Whoever the Minister's writer is he should be fired because his political antennae are pretty dull.

Mr. Pitman: I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this is the chaos in which the Minister of Education finds himself.

Mr. Sopha: Is that tendered for a Pultizer prize?

An hon. member: The Stephen Leacock award.

Mr. Pitman: Mr. Speaker, I think this bill deserves a great deal more seriousness than it is receiving at the present moment. I would suggest to you that certainly the trustees of this province in their initial reaction to this piece of legislation could only be described as thoroughly outraged. I do not want to quote all the petitions which the Minister received but perhaps one or two of them would indicate the truth of that statement. From the Ontario school trustees and municipal councils association:

> This association, therefore, makes strong representation to the Prime Minister of Ontario regretting any arbitrary establishment of county boards of education and requests the opportunity of consultation with and representation to the Prime Minister and Minister of Education before any final legislation is prepared.

This consultation did take place and, of course, most of these trustees and organizations have now fallen into line.

One might say why—why would they fall into line? One can only look back into history. The way one does this is to provide no alternative. There is not any alternative. What did Napoleon do when he wanted to become emperor of France? He said, "You have one choice—you make me emperor or chaos." And naturally 98 per cent voted him to be emperor. This is the ploy of any government which wants to get legislation through—provide no alternative.

Secondly, the Ontario urban and rural school teachers association acknowledges "the need for large areas of school administration" —as everyone in this House would acknowledge—"but has serious misgivings about defining areas exclusively along county boundaries, especially as applied to southern Ontario. Our investigation leads us to believe that further study is required before legislation is presented to the House."

Those are only two trustees organizations. The Ontario teachers' federation takes very much the same line. I am quoting Miss Nora Hodgins, the Ontario teachers' federation secretary-treasurer: "Among counties there is a great disparity in size, population, and numbers of pupils and schools." Miss Hodgins says:

> That detailed studies by both government and private authorities indicate that present county organizations are not adequate for either managing municipal or school board affairs. Counties such as Hastings, Leeds, Waterloo—to name but three—do not have the components necessary to organize the board of education for each of these areas.

I know that the Minister has heard these comments before, and I am not going to belabour him with these points, but surely if that county system in which Haliburton county has 2,000 students, Halton county has 46,000 students, and Lennox-Addington has 7,000 students and Peel with its 50,000 students, and has Prince Edward with 5,000 students and Simcoe has 43,000. How can all of these be adequate in the administration of education of this province? To suggest this is to suggest the absurd. It is to ask us to accept the completely irrational and the unreasonable. Look at the disparity in the average assessment per student to see if this system has any kind of financial rationality. Lambton county has an average assessment for students of $9,600; Renfrew, $2,750. In Ontario county the average assessment per student is $9,000. In Russell, $3,200. How can this House be expected to regard the county unit as an acceptable educational unit, when these disparities exist? To say nothing of the disparities in size, and in contour.

I advise you to look at the counties in eastern Ontario, which are very long and thin. How can you effectively administer education in that kind of a geographical entity? The population distribution, geography, all of these things demand, I suggest to you, another look at this matter. I was heartened by the fact that in a recent interview the Minister of Education indicated that there was some softening in his approach to this matter—that he could see the possibility that in certain areas there might not be a necessity to have a one board over the entire county—that there might be another arrangement worked out. What I suggest to you is that this surely must be looked into in our education committee. This is why we would support the amendment. We would support it very strongly. Also, we would support the Minister of Education if he is willing to bring this matter before the education committee of this House.

I would say this to you, in that there are a few other matters which I would like to bring before the Legislature at this point. A number of other matters such as election procedures which are very detailed and will, of necessity, have to be discussed in the further discussion in the House, and also in the committee.

One cannot help but wonder why the county organization was forced in this way. Why could there not have been a phasing of this development? Why was it that we had to do it in a few short months? Why do we have to make such a tremendous blind leap forward? For example, in some counties, there is no county board even looking after the elementary school system. I speak with some concern about this. I am rather proud to say that I represent a community which has moved ahead perhaps faster than any other county in this province, in this one area—in the fact that it is provided a county board. It was the first in the province to provide a county board to look after elementary school education in the county of Peterborough. I would agree with the Minister that this has been a step forward, that this has, indeed, provided better facilities, more experienced teachers. It also, I suggest to you, indicated a need for very special educational practices in rural areas.

I will give you just one or two examples of this. Many of you will, of course, realize

that one of the ways that young people are put at a disadvantage is the fact that most rural schools are unable to provide kindergarten. They are unable to provide orientation, before they enter into the elementary school system. You must realize that in a rural area that this is because it is very hard to bring young people into a school for half a day; the amount of bussing and the amount of cost for this transportation makes it impossible. In this particular rural area they have brought young children in for a full day for a shorter period of time.

That is their reaction to a problem.

One of the things that they are not afraid of is that the larger units will destroy the special methods that they have found for dealing with education in a rural setting and these larger units will destroy these very exciting prospects.

Another example is the provision of senior and junior schools for different grades of youngsters, because of the need to gather them into special facilities in the rural setting. They have provided excellent facilities in many of these areas. And for that reason, they wonder, if it is going to be so difficult for this county, which has gone so far towards the large unit of educational administration, then how much more difficult is it going to be for those counties which still are involved with township boards of education?

Here they are going to have to leap, not just from a township board, or a whole mass of township boards, to a county board looking after elementary education. They are going to have to make the leap all the way to a board of education looking after elementary, secondary, and all the other special services for special educational needs that the Minister has indicated may very well be put into such jurisdictions—such as retarded children—into the larger units of educational administration.

What I am suggesting to the House is this. I wonder why there could not have been a phasing, so that by, let us say, the end of 1970, all the areas of southern Ontario would have had to create a county board of elementary education. By 1974, they would have had to have a county board for elementary and secondary schools. Then, if necessary—if it is a matter of bringing a city and an urban area together—by 1976 or 1977, why could it not have been phased with continuous negotiation throughout, with an openness and a candour which would, I think, have been more acceptable to the people of this area? I am saying something that I am sure that the Minister will appreciate.

The educational system of this province rests entirely on the efforts of the goodwill and the time of the countless thousands of people, who have donated that time, and who have made magnificent sacrifices. I suggest to you to treat these people in the manner which it has over the last few weeks has been extremely unfortunate.

A moment ago, I mentioned the whole problem of the ends and the means. I am sorry to see the end being destroyed by the means because education, in a way that no other area of government depends, depends upon morale. I would suggest to you that it may not mean very much to the building of a highway whether the people in The Department of Highways are really terribly confident that there are continuing negotiations and dialogue and openness, and so on. But it is extremely important in the school system, because the education of every single individual student is dependent on the morale of the teacher who stands at the front of that class, on the morale of the administrator who is affecting that teacher, and on the morale of the trustees whose decisions are affecting every one of the teachers and every one of those students.

This is why I suggest to you that there is a distortion of the ways and means. I would suggest to you that there has been a distinct lowering of morale as a result of the way that this has been done. I hope that the Minister is able to rectify the situation. I am sure that with the necessary grants, and I am sure that with the use of his prestige and his popularity, and with his ability at communication, that it can be rectified, and I hope that it will, Mr. Speaker.

What I am suggesting is that it need not have happened. I cannot see why this could not have been done in an organized and orderly way. I would suggest that while we were doing it we would have found the administrative unit that would have, perhaps, been the most effective one, rather than being hamstrung by a county system which obviously does not look after the education needs of the province, and obviously is not appropriate. The Prime Minister himself said that the choosing of the county unit for education did not indicate that regional development was going to be on the basis of counties, although one has to be rather suspicious of that, in view of some of the other things that

have happened in other departments. But we would not, I suggest, have undermined some of the other areas of our activity if we had gone about it in this way.

Perhaps the greatest fear of the people of this province is one that, I am sure, every member of this House has left, and that is this —that somehow or other, the people in the province feel that they are losing contact, losing control of their educational system. I think that most of the studies in both the United States and Canada would indicate that this does not necessarily have to happen. It is not necessary. I would hope that along with this legislation, Mr. Speaker, there will be something exciting happen within The Department of Education which will encourage parents—and not just parents, those who are associated with the school simply by being where the school happens to be—that is, the community at large, will see the individual schools as the contact point for the education system of this province. I would hope that by every means at his disposal, the Minister will make every effort to shore up and give purpose to every kind of association. I am thinking of home and school associations—parent-teacher associations in the separate schools. This should be a part of this bill. I hope that the Minister will do everything in his power to see these as working aspects of our educational system—not dealing with the periphery of education, but dealing with the very basic information and decision about curriculum and about the administration of schools. Indeed, each school will, in a way which has never been true before, become a centre of educational activity and inspiration in every community.

This organization of larger units in a sense provides the first real break in tradition. In a way that is not true, because we have been moving towards more and more larger units over the past number of years and one cannot help wondering why this transition had not been allowed to continue. But as I state, this is a very great leap forward and I hope that it will be accompanied by that kind of development at the local level.

To come back to my view regarding the phasing of education. I cannot see why we were not able to find a better system of representation. The leader of the Opposition has indicated the need for representation by population. Now, this is the representation which exists in many other aspects of the relationship of urban areas and rural areas; the administration of justice, the administration of health units, conservation authorities, children's aid societies. All this is supported on a basis of representation by population. One cannot help wondering why, except because of the incongruous nature of the county system, we have to turn to this form of representation by assessment restricted to residential and agricultural.

You get into a situation such as, if I might use an example, in the city of Peterborough. I know the Minister has received a copy of this document, but I am using this only as an example of the difficulties that they get into because we are hung up on this particular form of educational jurisdiction.

You have this kind of a situation, for example, in trying to bring the county and the city together. In the city of Peterborough you have 69 per cent of the total population and the county has 31 per cent of the total population, but each has the same number of members on the board of education.

I know that the Minister is going to say that, for obvious reasons the rural areas need a greater degree of representation. But I would suggest to him that with phasing, along with a continuing policy of equalization of the facilities in the rural areas to a more comparable level in the urban areas, you might very well have found a situation where population differences would not have made that much difference—would not have made that much difference in terms of the representation system.

When you turn to assessment, the city of Peterborough, of course, pays 71 per cent of the taxes and the county pays 29 per cent, including of course, the industrial assessment. I realize that once again the Minister is going to say it is not fair to use industrial assessment because the people in the county are working in the city, contributing to the production of the city and then the rural areas have to provide the training for the children of those same people.

This is all very true to a degree, but it would seem to me that we could have found a more sensible unit. We could have found a more effective way of representing both rural and urban areas. We could have assured the province that these special services would have been increased if we had phased and if we had found an orderly way of going about this matter with openness and candour.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I want to discuss the price. For every step of progress there is a price to be paid, and very often the price is a rather high one. And one of the things I am sure must bother the Minister—must

concern him—is the fact that because of this development a great many people who work in his department have found themselves with a different future as a result. These for example are inspectors who now find that their roles are very seriously changed. In fact, in some cases phased out completely.

The Minister is also faced with a great many teachers who are very concerned about how they are going to fit into the larger unit; what kind of assurance they have that the home that they bought in this particular part of the educational jurisdiction will not be a millstone around their necks as they are required to teach in some far-flung part of the large administrative unit. I am sure he is concerned about how he is going to get good teachers to go out in the rural areas, even though these rural areas are now associated in a larger unit or associated with an urban centre which provides, as he puts it, more stable and predictable tax sources.

So, I suggest sir, that this phasing and this effort to secure a more viable unit would have provided a less callous way of dealing with all these men.

The Minister may very well say that there are new opportunities, but for men who have placed their futures in the hands of this department—I am sure the Minister would say that the success of his department depends very heavily upon that kind of loyalty; some of you might say, excessive loyalty which these men have for the present Minister of Education—I think it is unfortunate, I think it is tragic.

I think it is almost cruel that some of these men have had their services distorted as a result of this development.

There is a price in progress, but I suggest to you, in this case, in the case of some of these people, the price is too high.

The role of the Opposition in a matter such as this is not to oppose, but, I think, to criticize. I think it is to refine, it is to improve in the hope of lessening the injustice in such a measure of progress. I hope it is to increase the sensitivity of this government, and may I say that that alone will be he position which this group will take during the discussion of this particular bill.

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): Mr. Speaker, it has become obvious that no announcement made by the government has had such far-reaching results and was made with such little forethought as that made by the hon. Premier of Ontario last November in Galt. When the impact of this announcement was realized by the people of Ontario, there was a great clamouring for details of the county school boards system. In spite of the countless letters and briefs and delegations here to Queen's Park, it soon became obvious that very little previous thought had been given to the instigation of this new concept of one board per county.

Time after time, Mr. Speaker, I have been asked by school trustees, members of teachers' federations, school administrators, municipal councillors and others—can the department give me one instance where, except in vague and general terms, any group had been consulted or asked for opinion before the announcement was made. I think not.

Consider the concern of teachers, administrators and school trustees and municipalities from last November until early this spring while they sat and waited for a white paper to be issued on this important subject. Had there been proper consultation and direct confrontations with these groups I am sure much of our problem would have been eliminated, at least alleviated.

My files are bulging as are the files of the hon. member from Peterborough, with letters and briefs expressing concern of how this bill will affect the people of Ontario and their children. Much has been said about the startling manner in which this announcement was thrust on the people and I, in good conscience, must add my support to those who have been critical of the dictatorial aspects of the method of introduction, and also to certain parts of the bill itself.

I realize when the announcement was first made there was a sudden reaction from certain school boards whose attitude seemed to be—well we are the voice of education in this county so we will get on the ground floor and perhaps we can steer and run things as we see fit. This attitude, I am glad to say, has largely disappeared, and many school board members now see the bill for what it really is, a rigid inflexible document, designed to pour all counties into the same mould and ride herd on any dissenters.

As one who has attended meetings here in Queen's Park as well as in the riding where large numbers of trustees and councillors—125 in one case and over 500 in the other—met to voice their objections, I believe that a great many of the objections could have been overcome by a proper consultation and a working out of differences with the boards in a reasonable time before and after the original announcement.

This government has no one to blame but itself, if in the period from last fall to this spring, with no information forthcoming, feelings began to run high. Doubts and uncertainties, along with fears for the future, overtook many of the teachers, school trustees and parents in certain areas of our province.

Mr. Speaker, larger areas of administration are accepted by many and we can see benefits from this thinking. On that principle, I must support this bill, but I cannot support its imposition on a rigid basis. People with special cases must be heard.

The suggestion as presented by our caucus is reasonable. There are many persons with years of experience in education, many qualified educators, many trustees who deserve a better treatment. We in the committee on education and in this Legislature must give every opportunity for these people to be heard and their views evaluated. Mr. Speaker, there must be some measure of flexibility incorporated into this bill. Valid objections have been put forward and proper consideration must be given.

Specifically, Mr. Speaker, I feel the Waterloo county area is not well suited to single county boards. On the basis of projected population increase over the next few years, it will be expedient to designate the cities of Kitchener and Waterloo, the township of Waterloo and the village of Bridgeport as a separate board of education. Documented evidence and briefs have been presented to the Minister in this regard and I am sure he will take them into due consideration.

I believe also that there are perhaps four or five other areas in the province which fall into this category. Surely, Mr. Speaker, no proposed legislation should be so rigid as to preclude the accommodation of exceptional circumstances.

I would like to refer momentarily to the meeting held in Tavistock at which over 500 people appeared to meet with the Minister and discuss their objections to this bill. I will read just from one letter received after the meeting. This gentleman refers to the fact that:

> The purpose of my letter today is to recall to mind the answer that Mr. Davis gave to my question. For your information, my question was: "Since you state, Mr. Davis, there will be no separation between rural and urban education, how do you explain the case of Middlesex county where the city of London is separated from the rest of the county?"

The answer, as quoted in this letter by the hon. Minister of Education:

> The balance of the county is still sufficiently large for the proposed system.

Now Mr. Speaker, we have, I am sure, in many counties documented proof to show that there are reasonably large areas left to administer, whether there be two or three divisions of school boards in the county.

In my own county of Waterloo it has been worked out that a separated board of education for the cities of Kitchener and Waterloo with the township and Bridgeport, which would accommodate 25,000 public school children and secondary schools, would still leave a county board with 18,000 pupils, twice that of the remaining portion of Middlesex.

Even a division of the county into three boards, would leave school systems of 25,000, 12,000 and over 6,000 respectively. The division of boards can be made both rural and urban. There may be an objection by the hon. Minister that this does not work well, but I would have to disagree in the case of Waterloo county. I do feel that our rural boards have worked well in Waterloo county. I think they have done an exceptionally fine job. However, to accommodate this objection, the members of the committees working on this have worked out divisions where rural and urban representations are made on either the two- or three-board concept.

Now, along with this matter of rigidity there is another matter. I believe that provisions of this bill have also failed to realize that one of the basic problems of education in Ontario is that of financing. The cost of education against the property owner on the local level is far too great. No longer is a man's house the basis of his ability to pay. New and improved methods must be worked out to relieve the crushing burden from real estate. The only reasonable solution is for the provincial tax base to assume a larger share of the cost of education.

This proposition has been put forward by this side of the House for some time, and I am glad to relate that while the government has not indicated they will increase the grants to education to assume up to 80 per cent of the cost, they are beginning to see the inequalities that exist in educational finance under the present system.

I must congratulate the grants division of The Department of Education for finally realizing that the figuring of the provincial equalization factor in the Kitchener-Waterloo area has caused a tremendous hardship. The reduction of grants that would have been effective amount to hundreds of thousands of dollars. This was brought about by a reduction in equalization factor, which in turn was related to market values of houses in our community.

Now, I do admit to the need for equalization across the province, and I think that is good. But when the housing shortage, as was the case in our area, causes fluctuation in the equalization factor so great as to affect the size of grant by hundreds of thousands of dollars, then I do believe that the system is badly in need of a complete overhaul.

I am pleased that by our action and the co-operation of the grants division, we will be permitted to use either the 1967 or the 1968 equalization factor, whichever is the more advantageous.

In recognition of this alarming situation by the grants division of The Department of Education and the action of the government in this regard, I hope that this will point out the absolute necessity to expand this bill to include a better and more equitable system of financing our education system in Ontario.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Mr. Speaker, with your permission, sir, I would like to make a few observations on second reading of this bill. I hope that I will not be repetitious to any extent, although I realize there are areas which will overlap and if I do repeat, it is just in the form of underlining some of the basic points which have already been dealt with by a number of speakers.

On November 14 of last year, the Premier announced in Galt that he was going to consolidate the school boards across the province of Ontario, reduce them from 1,446 to approximately 100 by January, 1969. Curiously, the announcement was made under what are nothing short of extraordinary circumstances.

The Minister of Education, our hon. friend, whose department is responsible for education, was out of the country at the time. The Department of Education officials had no prior notice of the change and most of them read the announcement under banner headlines in the newspaper the following morning. These circumstances cannot be considered normal, and it is hard to understand why the Premier chose such a time to make such an important and far-reaching statement. Perhaps the Minister will have some comment in that connection when he replies.

Be that as it may, he did indicate that accepting the principle of the county as a basic unit for school administration, the following considerations were taken into account:

1. The county is a recognized and understood unit of administration in Ontario; and

2. By adopting the larger unit for public and secondary school purposes, the government is also accepting the suggestion of the Smith committee report on taxation that efficiency in raising revenue demands that taxes be levied on a base larger than our present small local units.

The big advantage, said the Premier, was that equality of educational opportunity would become a reality. A rural child would get just as good an education as an urban child. Certainly a very commendable objective. What happened? Well, the cry started coming in from the hinterlands of the province. From school trustees and councillors across the province there was a chorus of cries in opposition to the plan. I know other members have received a large amount of mail in this connection, and I have as well, and I just relate to the House through you, sir, the general tenor of the mail which I have received in this connection. The first one is from the town clerk of the town of Kincardine and he said:

> That this council go on record as being completely in accord with the brief presented recently to the Ontario Deputy Minister of Education opposing the government's proposed changes in school board administration.

Another letter from the village of Mildmay opposes the proposed legislation. A letter from the township of Culross says:

> For the benefit of administration purposes, this board opposes the size of the proposed county school areas. Enough information and research does not seem to have been made available to school area boards.

From the township of Carrick there is the same opposition expressed in their resolution. I could relate to the House a number of other townships and boards which submitted resolutions to me, but I think it is a fair statement, Mr. Speaker, that I had unanimity expressed to me on this particular subject. Everyone was singularly opposed to the scheme proposed by the Minister. In many cases the people did not object so much to what was being done;

it was how it was being done, and I think that in that connection, their point was extremely well taken.

To say the least, there was an information gap. The government, after the announcement, was secretive about the plan to the point that educators at the local level were as much in the dark as the educational laymen. In this sense, the Robarts government invited criticism by delay in providing full details of its plan for the county-size school units. The government did not release its white paper until February 1, as has been mentioned, close to three months after the Premier made the official announcement.

Even the Minister acknowledged, or has acknowledged on a number of occasions, that he has had considerable criticism from some portions of the province over his school board integration plan. I know that he has attended meetings in Tavistock; I know that he has had school boards into his office here at Queen's Park and, as nearly as I can determine, all those people are very concerned and, I understand, opposed to the plan put forward by the Minister.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I know that they understand the situation.

Mr. Gaunt: Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, the Minister is a well-known salesman and when he got them in the confines of his office he did a selling job on them, and if they are now persuaded, that is to the credit of the Minister.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The hon. member in my office agreed with the plan as it related to the delegation you were with, subbing for one of your fellow colleagues.

Mr. Gaunt: May I say to the Minister through you, Mr. Speaker, that I indicated to you that there was merit in some forms of the plan. In other areas, I disagreed with it, and I stand by that.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Gaunt: Mr. Speaker, if I may continue, to be sure home amalgamation is needed in some areas. On the other hand, some systems may already be too large and this raises the point about inflexibility. The Minister has said no matter what the circumstances, no matter what the geography, no matter what the socio-economic boundaries or confines of any region are, the system is going to be set up on the county basis and that is the way it has to be all across the province and particularly in southern Ontario.

I think that is a great fault of the plan. As I have indicated, there are some areas that need to be amalgamated, and there are other areas that may already be too large. To bring in a bill that gives blanket coverage on this particular point, I think is one of the serious faults of the bill and I hope the Minister will reconsider that point.

To reduce the school boards to around 100 is to cut out the services to the school boards of several thousand trustees that do not need to be cut out. The services of thousands of elected trustees is a priceless contribution to education in Ontario, particularly in keeping education democratic. County-wide elections will not return the community interest now generated.

Another point—and this is a real problem, as far as I am concerned—the biggest problem of equal opportunity in education lies in the disparity in tax resources between the Golden Horseshoe and the rest of the province. The rest of the province needs to be brought up to the level of the Golden Horseshoe, and this will not be done within counties, even though relatively small improvements might result.

The government is taking one or two steps to ease local tax burdens, but the problem remains substantially on the doorstep of Queens' Park. Of course, we have the equalization grants. These were alluded to by my friend, the member for Waterloo North just a moment ago, and the Minister says that this corrects, for the most part, the disparity between the Golden Horseshoe and the rest of the province. May I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that it helps to correct it, but it certainly does not correct it to the extent that it should.

The other point that was mentioned previously was that the government is working at cross-purposes. The Department of Education is moving one way and The Department of Municipal Affairs is moving another way. The Department of Education says, "We are going to set up our school area boundaries on the county boundary system", and The Department of Municipal Affairs has indicated on a number of occasions that the county boundary outlines are obsolete. So really, Mr. Speaker, I think that some very definite planning and co-operation should be emanating from this government and from the various departments. This has not been the case.

In selecting the county as the basis for the local school authority, the educationists are ignoring both the optimum financial criteria

and the pressures and trend toward regional government. It is inevitable that school costs will go up significantly as the more sophisticated and comprehensive educational programmes now largely confined to cities and towns are extended throughout rural areas. It is therefore essential that these costs be financially as fair as possible. The guidelines and the bill lack these ingredients.

The county boards of education—which are proposed to be governed by urban and rural trustees and elected according to the share of residential and farm assessment each municipality has of the county total—will mean in the great majority of cases that the trustees representing urban municipalities in a county will be able to outvote trustees representing the rural areas.

The farm population has been saying for years that the educational tax on lands and on buildings is a most unfair way of financing education, and correctly so. It is the old business of people paying for services to people, and property paying for services to property. It is a good bet that the unfairness in financing education as far as the property tax is concerned will be increased rather than lessened.

As far as costs are concerned, I noted with interest the statement by the Deputy Minister of Education, Dr. McCarthy. He said a short while ago that there is every possibility that the new system will result in higher education costs. I think that I reflect accurately the feeling of most of the people across the province that education is becoming an almost unbearable burden. For instance, in a city of 18,000 persons, it costs more to educate 5,000 students than it does to supply the city with other services—water, sewers, sidewalks, roads—and all the major capital work.

Having said that, I acknowledge that education is a very important matter; it is an investment in the young people of our country and I do not detract from that for a moment, and I do not want my remarks to be taken that I am against furthering education in this province—I am not. I am just saying that the people in the province are becoming most concerned with the escalating cost of education and they want to be assured that they are getting the best and the fullest use of their tax dollar insofar as education is concerned. In that way I think that it is very important that education costs be as equitable as possible.

There is another aspect to this matter, as well. When it is rememberd that the new boards are to have power to levy property owners direct, and to issue their own debentures, the question arises whether it is realistic to expect urban trustees representing voters who have already paid mightily for good schools, to vote enthusiastically for essentially rural programmes which will have to be paid by urban and rural taxpayers. Perhaps they will, I do not know, but this may be a point for consideration. The escape from this dilemma may lie along the lines recommended by the Smith committee on taxation —a much greater provincial share and therefore a more equitable distribution of education costs than is now the case. The Smith committee report recommended that the province assume 60 per cent of the cost of education immediately, and this party has said that the province should assume 80 per cent over the past couple of months. We still believe that. We feel that this is the most equitable way to distribute the educational costs.

I think the approval of the Smith committee report on this point is a valid one, namely that as long as local autonomy is considered an essential element in the school system, the problems of achieving uniformly high quality in education, and equality in financing, cannot be tackled separately. They must be tackled together. Unfortunately, in the consolidation programme, they are not tackled together, and I think that this is one of the tragedies of the scheme.

Well, Mr. Speaker, my comments are almost to an end, but you know, I cannot help wondering. This is a gigantic problem to say the least, and it calls for the judgment of Solomon, and the wizardry of Oz, and the precision of a computer. It is being undertaken by a government that cannot build a science centre, and cannot even get its student loans out on time. Mr. Speaker, I cannot help but wonder, how can a government that cannot accomplish these comparatively simple tasks be expected to successfully weld 1,446 school boards into 100 before January 1, 1969?

Mr. G. A. Kerr (Halton West): He is a magician.

Mr. Gaunt: He would have to be. My friend says that he is a magician, and I would certainly concur with that. I would think that the Minister would have to be in order to perform that kind of duty. As far as I am concerned, the formation of county boards of education should be made permis-

sive, with mandatory formation of boards not smaller than existing secondary school areas. This would take away the extreme rigidity which has been part and parcel of this bill.

As I said before, there may be some areas of the province where the school boundaries should be larger than the county boundaries. Conversely, there may be many areas in the province where the school boundaries should be much smaller than the county boundaries.

The government does not seem to have any sensitivity in this regard. It has been said that we are going ahead with this regardless, and I think that in this connection, the only sensible course to pursue at this juncture is for all members of the House to support the amendment as proposed by my leader.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Sandwich-Riverside.

Mr. F. A. Burr (Sandwich-Riverside): Mr. Speaker, I have a few remarks, and questions on the matter before us. Obviously the boundaries of the consolidated school boards should be drawn as wisely as possible. Now, what makes the Minister believe that these new boundaries and the present county boundaries established 100 years ago should be everywhere one and the same?

Those who are interested in education in Essex county, outside of Windsor, have reached the conclusion, and they are close to the problem, that there should be three school boards in Essex county and not one.

Will the Minister not give any consideration to any suggested school board areas that do not fall within these ancient county boundaries? It would seem that the regional government boundaries would be more logical boundaries for school boards.

Another reservation that I have is this. The interest of the citizen is vital in a democracy. What effect does the centralization have on the awareness of the citizen to the educational scene? Will it be decreased? And if so, has the Minister any plans for counteracting this adverse effect?

I wish to refer to an American study which I believe has a bearing on the consolidation and on the broader aspects of education in Ontario. The Coleman report which covered 4,000 schools, 60,000 teachers, 600,000 pupils, and cost $2 million in the United States, reached the following conclusion which I shall paraphrase rather than quote verbatim.

First, that disadvantaged children benefit from integration with advantaged children, no matter whether the disadvantages result from racial differences, social differences, or economic differences, and further, that the advantaged children are not harmed by this integration.

Secondly, that "formal instructional inputs"—which I interpret as meaning "subject matter," and "materials, and libraries," which I think translated into Ontario educational language means "frills"—are not as important to a child as is the economic and social composition of his fellow students.

The third conclusion is that good teachers and effective educational environment are of less importance to the advantaged children than to the disadvantaged.

It is also possible to conclude from the Coleman report that schools in the United States serve in an increasingly effective manner as a sorting machine for those who will conform successfully to society, and for weeding out and discouraging the rest. An educational system that serves that purpose deserves some other name. It is not a truly educating system and that is why those who are thoughtfully concerned about education welcome the experiment now being conducted in Ontario schools with regard to ungraded schools.

Just where the idea of passing and failing crept into the educational systems of civilization I do not know. Perhaps it started in the church schools and came from an analogy of heaven and hell.

Certainly it has been kept alive by teachers who, by and large, have been those who have succeeded in school and whose biggest thrills have centred around memorable school achievements, such as coming first or second or in the top five in the class.

It is my own opinion that even under our present graded school system, pupils should not be segregated into classes according to their ability or achievements. It is very pleasant, of course, for a teacher to be able to teach the A class, but at what costs to the other students and the other teachers?

In my own high school days at London central collegiate, we were graded alphabetically. From time to time we realized that Sam was not doing very well in French and that Cam was a pretty smart boy, but no student bore any label, A class, D class or F class, as is the common practice nowadays.

If the Coleman report has reached a valid conclusion on the benefits of integration of

pupils with social economic and racial differences, surely integration of pupils with different academic abilities and achievements is very important too? For this reason, in spite of some other reservations, I favour the principle of larger consolidated school systems in which integration of children of many different social and economic, religious and racial backgrounds would, in itself, contribute to the educating process.

Experiments in ungraded schools and de-emphasis on formal examinations are encouraging trends in education in Ontario today. Until recently, our system deliberately and cold-bloodedly decreed that a certain percentage of all grade 13 students in the various subjects must be failed. Although top scholars will always be accorded their due, it is unnecessary and it is inhumane to humiliate and hurt and demean those who do not excel.

Graduates who are not academic successes usually have sufficient difficulty in the cold world of unemployment, or employment, and it is not right for them to have to start off labelled as failures or drop-outs. Incidentally, and I think significantly, the great majority of the youthful offenders in our prisons consist of those who have had little or no success in our educational system.

I suggest that one criterion of success for a school system or for a school—perhaps even for a teacher—is to be found in the rate of the drop-outs.

Education—its aims, its results, its methods and its value—have been debated for at least 25 centuries. As yet, no one has found any final answers. Perhaps the aims and results and methods and values of education change, or should change, as society changes. From country to country, from town to town, perhaps from year to year, and because the life of the child is so short or the childhood of each life is so short, perhaps even from day to day.

Let me repeat, that with reservations I endorse the principle of consolidation. But let me warn that the education of our youth will depend not upon the so-called material frills —success will depend ultimately upon the skill that teachers acquire in inspiring, creating, and keeping in good repair, pupil-to-pupil and pershon-to-person relationships.

If posterity is ever to achieve the brotherhood of man, it will be because eventually some educating system achieves the brotherhood of children. If consolidation of schools will help us to move in this direction, Mr. Speaker, I approve.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Sudbury has the floor.

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Speaker, forgive me. Among all the government departments, this one reaches the Everest in using the obfuscated jargon that makes it so incomprehensible when one attempts to divine the purposes and intentions of a statute that it presents to the Legislature. The regulations published by this department are just beyond all comprehension to the layman. They rank with the ancient Etruscan language, which has not yet been deciphered by philologists, try as they might.

I have examined the new sections 86 and 87, which are comprised in section 1 of the bill. I say categorically that, unless I can be assured as a matter of principle—and if the leader of the Opposition will forgive me, this is the ninth principle, that I seek to add to three which he superappended to the five of the Minister. I am going to state the ninth one.

Unless I can be assured during the conduct of this debate that the county palatines, the Alsatias, that exist within Ontario, whether they be named Levack or Lively or Copper Cliff or the township of Falconbridge, unless I can be assured that they disappear in the field of education, once and for all, I shall vote gainst this bill, as a matter of principle. And, the principle is this, and I want to put it in two ways.

No person and no corporation in this province should escape liability for taxes for education. The second way to put the principle of course, is this: Half a century ago the then Conservative government of Ontario might have said to the International Nickel Company and its predecessor, the Mond Nickel Company: "Fine, come into Ontario and rip the ore out of the ground and do it with the assurance that you do not have to contribute your fair share of the costs of municipal services to the populations you create." Taken to its logical conclusion, of course, you might as well say this to the International Nickel Company: "Take the population that assists you in mining the ore, and leave them in a state of nature. Leave them as if they were aboriginal savages, the indigenous redmen. Do nothing to contribute to their uplifting or their amelioration. Because that has been the effect of what has been said to this New York company for many years.

Mr. MacDonald: That is what you approved of.

Mr. Sopha: Oh no, Sopha never approved of it. Never, never, never!

Mr. MacDonald: You change your mind with every political breeze that blows.

Mr. Sopha: Do not get me more exercised than I am. Sopha never approved of it.

Mr. MacDonald: The record says otherwise.

Mr. Sopha: By his being or his blood or his voice, he never approved of that principle.

Mr. MacDonald: We'll dig out the record sometime.

Mr. Sopha: They might as well have said to—are you going to sit and natter along with me? They might as well have said to this American company: "You will never have to be responsible for paying your fair share of municipal taxes. Insulate yourselves behind the captive municipalities, where municipal councils that have to care for the large deposits of population are unable to get at you." So what does the new section 87 say, which I have read and reread? It says: "They shall levy upon all of the property rateable! What does that mean? It means this: It means the smelter at Copper Cliff is not on the roll; it means the refinery is not on the roll. So, presumably, "the property rateable" does not include the smelter or the refinery. If that be so, and unless I be assured to the contrary, I, for one, shall vote against this bill in all its stages.

Why not the courage of The Homes for the Aged Act; The District Welfare Administration Act? Notwithstanding all the other works, the mines, the shaftheads, the driers, the powder-rooms and all the ancillary structures involved in that huge mining enterprise, notwithstanding those, the two important ones, the smelter and the refinery are made responsible for their fair share of care of our senior citizens, and the looking-after—in the Christian sense, being our brother's keeper of those who suffer from economic or sociological dislocation.

Why not a statement like that in this legislation, making it clear that the equalized assessment, including the same basis of assessment as The Homes for the Aged Act and The District Welfare Act shall be the basis of assessment in this Act? But I have not been able to tell anybody in Sudbury and I have had many scores of inquiries directed to me; I have not been able to tell them that, finally, in the dawning of the new era, the International Nickel Company is going to be made responsible for its fair share, its just proportion, an equitable rate for the payment of the local portion of education costs. Indeed, in the Act there should be a provision that a ratepayer in one municipality being dissatisfied with something being left off the roll, or being, in his opinion, underassessed in another municipality, should have the right to cross the municipal boundaries and appeal against the assessment. That is not in this statute.

Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence (Carleton East): May I ask the hon. member a question?

Mr. Sopha: No, pelase do not. There is no provision for a citizen of Sudbury—

Mr. MacDonald: No provision for questions either!

Mr. Sopha: —to cross into Copper Cliff and to say to the assessor, "Why haven't you got the smelter on the roll, at $100 million or some other modest figure?" You see the principle simply put is twofold; and I speak on principle. No person has the right to be immune from municipal taxation. That is abstract; that principle has nothing to do with Sudbury, or any other particular municipality.

The other principle is that for half a century the International Nickel Company and its predecessors have shovelled off their responsibility onto the dormitory municipalities. And study as I will 86 and 87, I cannot see any relief in sight for the citizens of Sudbury for that which amounts to 50 per cent of the tax dollar.

Where is the courage of the Minister of Education? Is it wanting; is he wanting in courage that he would not put it in his bill, to make it absolutely clear what equalization means? Or, indeed, is there a deliberate attempt to leave the thing confused and obfuscated, so that it has to result in, perhaps, a series of court decisions?

From time to time, it is remarkable, Mr. Speaker, and I report it to you that Ministers of the Crown come up to me and say: "If the government would change The Assessment Act, that iniquitous section 35, subsection 5. They say "if the government"—almost as if they are talking behind their hands and behind he backs of fellow Ministers who sit in that oak-panelled room at the end of the hall—now I must reveal that they come up and say: "If the government would change The Assesment Act". They are part of the

government, and one must assume, notwithstanding that which bounces off the wall from time to time, that they talk to each other. They have an individual and a joint responsibility to rid us of these Alsatias, where the Queen's writ does not run in taxation—to eradicate this privilege that has been ascribed to an American company for half a century.

I do not say things here that I do not say at home. A couple of Saturdays ago at a meeting of the municipal folk, the leaders of all the—

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): Point of order, Mr. Speaker. In my opinion the hon. member is not sticking with the principle of the bill involved, but has strayed far apart and I would like your ruling on it.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion, the member is speaking on a matter of principle.

Mr. Sopha: Good. I can tell you that after nine years around here, you can bet that every time you say something important somebody gets up on a point of order.

Mr. Gisborn: Is is very seldom you do!

Mr. MacDonald: You certainly made a mistake!

Mr. Sopha: If you talk about Lanark county being a great place to retire to, nobody will ever interrupt you. Now, two Saturdays ago, there was a meeting of the leaders of the 17 municipalities. After the remarkable disclosure of the International Nickel Company out of the blue that it was willing to pay local taxes, including, presumably, their share of the local cost of education, suddenly on February 29, they themselves offered gratuitously to be assessed for local taxation.

There are a number of faces over on that side that ought to have been red when INCO made that magnanimous offer. Not mine, not the present Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. McKeough)—one must relieve him because he has only recently come into the department. The Minister of Lands and Forest's (Mr. Brunelle's) face ought to have been red about it; the member for Nickel Belt's (Mr. Demers') face ought to have been red; they both ought to have blushed. The Smith committee report said, in respect of that matter, "The present system of grants in lieu of industrial assessment appears to be satisfactory to the mining municipalities and the companies involved." That is what the Smith committee said. But all the while, unknown to the Clasky committee and I will not stop to explain what the Clasky committee is, all the while it was sitting, staffed by the Minister of Lands and Forests, the member for Nickel Belt, who is not here—oh yes, you were on it, do not shake your head—

Hon. R. Brunelle (Minister of Lands and Forests): I attended one meeting!

Mr. Sopha: You were ex-officio, a member, you were a member. I remember the great fanfare in Sudbury with your picture on the front of the paper when you were appointed to that committee. Certainly!

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: For one meeting.

Mr. Sopha: That is not my fault. You ought to be given appropriate demerit marks if you only went to one meeting. But the member for Nickel Belt, whom I have not gone out of my way to criticize here, if INCO was willing to pay taxes including the local cost of education all that time, perhaps the Minister of Lands and Forests and the member for Nickel Belt might have gone and asked INCO about their attitude instead of spending their time in coming up with more of that legerdemain that is called a formula under regulation 30 of The Assessment Act.

You see that is what was so remarkable about INCO's offer and these sections 86 and 87 do not circumscribe the offer made by the International Nickel Company to abolish the county palatine. You see what is wrong is that company towns in any part of Ontario in 1968 are an anomaly. They are anomalous and they ought to be abolished. They are not consistent with modern ideas of democracy.

In the town of Copper Cliff, I report to the House, during the memory of people now alive there has never been a municipal election in that town. Never been. The mayor is appointed by some strange process that emanates from the company and for all we know, he has to be approved on Wall Street.

Mr. MacDonald: Corporate osmosis.

Mr. Sopha: Yes. Corporate osmosis. It is said that if they changed the leader of the Copper Cliff highland cadet band, that has to be approved on Wall Street.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Even before they can beat the drum.

Mr. Sopha: Yes. Even before. It is really no time for levity. I stated the general principle—the company town has no place in our modern life, but my complaint is where in

86 or 87 does The Department of Education go across those fictional boundaries of the company towns—those artificial boundaries certainly not related to economic similarity, community of interest, similarity of race, language and all the other things human—and say unequivocally in that bill, that every person, every corporation is going to be liable equitably for the local cost of education. It is not there.

One person who expressed a view, who must remain anonymous, though knowledgeable of the situation, suggested to me that some citizen in Sudbury will have to take the matter to the courts to determine whether smelters are assessable under The Assessment Act. That is to say that they are not excluded by section 35 subsection 5.

To which I say, how ridiculous. How stupidly ludicrous that such a suggestion should emanate from anyone who is familiar with the situation. It is wrong in principle, and it is wrong morally that that giant corporation operating in the Sudbury basin should have any immunity from local taxation at all, should not be called upon to pay a fair—and I always emphasize that—a fair and equitable proportion of the cost of municipal services. Nothing more than that.

Put another way, we say to the American company coming in to harvest our mineral resources, you come here, to do business, to use your technology, your skill, your management ability—all of which they have in large abundance—in the harvesting of those ores in the ground, and the municipal taxes, that is the cost of supporting and caring for a large population, shall be a cost of doing business, and shall be deducted from the gross income that you reap from the exploitation of those ores.

What could be fairer than that? That treats them the same as everybody else is treated. I have always known with certainty and sureness that if this Legislature ever passed a statute exculpating any form of industry in the city of Toronto from municipal taxes, any form at all of escape, those three Toronto newspapers would set up such a howl of protest that you would not be able to see the government as they disappeared over the horizon in retreat.

But for years, you see, few of us, only a few of us, have complained about immunity from taxation of a billion dollar a year company; somebody with gross receipts, not in Ontario—I must be fair—$500 million gross receipts with a net profit after taxes of something of the order of $140 million, and there are few corporations on this planet that equal that kind of experience, and yet this company has for many years been able to escape its moral responsibility. The only thing that needs to be said in relation to it is to advert to the hypocrisy of the government.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): Is this party politics?

Mr. Sopha: The story is never complete until the hypocrisy of this government in relation to that is underlined.

Mr. MacDonald: What of your own?

Mr. Sopha: None at all. Do not worry me, because in Sudbury it is well known that for years I have struggled for justice in this area.

The government, to show their hypocrisy, sneaked around behind the scenes; the courageous municipality, let us relate it first, its courage, the township of Waters. One year they put the iron ore plant, a plant in pelletizing and manufacturing, they put it on the roll, on the assessment roll, claiming that it did not fall within the exculpation of 35-5 of The Assessment Act. This government, afraid to tackle INCO head on—

Mr. Speaker: Order! I believe the member is now straying from the principle of this bill.

Mr. Sopha: All right. I will leave it. This embarrasses my friend from York South, because in Sudbury neither the union or any NDP candidate has ever stood with me on this. They have been silent. This embarrasses them.

Mr. MacDonald: The big lie becomes the truth.

Mr. Sopha: Well, there it is. I have said what I have said. I have thought when I looked at these that I do not understand them, 86 and 87, they are not meant to be understood. I am not going to struggle with them.

I thought, what is my obligation here? To go to Westcott, the assistant to the Minister, to one of the many, the multiplicity of assistant Deputy Ministers? The Minister is too busy, you cannot catch him. To go to them and to ask—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Only one Deputy Minister.

Mr. Sopha: To go to them and to ask—

An hon. member: He is down at the OEA all the time.

Mr. Sopha: Is my obligation to go to one of them and to ask what the rateable property means? Probably they would not know anyway in relation to Sudbury and the special circumstances there, so I concluded, no, that is not my obligation.

My obligation is once again, as I have in the past, to stand in the place provided me in this House by reason of the number of votes I got, to call attention to this injustice that has been perpetrated on the people of the Sudbury basin over the years, and in the payment of the local cost of education to insist that when the new board is formed and it functions, that in its assessment it goes across the boundary into the town of Copper Cliff. And having done that, it comes out with an assessment roll where something like $140 million of assessment is added.

Now, that is not peanuts, $140 million, if that is the price put on the smelter.

It goes a little bit to the south and it picks up the refinery there. Only goodness knows how much that is worth. And to the northeast into the township of Falconbridge and picks up that smelter there, and then when that is done, Armageddon has been achieved; the dawning of the new era.

And finally, when INCO is paying its fair share of the proportion of education costs, then we can turn and use our money for all the other leads we have got and they are multifarious.

But during my time in Sudbury there has been one constant refrain every time public interest was taken in something that needed to be done. It always met the same refrain, "We have not got the money, we cannot afford it." And the reason we could not afford it in short was for a half a century International Nickel Company has walked away from its responsibilities to pay its fair share.

Mr. Martel: Mr. Speaker, everyone seemed aghast today, or indicated this, at the announcement made by the Premier with respect to larger units of administration. As a teacher, this came as no surprise to me because having spent eight years working with The Department of Education I have found them not to be the most—what shall we say—responsible people.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Martel: How many of the farmers, Mr. Speaker, told us last week, when we were talking about a farm bill, that we did not have farmers in this party? So how could we be critical? Yet I hear all the farmers, Mr. Speaker, from the other side of the House telling me something about education and I have have been in it for eight years and they have never been in it.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): They have never been exposed to it.

Mr. Martel: And not only as a teacher, Mr. Speaker, but as a worker in the teachers' federation I very quickly learned what The Department of Education meant to teachers. I think you have the most petrified group of people in the world who work under The Department of Education.

Mr. G. Demers (Nickel Belt): Shame on you.

Mr. Lewis: Darned sore spot over there.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Martel: It is nice to have all the experts across the floor, Mr. Speaker.

In dealing with this bill I want to consider two things. The one aspect I will come back to is teachers. The first one, however, is the manner in which The Department of Education saw fit to ignore dedicated men who for years had worked for next to nothing without consultation, without drawing them in on their plans. They simply announced one night that as of 1969 all of their hard work would be down the drain, they would be out the door.

Because of this and, as the other members have indicated, we have received gobs of mail. I think the stamp department for the postal department must be very happy, they must have made money just on stamps for this type of correspondence.

It was, I think, very irresponsible to handle this matter in this way when you consider that board members along with teachers have been largely responsible for the type of education, the standard of education we have today. Now, in our own area, without being forced into it, many of the boards saw the need for larger units of administration, and I might state at the outset I personally am not opposed to somewhat larger units of administration like those before me—I think it has merit.

It is the manner, the arrogant manner, that it was foisted upon the people of

Ontario, the board members and the teachers, neither being consulted. In our own area, the problem lies in representation, the problem that has been mentioned by other people. A new formula has been derived, I understand, but however, it is still basically representation. The city of Sudbury will end up with, I understand, 11 members of an 18 man board; the outlying area will end up with 7 members.

The outlying area makes up about 20 municipalities, some with as high a population as 8,000, and many of these will not have representation to the board. In the briefs I have received, most of the municipalities are asking for two boards, one comprising the city of Sudbury, approximately 85,000, and a second board comprising the outlying areas with a population of approximately 60,000. I leave this for the Minister, and I hope when we get into committee, the educational committee to study this, he will give this consideration.

The second matter I want to discuss, Mr. Speaker, is that of the teacher. In this whole thing the teachers have now sat for months not knowing what was going to happen to them. I attended some of the meetings last week or the week before—the teachers' federation meeting here in the city—and things have really built up to a point, Mr. Speaker, that the teachers have now set aside a strike fund, something they had never considered in the past.

So, if the hon. members think what I am saying is not true, when we reach a point that teachers are starting to build a strike fund—a group of people who have never considered striking—it becomes very serious, except Windsor.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Martel: What other area was going on strike? There were mass resignations, but there was no strike.

Hon. Mr. Davis: There was talk of a strike fund.

Mr. Martel: With which federation? It never got through any resolution, and it has this time.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I know it did not get through any resolution, but there were discussions.

Mr. Martel: Now, if we are going to build, Mr. Speaker, a better standard of education for everyone in Ontario, I think it wise that we start to clean up the teachers' colleges, to produce a type of teacher who is trained to meet the problems of today, and this certainly has not been done. As a graduate of teachers' college I was certainly disappointed when I got out to find that 90 per cent of what I took there was virtually useless to me, and the things that I really needed I was not prepared for. As I went along in teaching, Mr. Speaker, I found the same problem.

If I was going to meet the changes, to keep up with the changes in education, I would have to retrain on my own time at night, on Saturdays, and the whole gamut and the dictates came from The Department of Education to do so with very little assistance. Teachers continued to bring up the standard of education but I am afraid it was not through the efforts of The Department of Education, but rather through their own initiative.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Is that necessarily a bad thing?

Mr. Martel: Yes, it is bad because when the teachers go in to teach if they have been on courses weekend after weekend they go in tired and this brings down the standard. They are not at their best to provide the education for the children that is needed.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Is it bad that they do this on their own initiative?

Mr. Martel: No, it is not bad to do it on their own initiative, but it is bad to do it on their own time, and I am sure the Minister will agree with that.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Martel: Now, Mr. Speaker, the teachers, and I have had many letters from them, are still waiting. I think this has affected the teaching this year, the fact that they have been uncertain of where they are going, uncertain of what is going to happen to them. They certainly have not been advised as to all the ramifications involved in the new board; such things as pay for retirement and so on have not been cleared up. It has made a serious mess.

Mr. Speaker, in summation, the two things that I am concerned about are the formula for the representation to the new boards, and what is going to happen to the teachers.

One final point on which I must agree with the member for Sudbury is that International Nickel and Falconbridge are going

to have to pay their share. However, I cannot agree with him on the point that he presented, that no member on this side of the House ever stated that they should pay their share.

I can recall in the 1963 campaign, during the debates when the member for Sudbury now sitting in the federal House was running provincially, he suggested that INCO might pay its share, and the member for Sudbury disagreed. Also in 1961, the member for Sudbury said that councils could not handle the type of money that they would get from International Nickel, and this is recorded in *Hansard*.

I have some suspicion as to INCO's reversal. I am just wondering how feasible it might be for INCO to become amalgamated to a place like Lively in the long run, rather than to the city of Sudbury and what it would do to the whole theory of it being integrated into Sudbury, and Sudbury deriving more tax benefits. I am very suspicious of what they intend to do.

I would ask the Minister to consider a new formula for representation. I would ask him to consider some new steps in training for teachers. This would bring into focus some of the disparity that now exists in the standard of education across the province.

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent): Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words on the second reading of Bill 44. I would like to say, through you, to the Minister, that since the Prime Minister of this province made a statement last November 14 saying that great changes were going to take place in our education system in this province, the people have been greatly concerned about the rapid changes that have been taking place.

Of course, many of them think that these changes are coming too fast for certain areas of this province. When the Minister introduced this bill, I was contacted by members of township councils, and school boards in the riding which I happen to represent. They are greatly concerned that they are losing any say in our educational system in many townships, towns and villages, if this bill gets final assent.

We have, in many municipalities, dedicated people who have made great contributions to our educational system in those municipalities and at no cost to them. With this bill, they perhaps would not have a representative on this county school board that is going to be set up.

As I understand it from this bill, the number on the school boards will be 14, 16, 18 or 20. But in many counties there are more municipalities than 20, so that leaves a number of municipalities without a representative on this new county school board.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that during the last election I visited many parts of the riding—as a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, ever part of the riding in which I was a candidate—and I never saw so many tax notices in my life. People today are feeling that taxes have reached the saturation point. Everyone with whom I talked is in favour of equal opportunity to every boy and girl, no matter where he or she lives, but these changes are coming fast and with each of them the cost is increasing. Many of these people feel that the Minister of Education or this government are going too fast and are not giving too much consideration to the small taxpayer.

Our economy is out of balance. We have a large segment of our population in the high-income bracket and we have a larger section in the low-income bracket and today they are greatly concerned. If there is not some consideration given to those citizens—the small taxpayers—they will be broken by education costs. We must give consideration to the small taxpayer; if we break him, we have nothing left.

The changes are coming too rapidly, Mr. Speaker, for many areas of the province of Ontario and every consideration must be given to them. If this government is in favour of these rapid changes that are taking place, they must absorb, as my leader has said, 80 per cent of the cost of education and that will relieve a great deal of criticism.

I hope that the Minister will hand some of the controls back to the little people on the back concession. Once you get away from the grass roots of this province, Mr. Speaker, we are due for a fall.

I am going to support the amendment of my leader, having in mind the concern of the people in my part, and in many other parts, of the province of Ontario. They want to know where they are going. They want to come here and to face the education committee and get some of the answers they are seeking and cannot find.

It being 6 o'clock, p.m., the House took recess.



Legislature of Ontario Debates

No. 46

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

First Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Tuesday, April 2, 1968

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1968

5

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Tuesday, April 2, 1968

Secondary Schools and Boards of Education Act, bill to amend, Mr. Davis, on second reading 1541

Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Davis, agreed to 1578

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to 1578

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

TUESDAY, APRIL 2, 1968

The House resumed at 8 o'clock, p.m.

THE SECONDARY SCHOOLS AND BOARDS OF EDUCATION ACT

(*Second reading—continued*)

Mr. Speaker: I wonder if, before we continue with the debate, I might welcome tonight some of the visitors in the west public gallery—the twenty-third scout group and girl guides from Toronto who are up there in the audience.

Mr. A. Carruthers (Durham): Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak briefly on the principle of this bill, it has a particular significance for me and the people of my riding in view of the fact that Durham county forms part of the united counties of Northumberland and Durham. There has been some concern felt in the county over the fact that has been illustrated here, that there would be a lack of representation from Durham county with respect to that of Northumberland county. Now, this may or may not be true, Mr. Speaker. It is quite possible that in setting up the wards, the committee will establish them across the county boundaries and this fear may not be realized.

In the county there are two small high schools, Millbrook and Blackstock. We had a very fine representation from Millbrook high school in the gallery this afternoon, they prolonged their stay in order to take advantage of the debate on this bill. Very fine young people indeed. This school has an excellent record as a small school, having won several Ontario scholarships and I would hope that both these schools will be given real consideration in the establishment of the new plan, and that they may remain as small schools with the close personal relationships that they have had with the respective people of their communities.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot support the resolution or the motion put forward by the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Nixon) because I feel that it is in complete opposition to the concept which he tried to present. One of the criticisms that the Opposition has levelled at the bill is that there has been a lack of discussion, and a lack of opportunity on the part of the general public to make themselves aware of the implications of the bill.

The debate this afternoon and this evening will give the various members of school boards, and the people who will be present at the hearing before the standing committee on education an opportunity to become better informed, and be in a position to discuss the various features of the bill, in a very knowledgeable and intelligible manner. Therefore I give the Minister great credit in deciding in his wisdom to have the second reading beforehand. In allowing the bill to go before the committee on education I would therefore suggest to the hon. leader of the Opposition that he withdraw his motion, and allow the principle of the bill to stand as it is.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there have been several objections put forward with respect to the new units of administration, and very little positive attitude taken. I would like to discuss very briefly, if I may, some of the objections and point out many advantages that will result from the introduction of this legislation.

There has been the argument that the legislation will ease school administration at the expense of education, that school decisions will be removed from the people and that local boards have been able, in the past, to select teachers who have fitted into the local scene and have earned the respect and admiration of the people of the various communities. Now, this is very true, but when we look at the overall picture, we find that at the present time, educational leadership is restricted in small school areas. They are unable to supply the supervisory and administrative staffs so necessary for an effective system of education. While on the other hand, a large unit of administration under a board of education, providing services for both elementary and secondary schools, will be able to employ professional staff under a director of education without the present duplication of personnel and the multiplicity of school areas which we have today. It is a move in the right direction.

There has been the criticism in my own area that it will force children to ride long distances by bus to school and yet, Mr. Speaker, the opposite is true. In some areas in my riding, in fact in one area in particular children are being transported a distance of 25 miles to the Victoria high school in Lindsay, with a very fine school in Millbrook three miles distant, within walking distance almost, but because the township has a contract with the Victoria high school board, these students are forced to ride some 20 to 25 miles by bus to a school outside the boundaries of the county. This legislation will correct that situation.

It has been the argument that it will tend to lessen the interest in schools and education. The fact that the new boards will be elected by popular vote, I believe, Mr. Speaker, will create a new interest in education in the various communities.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): There are now.

Mr. J. Jessiman (Fort William): Welcome back, Eddie.

Mr. Carruthers: The boards will now be responsible—directly responsible—to the people who are served.

There is the argument that the integration of education from kindergarten to grade 13 will result in problems of bigness. This has not been expressed by either of the Opposition parties today, in fact, in one instance an hon. member spoke of going beyond the county boundaries into larger regions of administration.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the Minister and his department have used very sound judgment and I can see that there has been a great deal of research—a great deal of study undertaken in deciding that the boundaries will be on a county basis.

In speaking of my own riding the people of Durham county are familiar with county boundaries. They are familiar with county administration. We have one of the finest county health units in the province of Ontario —administered efficiently—and we have the county road system. People are familiar with this form of government and it is logical that we should naturally base our educational system within the confines of the same boundaries.

Not only that, as we move into county assessment it is only logical that the education taxes should be raised on the basis of the county administration. There has also been the suggestion that placement implications could result in recruitment problems. School boards depend to a great extent on married women to staff their schools. Teachers forced to travel long distances would, in many instances, hesitate to take positions.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Sudbury East (Mr. Martel) spoke on behalf of the teaching profession this afternoon and said that there was considerable opposition on the part of the Ontario teachers federation. Now I cannot agree with him. I think that this programme of county administration will provide greater and new opportunities for members of the teaching profession.

Teachers can be facilitated without the loss of accumulated sick leave benefits under the new unit of administration. They can maintain their tenure rights, their experience allowances and all the other fringe benefits they enjoy under the present system. If they have to move outside the boundaries of the local area, they are likely to lose many of these benefits. Teacher morale will be improved, because those wishing to specialize will be able to do so within the county system. Prior to this, they had to move out to another area entirely. I see great advantages in the proposed plan. They will be able, within the county system, to move to an area which will provide greater opportunity for them. Boards will be able to designate teachers to various areas by providing incentives—an art teacher may be needed in a particular area, and a specialist in physical training needed in another area, and they can move with the proper incentive within the system without losing their benefits. This is a great advantage.

One committee now will be able to negotiate salaries for a whole area, and fewer people will be involved. Less time will be wasted, and boards will not be competing with each other, as we have seen them do so often, particularly in Metropolitan Toronto.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): You do not like competition?

Mr. Carruthers: Yes, there will be competition, but not this type of competition.

A uniform salary scale can be established and related employment practice can be achieved with a larger unit of administration, as has been proposed. This will bring the rural teacher up to the level of the urban teacher as far as salary is concerned, and it will mean equality of opportunity not only for the children of rural areas, but for the citizens, as taxpayers.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Carruthers: They will be able to afford the best type of education that the teaching profession can provide.

One of the features of this bill which has not been expounded to any extent, Mr. Speaker, is that of the economic aspect. I believe that one of the important features of the programme is the fact that it will, to a great degree, limit the present competition between municipalities for industrial assessment. Certainly this will be very true in my area.

With the industrial assessment, in my case, spread over the united counties of Northumberland and Durham, industry will be able to settle in those areas where it should settle, close to growth communities, while housing can develop without too many restrictions, on a well-planned basis, in our rural areas.

Mr. N. Davison (Hamilton Centre): That is pretty far fetched.

Mr. Carruthers: It is not far fetched; it is factual.

An hon. member: Who wrote that speech for you?

Mr. Carruthers: I wrote it myself; it is funny, is it not?

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

An hon. member: There you are, Alex; there you are!

Mr. Carruthers: In fact, this appeared in a number of the local papers.

I was rather amazed at the hon. member for Peterborough (Mr. Pitman). I thought he would put forward a reasonable argument against this legislation, but I can understand it. The fact—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Carruthers: —that his riding was one of the first to establish a county system of education and it is working very well, as the hon. member realizes. There was an editorial in the Peterborough *Examiner* last month which stated:

> If there is a weakness in the plan, it is that it is organized along county rather than large regional units.

Now I cannot agree with that. I have already pointed out the reasons why—and I think they are good logical reasons.

Let us consider, for example, if it is based on economic regions, the riding of Durham. The people of Darlington township have an economic interest in Oshawa; for the people of Hope township, the centre is Port Hope; for Cavan township is that fine city of Peterborough; while in the other corner of the riding we have Cartwright and Manvers, with interest in Lindsay and Port Perry. How are you going to set up boundaries along these lines? It is just impossible. The logical boundaries for the present time at least are the county boundaries.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Carruthers: Yes, that is why we are opposed to other proposals at the present time. That is why we are opposed to them.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): Are you opposed to regional government?

Mr. Carruthers: No, this is a form of regional government; let us move ahead progressively. Your own member, the hon. member for Peterborough, said that we should phase this in gradually. Then the next speakers declared that we are not moving quickly enough. It is hard to understand. I never saw a group as badly confused as that group in the centre.

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, the new school boards will be directly responsible to the electorate; they will levy their own taxes and county boards will also result in increased responsibility for education at the local level, and with increased responsibility will come increased interest on the part of the people. County boards will allow a greater range of grouping, and will make it easier to sell debentures. The establishment of county boards will not result in the dislocation of students who must move across county boundaries to reach the school most accessible to them. As I said I have a case of two boys living across the road from each other—one has to go 25 miles by bus—

Mr. Speaker: Order! Perhaps the member would carry on the debate properly, through the chair.

Mr. Carruthers: I apologize, Mr. Speaker, Certainly, Mr. Speaker, children will be able to attend the school nearest to their home and instead of spending long hours on a bus they will in most cases be travelling short distances.

I do not intend to prolong this debate. Certainly the arguments are very logical, Mr.

Speaker, they are positive, and may I again suggest to the leader of the Opposition that he withdraw his motion. I urge all members to support this bill.

Mr. G. Bukator (Niagara Falls): For words of wisdom, Mr. Speaker, nothing that I have heard in the last 15 or 20 minutes is going to change my mind. I know not where to start in, except maybe to relate some of the history of some of the areas of this province. A very progressive group of school boards in the Niagara peninsula, at least 10 or 12 years ago, decided that small municipalities having public school boards and a high school board in each one of these municipalities was just a little too much. I do not want to take any credit away from The Department of Education; I do believe that they strive to give everyone in the province a better deal, and so they go to extremes. Having said that, the little village of Chippawa, where I have lived for over 50 years, had a separate school board for the public school. The township of Willoughby had several schools spread out in it, such that the hon. Minister did away with some a year or two ago, and I think that this was a good idea.

Stamford township, with a population much larger than the city of Niagara Falls, had a high school and they could rent out space to the small municipalities that had no high schools in their area, so that on a per-capita basis, they bought their high school education. The day came that these progressive school boards decided that they ought to have one board. And so they did away with the public school board, and they decided to have public and high school under one administration. I suppose that it was the pilot plan in this province; I do not think that there was one like it in the province because there were two townships involved, a city, and a village. They decided to transport the youngsters to the nearest high schools by bus, which did make for better education for those youngsters of those four municipalities. So they decided to merge with Stamford township, and finally one comes to the point where one has one city—one big city in my opinion, some 55,000 or 56,000 people—and a village and a township.

This is the very thing that the last speaker said cannot happen, could not work well and did not work well in that area up to this day. Having made that point, we were visited by the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs, and in that area they decided that possibly we ought to have regional government. This was the Minister before the present gentleman—Mr. Spooner, an exceptionally fine man, and well acquainted with municipal affairs in my opinion, a man who made a contribution to this province in public life that I doubt very much many of us will equal. He was sincere in their effort. I must give this Minister credit, he did invite me to a meeting where they had representation from every municipality in the county of Lincoln, and the county of Welland, to look at the possibility of a study for regional government which would include school boards.

It runs in my mind that half of the cost of that was paid by the municipality, and half was paid by the government, and I think that the figure was something in the neighbourhood of $60,000 more or less. The municipalities of that area made quite an investment of $35,000, and the government was sincere in their efforts and Mayo came down with this report in August of 1966. A most interesting sketch I have before me, for the proposed boards of education in the municipality of metropolitan Niagara. I think that we could have got along very well without the metropolitan in there.

But this report brought a peculiar thing before the people of the province. I did believe last year that maybe this report would be implemented and we would have regional government to take care of the school boards also. But I find that in this report they decided that the township that I spoke of—Stamford—which is now part of Niagara Falls, the village of Chippawa, and Willoughby would be one city; and they would have a borough of Fort Erie; they would have the city of Welland; they would have the borough of Thorold, Lincoln and Fonthill in one corner to the west; and along Lake Erie, they would have the city of Port Colborne and the borough of Wainfleet. Progressive thinking.

Most of the municipalities of that area are included, with some exceptions, because those who detailed the rules of the game felt that this would come into existence very soon now. So we find that the cart has been put before the horse. The long study made sense because this portion of the county that has this type of administration is working well. They have good education in those areas, and they have lovely schools, the Minister knows that. So let me read one of the recommendations of that new school structure in chapter 13:

> We recommend that the new school administration system come into effect at the same time as the new proposed municipal system.

They decided that when there would be the five areas, the five boroughs, the five cities, then the school boards ought to take on those similar boundaries. One portion is working and working well.

One can readily understand why the people of Niagara Falls are quite concerned about this proposition of a county system because, if it becomes one greater package, no one can tell me that a bigger area will not cost more money. The city of Niagara Falls was getting 17 per cent for education costs when they were just a city with about 28,000 population; Stamford township, that completely surrounded them with equal population, was getting a 60 per cent grant for education, simply by just changing the name. One is a township getting 60 per cent; one is a city getting 17 per cent; they decided to merge and the government here decided to give them a bit of a break. They said "Fine, we won't take the grants completely away from you in one year; in five consecutive years a portion of that will be borne by the city and we will give you less grant because you are now a city and ought not to get much more than about 17 per cent." This year, they came to the point where their last portion was taken from them; and I shall read to you just one small portion of the cost of education in that area:

> The board lost $395,000 in grants this year because they have decided to become a larger area.

Mind you, the village in which I live is also picking up a portion of that tab—the township of Willoughby is also picking up a portion of that tab. I say to the members that if this government was sincere about the larger county system, then they ought to tell us how much of the grant they will increase to them so the municipalities will not have to bear added costs for education of the type that my good friend spoke about just a few minutes ago. We want better education and I think we ought to have bigger systems and bigger areas; and I think this Minister has tried to do that. But when he came to the point that he decided with his department this hon. Minister said to the people of the province of Ontario: "We will now have a county system." And regardless of what we do here tonight, it does not take a prophet, Mr. Speaker, to tell you that this bill will be passed.

Mr. Sargent: I have a bet on it.

An hon. member: I expect you will vote for it.

Mr. Bukator: I doubt very much whether I will vote for it in view of what the Minister said. I know that if the people of the province have to pick up added costs on their property for school purposes, then this is not a fair thing to do to the people of the province at this time.

Mr. Sargent: Hear, hear.

Mr. Bukator: I would say to the Minister, through you, Mr. Speaker, that it is a simple solution—you just pay the bill as you are going to do on administration of justice; we will take a good look at a county system. It will come to that; slowly you are giving but very little. Can you imagine, in this year, that the mill rate in one city alone went up 8.82 mills; in other words, on $1,000 of assessment, they will have to pay for each thousand $8.82 more on their taxes—for what? Before the new system is taken into consideration.

You can readily understand why a board of education—and the Minister will agree, Mr. Speaker—and the city of Niagara Falls —which is a good board; they are good administrators doing a good job—are concerned about this bigger portion from the county because if the lesser, the have-not areas, have to be paid for by the areas that have—and the province has not told us if they are going to pay a little more towards that —then they will have to bear more of the costs and get nothing more for their money.

Naturally, no one can support this. And so, I have many, many clippings and objections, and I do believe this Minister, Mr. Speaker, did get a copy of the brief from Mr. McLeod. But I think I ought to read a small portion of this because I think it is worthy of having on the record.

This was written, I find, by R. A. McLeod, director of education:

> We are pleased to enclose a copy of the memorandum presented by our chairman to the city council on Thursday evening, March 14; the copy of this memorandum has been forwarded to the Minister of Education, the hon. William G. Davis, for consideration.

They touch, too, on the same subject that I did; they mention that at a time of the Mayo commission hearings in 1966, this board through its brief and evidence supported regional government as a means of providing equal opportunity for all students in the region; and I think herein lies the key to

the problem. If this government, through the new Minister, who has not indicated to me up to this moment that he is not progressive, and he has not proved otherwise—

Mr. Sargent: Hear, hear.

Mr. Bukator: —if he were to take the recommendations of the Mayo report, including Lincoln county and Welland—and I am not saying that they ought to do that either without first saying to you, Mr. Speaker, to the Ministers and the Cabinet of this government, that first of all they will do certain things by way of grants to equalize, and people will very quickly come together. But no one will buy this package; and I am here to say to you on behalf of the people that I represent, we want no part of this until this hon. Minister tells us where the slack is going to be picked up.

I would think maybe he could put a ceiling on what should be paid for education. And when you come to that saturation point, then they pick up the difference for a period of three or four years until this thing comes about. At least if we had that much of a concession, we would be on the right side. But, surely, many hon. members have been elected to local councils and county councils, and former wardens such as my friend the Minister of Energy Resources Management (Mr. Simonett); know the problems these people have to wrestle with; they are not going to buy this until they know from this government that it is not going to cost extra dollars.

I say to you, from all indications, I am amazed, really I am, to think that a Minister could persuade a Cabinet to buy this kind of a bill of goods when I would say that half of your back-benchers were talking to me in the hall right at this moment; they would shake my hand and tell me that I was right. I would say not half of them, 75 per cent; one man was shaking his head "no," but I did see a few smiles.

Mr. Sargent: They are hanging their heads over there, they are hanging their heads.

An hon. member: Even the front-benchers.

Mr. Bukator: Yes, I would think maybe they can see through this better on the front benches than they can on the back because they have not studied this as well.

With the greatest of respect to you, I say this in all sincerity, councils and municipalities of this province just cannot buy this package without objecting to it because you have not spelled out the rules of the game and what portion you are going to pick up of the added costs, because extra costs are coming.

Having said that, I will sit down and let others who might be able to impress you better than I can, but you can rest assured that if nothing comes of this, you can depend on this, that I have been sincere in my presentation tonight.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Bukator: It is a serious problem and we have this to wrestle with and I think you are in the position. You are in the position to tell us tonight, how you are going to handle this problem when the costs are added to the man who is on a fixed income, who has a package of land, who has raised his family, and has constantly increasing school costs on his property, he is not in the position, he just does not have the money to maintain himself now. When they added their funds to pension plans, the dollar then could have bought something; today their pension plan is so small that they can hardly exist and 8.82 mills or $8.82 per thousand of assessment is much too much to burden them with because they have paid their way. The problem has been settled as far as they are concerned, they have educated their children. It is coming out of the wrong pocket. The province has 37 sources of revenue and that is where the money should come from. I am waiting for the hon. Minister; I suppose he would say to me, "If you will sit down, I will tell you". But I am hoping this Minister has a solution to the problem and shows us how he is going to handle this; other than that we have no other choice.

I would like to read a small portion of the amendment because this makes sense, and there are people here this evening, among the members that did not hear it this afternoon or I am sure they would not oppose this amendment.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bukator: Well, I am going to tell you something; if you went to the people of the province with this issue right now; if you went to the people of the province with this issue right now it would be no problem.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bukator: No one in this House, or on the sidewalks of the city or in the rural municipalities that I am so well acquainted

with, can afford to pick up the added cost of education. It just cannot be done and when you have the larger unit it will be much more. So I say to you that Bill 44 be referred to a standing committee on education for its report so that those citizens across the province who have special knowledge and concern in these matters will have a proper opportunity to publicly state their views to the committee, in the presence of the Minister's departmental advisers as well as the members of the Legislature before this House is asked to decide on the principles of this bill. I do not know how else I could put it.

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): I think this is the first occasion that I have ever spoken to the Minister on matters of education as I feel quite inadequate on the situation when I am in his presence. But the feelings that have been expressed to me, both by the teaching profession within my great county of Essex, by the people from the boards of education, and more specifically by the average man in the streets, have led me to pass a few remarks concerning this proposed legislation and the principle contained therein.

I think that the Minister and his associates should take countenance of the feelings of the people of this province in this regard. Many of these items have been dealt with by previous speakers, and I would just like to enunciate a few of the principles which have been put forth in brief summation and then deal with a couple of specifics that relate to my area.

I think the first and overriding principle is that the counties are not necessarily geographic, economic or sociological entities and I think this is most true, as has been pointed out to me in the county of Essex, especially in relation to the economic and sociological entities within the county of Essex. The main concern of the average person, however, seems to be the arbitrary announcement that came forth in this regard, and there tends to be a great deal of resentment on behalf of the people that this was not put forth as possibly an election plank by the government of the day.

One of the areas of major concern to boards in my area is the problem of providing additional qualified staff for some of the specialized undertakings that they would like to proceed with. And some of my boards have been attempting to do this during the past few years, but the teaching personnel were just not available in our province.

Then, too, there is the feeling that certain areas or certain boards are being penalized because in the past they have been very good and efficient and their ratepayers are going to be burdened with assuming the costs in less effective areas.

I think one of the real nubs of the principle of this bill is that the larger administration units will be more costly in providing services that do not directly benefit the students. We are not particularly questioning the cost of education as such, but those benefits that do not benefit the student directly.

I am sure the Minister is quite cognizant of the brief that was forwarded to him and the members of the Legislature in Essex county by the Essex county school trustees and ratepayers association, and I would not take the time of the House to read the principles enunciated there. But I might point out to the hon. member for Sandwich-Riverside (Mr. Burr), that they asked for four boards of education and not three, as he had indicated.

In speaking with teachers, and I am sure the Minister is quite well aware of the substantial contribution various teachers in the county of Essex have made in the teaching profession and organization of teachers in the province, they seem quite concerned with the potential loss of contact with members of the school boards. This is a matter of deep concern to them, losing the close liaison that existed in previous years. Further, they are somewhat concerned with the possible restrictions that may be placed upon them in ordering special classroom supplies for their special interest programmes, which come into our area and certainly into various other areas of the province.

One of the areas of levity is the possible insecurity of teachers in the riding of Essex South, in the county of Essex, due to the fact that certain teachers are resident of an area and may be faced with the possibility of being—I will put it bluntly—shipped off to Pelee Island, 15 miles out in Lake Erie.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Over the ice.

Mr. Paterson: Over the ice, or under the water.

An hon. member: Is that a fate?

Mr. Paterson: Whether this is a fate or not, is really difficult to assess, because it is a most enjoyable island. But it is something that is causing consternation in the area. And this is possibly the main point of my few remarks

here tonight, that in this bill the Minister has seen fit to designate Pelee Island to become part, or be considered part of the county of Essex, although it is a separated township.

I am sure the Minister and his many officials are quite well aware of the problems of obtaining teachers for islands in our province, in the remote areas. The Minister and his officials, Mr. Speaker, I am sure, are quite well aware of the problems of a multiple grade school and a continuation school. The problem of sending students to the mainland during the tender years of their personal development. The problems relating to the bill that was passed in the last session of the Legislature to help finance the movement of these students to the mainland.

But what with the advent of the technological courses in our district high schools, the need to move these children to the mainland is getting more acute, and the families are being uprooted. The children may possibly never return to their island homes. But the whole nub of this problem is transportation. I am sure the Minister of Education is quite well aware of this, as is the Minister of Highways (Mr. Gomme), and his various associates. I might point out for the edification of this House that the sovereign state of Ohio, for a great number of years, has flown its students from Kelly's Island, a neighbouring island, to the mainland daily to provide them with proper educational facilities, and I am sure if we read through the Ministerial statements on the equality of education, equality of opportunity, I am sure that he would like to see the programme of his government carried out in relation to the students.

An hon. member: Send cars with chauffeurs.

Mr. Nixon: They have airplanes now.

Mr. Paterson: This is one of the problems that concerns me, and I relate it to the provisions of the bill when I determine that Essex county itself is entitled to 16 members on their board and the view of these special interest problems of this—we will call it remote area in the middle of civilization—it seems that there would be very little chance, or almost impossible, to elect a member to this board on the basis of population or assessment. Plus the fact that it would be a very heavy cost for members of the board to administer over to the island due to the transportation difficulties.

So I would suggest to the hon. Minister that possibly, when this comes before the committee on education, that he consider making an amendment to this Act to designate a 17th member be allowed for the purposes of the board of education of the county of Essex, specifically for the township of Pelee, for at least a transitional period to help them over their many difficulties.

A second point I would like to raise is a principle, and I cannot determine it anywhere within the context of this bill. It is in relation to the schools for retarded children, specifically the Sun Parlor school for retarded children, at Essex. Now as we are all aware, the funds for this come jointly from the province and the county and municipalities and public subscription. But this particular school, serving the county of Essex, is almost at the limit of its facilities. There is the possibility that a new association will be formed to create another school in another part of the county. But, these people are awaiting some direction from the hon. Minister in this regard, and I would appreciate the Minister's comments when he sums up the debate on this particular bill.

I trust I have not overlapped too greatly what has been spoken before, but I thought I had better put forth the wishes of the people of my riding and trust that other members of this House will take the opportunity to do likewise. I am sure the hon. Minister's friend, Mr. Elmer Bell, must have been deluged by innumerable briefs, and I am just sorry that he is not in the gallery here today, to listen to the debate as it proceeds.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Yes, Mr. Speaker, at the risk of being somewhat repetitious, I feel I must make a few brief remarks about the principle of this bill, and the principle about which I talked is the principle of the enlarged school jurisdictions. I feel that this is a good step forward for the province of Ontario. There is one problem, though, that sort of gazes out from the government benches.

An hon. member: A few problems—

Mr. Deans: Actually I see one that strikes me at the moment. There are many problems gazing out, but I think it is an indication of the sort of lack of cohesion within the Cabinet. Here we have the Minister of Education suggesting that we should have enlarged jurisdictions on the county basis, while in the municipal front we are conducting enquiries

and investigations into the possibility of having enlarged municipal jurisdictions not on the county basis.

Mr. P. J. Yakabuski (Renfrew South): What would the member suggest?

Mr. Deans: What I suggest really—if the member is interested, and I really do not believe he is but I will tell him anyway—is that there ought to be a little more talking, a little more understanding between the Ministers of the Crown. It certainly appears to me that they do not get together too often to discuss most things that are of necessity, in order to improve the existing situation in this province.

Mr. M. Makarchuk (Brantford): Maybe they spend too much time in New York.

Mr. Deans: As I said, the enlarging of the school jurisdictions, I believe, is a good step forward and the Minister well knows my position with regard to the area of Wentworth. I had the opportunity of talking with him about it and I hope that he will take under advisement suggestions that were made at that time.

There is one problem, though, that was raised and I think it is something that we should pay a little more recognition to, and that is this problem of those municipalities that have had a fiscal policy that allowed them to pay as they go and not to acquire any great amount of indebtedness. In the process of doing this they have perhaps a larger municipal tax, a larger property tax, realty tax than they would normally have had if this policy had not been followed. These municipalities will have to absorb into their tax structure other municipalities who have perhaps not adopted a policy such as this; municipalities who, by reason of not having a more solid tax base, have had to go into greater debt.

I am quite sure the Minister has tucked away in the background an answer to this problem. I am quite sure that when the time comes he will bring it out. It is unfortunate that he has not taken us into his confidence and brought it out up to now. There is no doubt that we are going to have to somehow come up with a tax grant structure that will equalize the assessment. We cannot expect one municipality to absorb the debt for four or five, and this is what is going to have to happen in this equalization at the present time, as I see it.

The other problem that strikes me, is the one that has been discussed at some length by a great many people here, and that is the fact that those people who have the best knowledge of the educational system just have not been consulted. I feel that if we were going to introduce a programme as large as this, a programme that makes such radical changes to the structure, then we surely must have taken some time to sit down with the people who are most concerned and to discuss the problem, to find out their reaction, to discuss with them the best possible way. It seems obvious to me from the kind of letters I have received or the phone calls I have received and from the comments here tonight, that the people of the province—those who have been faced with the problem of administering education—are not happy.

They are not at all happy with the situation that the Minister places before them, and it is obvious from this that the Minister does not really feel the pulse of the educational system. It is unfortunate, but he does not feel this. Those who administer education in the province at the present moment are very, very unhappy with the prospect of having these boards—

The Minister shakes his head no, but they are. They are unhappy with the prospect of having these boards forced upon them on this basis.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Deans: Very interesting. I always like to hear the comments of my friends from the other side and they have many, many comments and none of them of much value but—

Mr. G. A. Kerr (Halton West): They went to different schools.

Mr. Deans: But the thing is this, that we are taking archaic, outdated boundaries and we are trying to adopt them into a modern system and this cannot be done. It is necessary if we are going to have a modern system that we adopt modern boundaries with the proper tax base, and it seems obvious to me that if we are going to have a modern system with a reasonable tax base, the place to begin was with those people who were charged with the responsibility of administering it up until now. This has not happened to my knowledge. The Minister will, perhaps in summation, correct this impression; it is an impression that has definitely prevailed throughout the length and breadth of this province. I hope, in his summation, that he will point out how, as I said before, we are going to equalize the tax structure.

I hope that he will take into consideration the fact that The Department of Municipal Affairs is, at the present moment, doing something similar to what he is doing, only on a much larger scale, and that they will get together in this matter and come up with something that will be acceptable to all municipalities, for both education and for municipal purposes.

One final comment that I would like to make about the tax structure: I feel that we could have overcome this entire problem of refinancing, of absorbing debts, had the province been prepared to take a good stride forward and accept a greater portion of the cost of education and accept it as a provincial responsibility. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Grey-Bruce.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, the only unfortunate thing—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, the unfortunate thing about this bill, or any other bill before the House which is so important to our people, is that I do honestly feel that for the members of the government, especially the back-benchers, who know the magnitude of this problem and know their own feelings on it, there is something wrong with our process of democracy when they cannot get up and give the House their knowledge on this very important question.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sargent: But the fact was we heard, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Niagara Falls, with his wealth of knowledge accumulated over the years from a lifetime of service for people, spoken in language that the Minister could understand. There are many in the government who know that he is right and who know in their hearts that this bill is iniquitous, but they sit there and look out the window, as it were, when this very important thing is being discussed.

I think that their knowledge should be brought into the fold and for once democracy should work; a bill should not go through which is, in effect, a piece of camouflage. In other words, our leader brought forth a programme to take 80 per cent of the cost of education off real estate and this is another way in which the government is camouflaging the whole issue when they know that they cannot face up to the facts.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order!

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, it is, in effect, another example of where more and more people are having less and less to say about things that are very important to them—things they can measure—their children and their contacts with education. I say, Mr. Speaker, what rights do people have, when almost unanimously the school boards across this province are opposed to this?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sargent: And the members all know this!

Mr. Speaker, I can sum it up this way: The Minister and the Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) would not dare to pull this stunt in an election year. They would not dare do this! They bring it on now and have four years to let it die off, and with it all the bugs in it—and believe me, there are a lot of bugs in it.

Mr. Speaker, I know that most members will have received from your various school boards, letters. This is a sample letter. I received probably 40 or 50 letters of this type, not only from one riding but from different ridings. This is a copy of a letter written to Mr. E. Bell which is self-explanatory.

> The Eastnor township council asked that I send you a copy and request that you, along with the other Opposition members, fight this legislation.
>
> Yours very truly,
> Glen Cameron
> Clerk of Eastnor township

This letter went to Elmer Bell, the president of the Ontario Progressive Conservative association.

An hon. member: The past president.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sargent: It is a pretty stuffy league that he is in—

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Sargent: He says:

Dear Sir:

> This is a letter of protest and extreme dissatisfaction over the recent proposed legislation—

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Minister of Municipal Affairs): You do not have to put them on the record.

Mr. Speaker: Order. Perhaps the Minister will allow the member to complete his remarks.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, anything he says is music. He is a new boy here, so he has to be heard sometime. To continue:

> —regarding the county boards of education in lieu of area boards. Late last year, in his speech one evening, our Premier, the hon. John P. Robarts—

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Sargent: Well, in a lot of areas he is not so honourable tonight, I will tell you that.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

My only point is that I got a copy of this letter and I really do not think it is necessary to put it on the record, but I think it should be pointed out that the copy I received referred to the Premier of the province as the Prime Minister, and I think it should be read that way.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, I will bet the hon. Minister that one of us is—I give you my word that it says, "our Premier". They know the right terminology, too.

Mr. W. G. Pitman (Peterborough): I did not get one.

Mr. Sargent: I will send it over to you after I am through with it. It is not that good a letter, but I will read it anyway.

> —the hon. John P. Robarts issued an ultimatum to his people declaring that in January, 1969 some 1,500 school boards will be amalagamated into about 100. These new boards would consist largely of county boards of education. Since that time, representations large and small have rebuked the Premier and The Department of Education for this proposed new legislation being received by a deaf ear.

These are people across the province who are knowledgeable, Mr. Speaker. This is their business. They come to the Premier and to the department and say, "We do not want this thing to happen."

An hon. member: They get a deaf ear.

Mr. Sargent: It goes on:

> In today's modern society where large area governments, federal and provincial, are holding conferences in joint efforts to work out ways in which they can come to a closer association with the people, this irresponsible attitude of our provincial government is certainly a step in the wrong direction. Our particular area is already a school area board—

An hon. member: Where is that?

Mr. Sargent: This is in Eastnor township, near Lion's Head.

> —representing four municipalities, and as we see it, plenty large enough both efficiently and economically. Anything larger would require full-time directors and representatives which would entail large-scale salaries against our already too-high cost of education.
>
> Mr. Robarts definitely had this new programme implemented before the provincial election last October. Why did he not announce it as part of his platform? With this kind of dictatorial government, it would not be the least bit surprising to hear Mr. Robarts announce one evening that regional government had been implemented and would become legislation at some given time.
>
> Yours for better government,
> The Council of the township of Eastnor, per
> Glen Cameron, Clerk

Mr. Speaker, this is a sample letter that I received from over 50 letters.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: How many?

Some hon. members: Read them all.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, we have other letters showing the difficulty of this being a practical working arrangement in our area because of the great trouble to get across in the wintertime, because of snow conditions.

One thing I am concerned about in our area is that we have a very low economic condition. It is reflected in nearly every phase of the lives of the residents in the Grey and Bruce counties. In education, for example, the counties rank 45 and 49 in percentage of population with university education. The provincial average—and the hon. member for Grey South (Mr. Winkler) knows this—is 6 per cent in the province as compared to 3 per cent in Bruce and 2.8 per cent in Grey. A shocking situation.

Mr. Kerr: This bill will help you—

Mr. Sargent: Well, let me tell you why I am not supporting it; I will tell you why

right now. Mr. Speaker, we have a chap in Wiarton. He runs a restaurant. He is Chinese; a very fine chap. He has three children and there are two in university now and one to go next year. It is costing him right now, this year, about $4,000 more than it would cost a man in Guelph, Stratford or Kitchener or Toronto, because there are no universities near us, and next year it will cost him $6,000 more than it will cost anyone else across the province. This is the kind of situation in that area. It is most inequitable and unfair that we are disregarded up there in every phase of highways, education and hospitals, right down the line.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: We want a university in Wiarton.

Mr. Sargent: We certainly want one near Owen Sound, Mr. Speaker.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sargent: I say, Mr. Speaker, very sincerely in finalizing my remarks in this regard—

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Sargent: You have even got the hon. member for York-Forest Hill (Mr. Dunlop) thumping the desk there, Mr. Speaker. If this is such a good idea, why was it not made permissive, and why was it not made progressive? Mr. Speaker, we have a situation in Port Elgin. We have a million-dollar high school there and they are going to do away with this high school. The debentures are still $300,000 owing on this school, and you are going to do away with this million-dollar high school. The inspector tells the board of education that it is going to be done away with. What happens to people when those engaged in the industry across the province say that they do not want this, and the government says that it does. It is just another case of the age of the big takeover in every area of our economy. Here we have the most important thing, Mr. Speaker, the rights of people. Because they will not have anything to say about what goes on as far as the education of their children is concerned.

I think that it is a—

Hon. W. G. Davis (Minister of Education and University Affairs): That is being a little unfair.

Mr. Sargent: Well, I am trying to be as fair as I can. I would like to see a square deal for our people for a while. And this area of the government making—

Hon. Mr. Davis: A part of this area has already gone into a county board.

Mr. Sargent: Well we have about 100 boards and commissions that are not responsible to the people, and this is almost close to it, but this is not responsible to the average person who has children in school. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: I recognize the member for York Centre.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): As the leader of the Opposition stated we on this side of the House are certainly completely in support of the objectives of this bill. It is difficult to be against equality of opportunity; it is difficult to be against something that will bring in, and permit special educational services in all areas of the province, and it is difficult to be against something that will distribute the tax burden perhaps more equitably if that is what comes from the bill.

But we have to look at what this bill is actually doing. It is actually wresting local initiative and responsibility. It is breaking up many groups and associations of boards of education that are now co-operating, and doing a great job of achieving the ends that this bill is seeking to achieve.

It is threatening new problems, caused by the size of units, where distances are such that problems of communications and of co-ordinations are very considerable. It is also creating another confusion of boundaries. Not that we do not now have county boundaries, but we also have other forces within the government, and departments within the government that are pretending to disregard these boundaries, and tending to consider them outdated and outmoded for many reasons.

The county of York, part of which I represent, has passed a resolution in support of this bill that the board be on county boundaries. But the school officials are strongly divided on the questions of the two boards for several reason.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, why do you not say "two areas within the county boundaries", so that you do not have further confusion?

Mr. Deacon: Now, within the county of York, if it is divided in two the way that the school officials wish, there will be a similar assessment per capita. It would almost be split down the middle as far as population is concerned, but the southern half is faced with problems that are of great concern to those residents within it as well as the northern

residents of the county. For example, last year, in the year 1967, there was a 42 per cent increase in classrooms in that area, and a rather unprecedented explosion in school needs and requirements, which the northern half of the county would have to bear. As you know, the southern half of the county is adjacent to Metropolitan Toronto, with the pressures of expansion and growth that are associated with that area. In the southern half of the county, there has been a group of all the boards co-operating, not only among themselves but also with the separate school boards in achieving many economies and many progressive measures through this co-operation. I believe that we need to take the same care and consideration in setting these boundaries as the government is taking in introducing amendments to legislation and other measures that the Smith committee has recommended.

In the case of the Smith committee, there is a considerable amount of consultation with local authorities being organized. The well set out programme where people know what the objectives are, the times that they are to send in their briefs, and the times for meetings with the Ministers in the departments —and the government can carefully work out I am sure, a well developed programme for introduction of the Smith committee recommendations or whatever part of adjustments or changes are being found necessary. And the government also used some considerable discretion in the introduction of the measures proposed in Bill 54, some years ago.

In the townships of Pickering and Markham, the two townships were divided not into one single township area, but into two areas, and this enabled the two areas, one of which was more rural, and more stable, to work together without having the conflicts that often arise in rapidly developing areas, as opposed to the stable rural areas. In the case of Markham township, this programme of dividing the township into two areas worked out very well. So that after four or five years, the two townships' school area boards were actually planning to come together. It was not a forced matter; it was one which they were doing on their own initiative, after seeing and weighing the advantages of the larger unit.

However, the township of Vaughan used another route. The township of Vaughan decided to co-ordinate their whole township into one school board at one time, and members of that board have told me that they spent five years wrangling between the one side of the township, which was developing rapidly, and the other part, which was more stable. Each had different ideas of what their objectives were, and as a result they did not make nearly the headway that was achieved in Markham township, where these unnatural boundaries were not forced. So I do hope that the Minister will not, Mr. Speaker, insist on these county boundaries. I hope that he will work out, as is suggested in this amendment, a programme of consultation with the educational authorities. We have many matters that this legislaion brings up that need to be considered, and after all, this government has obviously not decided that the county is the ideal unit. It has now proposed in its health legislation that health units will take in several counties, and sometimes very unnatural divisions of these counties.

In the case of planning they are also—certainly in the area around Metro Toronto —covering much more than single municipalities. And in connection with planning, one of the very great problems that face any area which is developing rapidly, is its ability to absorb new residential development, because of our present tax arrangements. They must maintain a proper balance between industrial-commercial assessments and residential assessments. But if we have this new county system, there is no planning control going along with it, which will give the county some control over the development in case one area suddenly goes off at a tangent in residential development, without any industrial and commercial development to balance it.

Perhaps the government will consider following the recommendations of our party for greatly increasing the educational grants which would alleviate this problem—but it is a very important matter at the present time for the government to take into consideration. Planning control must be aligned with the boundaries of these educational units, and I do hope that the government will not only consult with the boards through a carefully worked out programme, such as that proposed in the amendment to this bill, but will also consider the importance of having boundaries not fixed necessarily now, but have a period of adjustment whereby the people concerned can gradually work together of their own free will and not be forced together. You can lead a horse to water but you cannot make him drink.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Kingston and the Islands.

Mr. S. Apps (Kingston and the Islands): Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that when we as a government take a long time to pass legislation we are accused of dragging our heels, and then when we do it more promptly we are accused of not giving it enough consideration. So, regardless of which way we do it we are not going to win anyway as far as the members of the opposition are concerned.

However, I think we should not lose sight of the fact that the basic principle in this legislation is to give equality of opportunity to all the young people in this province and fundamentally this is what this bill is trying to do. I do not think there is anybody that has any argument against that.

The principle of the bill is not to give benefit to the teachers, although they will receive some benefits from it. It is not to give additional benefit to the school boards, and I am sure the members of the school boards who are genuinely interested in education will find lots of opportunity to keep on being interested in education.

Certainly there are going to be problems —nobody is going to deny that at all. Any time that you make any changes such as this there are going to be problems, particularly administrative problems, but I feel that the people on our boards of education who have done such a tremendous job over the past many years, are still going to have the same opportunity to carry on the work that they have been doing, and I think that anyone who is really interested in improving the educational aspects of our young people will have plenty of opportunity to do that even with the enlarged educational districts.

I can understand how there is apprehension among the teachers. I can understand how there is apprehension among the school boards, but I still feel that people of good will, realizing what we are trying to do, will sit down and will have no problem at all in working out the administrative problems that are bound to crop up from time to time, and when these are straightened out I do not think there will be anybody in this province, or in this Legislature, who will not feel that this move, as outlined in this bill, will be of tremendous help to all the young people of this province. I will tell you why and give you a few examples from the area from which I come.

There were two main problems concerning many of the people I talked to. The first was that they felt they were being a little bit further removed from taking an active part in the board of education and thus in the education of their children. Well, this is not so, particularly as far as my area is concerned. At the present time in the city of Kingston we have ten members on the school board. When this bill is completed and the redistribution takes place we will have eight or nine members on the school board, so that the people of Kingston will have approximately the same representation then as they do at the present time. I do not feel that people will be farther removed from taking an active part in education. As a matter of fact they will have a challenge—they will have a greater opportunity. Instead of looking after their own city they will be able to co-operate with people from the county and look after the whole county and in so doing, give those young people there a better opportunity than they are getting at the present time.

Now, take the example of Amherst Island. They had at one time a continuation school up to grade 12 and the students went over to the mainland for grade 13. Their problems of transportation which I have outlined here on many occasions made it almost impossible to get good teachers to teach in that continuation school and the result was that when a young lad or a girl finished grade 12 and went over to get grade 13 in one of the high schools on the mainland, they were over their heads; they dropped out. As a result we lost the potential of the young man who could have, if given the proper opportunity, gone on to higher education. Now this will facilitate young people getting a better opportunity than they have at the present time.

The next one is Wolfe Island, an island that you all know about—we are going to have a bridge over there some day—they have a board of education. They are concerned that they are going to lose the interest that they have when this board of education is amalgamated into the county unit. And they may well be concerned, but really they do not have to be, because whoever is the representative who looks after that particular area. there is no reason on earth why the interested people on Wolfe Island cannot make their views known to their representative just the same as all the people in Kingston make their views known to me in Kingston when things do not go exactly as they think they should.

I think we must realize that in our rural areas particularly, the great majority of the young people who are living and growing up there are going to seek work in our cities and they must be given the same opportunity for education as the people in our urban

areas. Otherwise, they will be outclassed when they get there, they just will not be able to compete with those young people going to school in the urban areas. So I feel that there is a great deal to be said for this proposed legislation. I realize that there will be problems and I think the Minister realized that, but one thing about this Minister is that he is happy to sit down and work out the problems with those people who feel they have them and he has on many, many occasions visited many places in the province to explain what we are trying to do, and once he has done that those people, I think, feel much better about it. The reason I entered into this debate was principally because I felt we were straying a little bit from the basic principle, and that is to give the same equality of opportunity to all the young people of this province. I cannot understand how anybody in this Legislature could vote against that principle; and I think that all the people who are genuinely interested in education for the young people of this province will certainly support this bill, will certainly support this government, and I for one am happy to do so.

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): Mr. Speaker, I find it difficult to understand the reasons of the Minister of Education's Bill 44. In Welland county, there are eight central school boards, including three cities, Niagara Falls, Welland, Port Colborne, with the Peace bridge area board, the Thorold district board, and the Pelham district with a total population of approximately 175,000. The summary of the development of large units of administration states in part:

> to provide for equality of opportunity for every child in Ontario, regardless of his place of residence or other circumstances, now demands that the next step be taken in the long evolution of educational administration in this province. The elected representatives at this level, at the municipal level, and school boards would agree with the stated goal of the proposed reorganization to create educational jurisdictions capable of extending equal education opportunity to the boys and girls in Ontario.

Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, I am going to take a slightly different approach to my debate. In 1792, John Graves Simcoe completed the organization of the province by dividing the four districts into 19 counties, all fronting on the St. Lawrence River, Lake Ontario and Lake Erie. These counties, however, were not intended to provide any form of local government; they served only for the organization of militia, in the election of members to the new assembly of Upper Canada; their importance was provincial not local. By 1800, the four administrative districts had been subdivided and renamed the Eastern, Johnson, Midland, Newcastle, Niagara, London and Western districts. Between 1800 and 1849, due to the increased population growth, these districts were frequently subdivided into the regions north and west of the original loyalist settlements—Oshawa, Dalhousie, Bathurst, Victoria, Prince Edward, Colborne, Simcoe, Wellington, Gore, Talbot, Brock and Huron, making a total of 20 districts.

The statute of The District Councils Act of 1841 was the second milestone on the road of self-government. By its terms a municipality was governed by a council of elected councillors; a warden appointed by the governor; the governor appointed the clerks and treasurers; the new district councils inherited the administration powers of the justice of the peace; the justices were now restricted entirely to judicial functions. In the beginning, the warden and senior officials of the new system were all appointed or approved by the governor; the governor with his many powers could disallow any bylaw within 30 days and could dissolve any district council with the advice and consent of his Cabinet.

In 1846, these restrictions were gradually relaxed and the councils were given full power to appoint their own warden, clerk and treasurer. Rightly or wrongly, the justices have often been identified in the average mind with those of the so-called family compact, the small exclusive group of people who held most of the important jobs of government and business, and who it was believed used the power for their own rather than the public good. Justices were of local administrative purpose; many problems were allowed to go unattended and unsolved; with the increased growth, no progress was made in local government until all the problems of the province were dragged into the public eye of the rebellion of 1837.

In Upper Canada, the rebellion was primarily a rural revolt. One factor which caused dissatisfaction with rural areas was a system of government by judges. As the result of the rebellion, Lord Durham was sent from England to inquire at firsthand into conditions in Upper and Lower Canada. Among other things, he was to report on the form and future of government in Upper and Lower Canada. Lord Durham laid

blame for much of the political unrest on the absence of any system of efficient and proper local government. He pointed out plainly the great weakness of this system that made it necessary to get the legislative approval committee to oversee purely local improvement conditions. In his famous report, Lord Durham warned that a proper system of municipal institutions that could take care of the local needs was indispensable to the peace and good government.

For the larger province of government, he recommended the union of Upper Canada and Lower Canada as a confederation with the Maritime provinces. He insisted that municipal corporations would be absolutely essential, if the union was to be durable and complete.

One man who opposed Lord Sydenham's district councils Act in 1841, for he had more faith in people, was Robert Baldwin, leader of the Reformers, the Liberals of that time. In 1843, Baldwin as Prime Minister, tried to give more local autonomy in municipal government, but his bill died. When his bill was defeated, he resigned in the midst of debate with the governor over the control of patronage and local appointment.

Mr. Speaker, even at this early date in history, the Tories at this time were opposed to any form of local government and fought it desperately. In 1849, however, Baldwin was again leader of the government and he reintroduced his bill to give full municipal self-government. In the Niagara region in 1865, education expenditures absorbed 46 per cent of local taxation. Of the total school costs, the province paid about 47 per cent and the municipalities the remainder, and I might say perhaps this year it would probably be below 47, it would probably be 37.

Judging from the evidence before the review commission—I am speaking of the Mayo report— the main problem of education is inequality in the standards available throughout the Niagara region; that is to say, all children have not equality of opportunity. The educational officials representing the councils of Lincoln and Welland city stated in their brief that the following educational services are being enjoyed by some but not by all.

1. The educational facilities for slow learners, physically handicapped, emotionally disturbed.

2. Psychological and psychiatric services.

3. Provision of consultants in the primary methods, art, music, speech, therapy and reading.

4. Provisions of audio-visual centres, including educational television equipment.

Mr. Speaker, I ask this House: are we moving ahead in this province or are we going backwards? It is not new. County boards of education were established some years ago in the province of Ontario but went by the wayside, and one of the main reasons was that it was out of reach of the people it had to serve. This government has totally refused to accept the many recommendations and briefs from municipalities in the Niagara peninsula on the Mayo report, local government review.

Mr. Speaker, I will read some of this report:

> The public school consultative committee of the Welland county council reports willingness on the part of the school boards in the county to consider larger units of administration. The school boards of Fort Erie, Crystal Beach and the township of Bertie are presently studying the possibility of establishing one board of education for the entire area.

And I might say that this has come into effect this year, where they had the one area school board in the three municipalities.

> It has recently been announced that Lincoln county council has approved a board of education for the town and the township of Niagara. There is no doubt that in accordance with The Department of Education policy the tide is flowing strongly throughout the region in the direction of larger school board areas, the two tier system.

The brief of educational officials, as cited above, said there should be division of regions into a number of sub-units or zones together with the formation of regional boards. They propose that each school zone should have:

1. Equal educational opportunities. 2. Common boundaries for public, elementary, public secondary and separate school education which should, if possible, coincide with the municipal boundaries. 3. Areas small enough to minimize the transportation difficulties and yet large enough to include a school population of not less than 4,000 secondary pupils.

In point of geographical size, it is not unreasonable to bus pupils 25 miles or over,

over first class roads. The larger regional board proposed would establish overall fiscal policies and provide some of the highly specialized educational functions:

1. The curriculum development and co-ordination. 2. In-service training of teachers. 3. Central film and record. 4. School of physical and emotional handicapped.

A Port Colborne board of education brief expressed views not unlike the above, those above on the functions of district boards and regional boards.

The Niagara Falls board of education also prepared a system with a central board and five or six local borough boards in support of larger units and the board quoted Dr. George Fowler.

The advantages of larger size, or if you wish, the reason for the movement towards larger size, are many. There are the advantages of economy of scale. Larger size makes the financial resources of a wider area available for educational service wherever they may be required within that area, and have more economic costs equivalent service. There are advantages of programme and personnel; larger size permits the broader more specialized programme and services than would otherwise be possible. Further, a larger size unit is desirable with widescale planning and co-ordination of educational services. The board suggested that the borough boards might have responsibility for:

1. Instruction and supervision. 2. Maintenance. 3. The financial administration of local services and policy. 4. Purchasing. 5. Attendance. 6. Transportation. 7. School planning and construction. 8. Limited taxation authority beyond the foundation requirements.

The review commission was struck by the co-operative attitude of the separate school boards towards the regional framework of organization for schools. We are also sympathetic to the suggestion that separate school supporters should elect representatives to a board of education. Perhaps another decade will bring this about in Ontario.

So you see, Mr. Speaker, the Mayo report has made none of these suggestions but yet it has not been followed by this government. You can see that the government of today is going backwards over some 125 years. The government wants to have centralized control to remove local autonomy from the municipalities. I can only foresee that education in Ontario will be controlled by the state, out of the hands of the parents, bureaucracy will control our education. I can also see a substantial increase in school taxes at a local level. The Minister has predicted that increasing education costs combined with other government expenditures could bankrupt Ontario.

In the brief submitted by the Peace bridge district school board of education, and I quote from this:

> Throughout the entire booklet on reorganization it is implied that the standard of education throughout the province will be upgraded by the establishment of county boards. We submit, that in many areas the standard will be, in fact, diluted. Many boards, including the Peace bridge district board, have embarked on special programmes and facilities of their own initiative and the proposed merger will most certainly signal the end of these projects as countywide education is levelled to something slightly above the lowest common denominator. For these reasons, this board is strongly opposed to the proposed reorganization of school jurisdictions. We do, however, recognize the goal of the legislation in providing equal educational opportunity as one towards which every board should be striving. It is our belief that this goal can be more effectively reached by one or two approaches.
>
> 1. Permissive legislation and encouragement to enable small boards to amalgamate or at least co-operate on joint ventures to provide special educational services that could not be implemented on an individual board basis.
>
> 2. A study by the government of Ontario to determine the areas of substandard education and take such steps as are necessary to correct the situation by encouragement and/or direction from The Department of Education level.
>
> We, the members of the Peace bridge district school board of education urge that you give serious consideration to the implications of this legislation on the youth of our province and on the principle of self determination by the citizens of this province.
>
> Respectfully submitted,
>
> The Peace bridge district school board of education.

Mr. W. Newman (Ontario South): Mr. Speaker, getting up briefly to talk on Bill 44 tonight, I notice that the hon. member for Grey-Bruce said that he was concerned about

what the back-benchers felt on the government side of the House. And I would just like to—

Mr. Sargent: There is nothing to tell them.

Mr. W. Newman: I would just like to make it clear to him that all his statements here tonight, Mr. Speaker, are not quite right.

I realize, in speaking on Bill 44, on the educational bill, that this bill is not perfect but this bill does show the forward thinking and planning of our great Department of Education and our hon. Minister of Education. He has truly pointed out to us, and to me, that he really wants full equality of education for all the people of the province of Ontario and this is what I think this bill does.

If we are willing to understand and to listen and to realize the purpose of this bill and what he is trying to do for the people of the province of Ontario I think all parties here would be very much in accord. As I said before, this bill is not perfect, but it does lay out many things which we need in the province of Ontario and for the forward planning which this party has done in bringing forward this bill. And, Mr. Speaker, to show you that all the people are not against this new county system of education, I would like to read to you a letter received dated March 26, from the county of Ontario, the southern part of which I represent.

Mr. Sargent: It is the only one you got—one letter.

Mr. G. Demers (Nickel Belt): You would be surprised.

Mr. W. Newman: Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to argue with the member for Grey-Bruce. He read only two letters and he said he had 50. This one is a true letter, Mr. Speaker.

> On March 20, 1968, the council of the county of Ontario passed the following resolution:
>
> Whereas the Ontario county consultative committee has reported favourably on a new educational unit composed of the county of Ontario and the city of Oshawa, and whereas it is the opinion of this council that the cities and separated towns should be included in the larger educational unit, therefore be it resolved that this council supports the Minister of Education of the province of Ontario in his proposed reorganization of school jurisdictions on a basis which includes the cities and separated towns.

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to show you that the fine county that I come from and the part that I represent surely understand what this great government is trying to do for the province of Ontario. Thank you.

Mr. R. H. Knight (Port Arthur): Mr. Speaker, the hearty, hard-fighting, hard-living people from the exciting riding of Port Arthur that I represent did not send me here to throw any bouquets at the government. But, if I had a bouquet of roses here now, I would throw it clear across this Chamber into the lap of the Minister of Education, because I have admired him for some time in his aggressiveness, ability, his youth to move ahead on programmes in education—

Mr. Sargent: Just a good football player.

Mr. Knight: —that the province of Ontario has needed and the current task that he has undertaken is a monumental one and we all know it and that is why I, along with my leader, and other members of this caucus agree in principle with what he proposes. However, I must say that my bouquet would have a string attached to it and if this Minister did not have the good intention and the—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Knight: —and the intelligence to accept the well intended constructive criticism that we, on this side, are trying to offer so that this system will come into being in the proper manner, I would pull the bouquet right back and I would not hesitate.

Mr. W. Newman: You are an Indian giver.

Mr. Knight: He is in a very fortunate position to have others in this House who are also interested in the education of children and are also interested in the wishes of the people that we represent. So I hope—I see that the Minister has listened very attentively to what has been said here today, and I admire him for it. But I hope that he will also do something about it and incorporate these thoughts into his policy. He will not lose anything by it. He will gain much by it because our suggestions are certainly offered in the best of spirit. I have one of my own which is somewhat parochial.

When you start talking about amalgamation up at the Lakehead where I come from,

you are touching on a very sensitive point. Because amalgamation has been floating around in the air up there for some time. When I went to the Lakehead eight years ago, I said it in a few editorials, and I thought that I was going to be ridden out of town on a railroad tie, but things have changed and attitudes have progressed, and there is a much better attitude toward the whole idea of amalgamation at the Lakehead. But with our rural people, they are especially concerned as to whether their rights, the control that they have over their own affairs and their own townships, are going to be usurped.

Believe you me, when the people in the rural townships saw the formula for representation that The Department of Education is proposing for the new single Lakehead board, they had reason to believe that some of the control over their own affairs was going to be usurped because from what I understand the department is proposing 18 members for this board, six from Fort William, six from Port Arthur, three from the separate secondary schools, and only three from the rural area. Now, I understand that the rural area comprises here 22 townships, but they will have only three voices. That would be 15 to 3 on that board. I think that the people under these circumstances who live in rural parts of the Lakehead have reason to be concerned that perhaps under the new board they might not be as well represented as they would like to be.

So, I rise to ask the hon. Minister to reconsider this formula, and in order to close my remarks, and to offer some authenticity to what I have said, I would like to read from the Port Arthur *News Chronicle* of last Saturday, March 30, a story or report on the Thunder Bay municipal league annual convention in which Oliver township council has entered a protest. I dare say that this protest must be in the hon. Minister's hands. The report says, and I read it as it is indicated on the front page of the *News Chronicle*:

> The Oliver municipal council has criticized the representation formula devised by The Ontario Department of Education for the Lakehead regional school board. The council was one of several municipalities to have resolutions endorsed during the final day of the Thunder Bay municipal league's annual convention in Fort William. The regional school board devised by the department is to become a reality by the end of this year. It will combine the school boards of Port Arthur and Fort William and several municipalities, as well as more than a dozen township school boards, into one administration. The boards are to be unified to bring equalized educational opportunity to all students.

We have heard that phrase many times today.

> In its brief, Oliver council says representation from the rural sections which would comprise the Lakehead board, would not allow sufficient representation from the rural areas. Under the scheme, Lakehead cities would have six members on the board, with three representatives from the separate school board, and three members from the remaining rural boards. The resolution, which will be forwarded to the Minister of Education, says that rural members who have greater knowledge of the operation and problems of the rural schools, would not be represented in sufficient numbers.
>
> The township of Oliver voices strong opposition to the department with regard to the proposed redistribution of board members, and recommends that a new formula be devised. Oliver proposed a programme taking into account the size of the area involved as well as the number of boards to be amalgamated. It was suggested that the number of rural members on the board equal that of the combined total of the Lakehead boards.

And that is the end of the quote.

I do not suggest that the number from the rural area should equal the number from the cities, because the population within the two cities is far greater. But I do suggest this: I think that in the past, the rural townships adjacent to Port Arthur, that is to the east and northeast, are more closely associated to the Port Arthur board of education, and those to the west and northwest of the Lakehead have been closer aligned, I think, with the Fort William board of education. I think that it would be fair to propose that there be three rural area representatives from each side of the Lakehead, and I think that this would satisfy them.

I certainly hope that the Minister would reconsider redistribution. I would like to reiterate that regional government of some sort is coming to the Lakehead area, there is no question about it, we are now awaiting the Eric Hardy report, and I think that will probably be released this week if the member for Fort William is correct in the news

releases that he has made at the Lakehead. I hope that he is right because people are very anxious to hear the results. But the way the people react to the recommendations of that report will have an awful lot to do with what The Department of Education does in formulating proper representation in this board.

They are getting an idea here of what the government plans to do. Are they going to retain any say in their affairs or not? And this is the appeal that I make to the Minister, to find some way of helping them to retain some control over their affairs. Thank you.

Mr. N. Whitney (Prince Edward-Lennox): Mr. Speaker, I did not rise to question the last member's remarks. But I did rise on a matter of general principle regarding education. One of the things that I have experienced through the years is the fact that, probably, in the public mind, the people with the highest degrees and the greatest advancement in education are regarded as being the people who know it all. And I question whether that is the case. I have had a situation near a highway where The Department of Highways staff was thinning out a bunch of trees to let the bigger evergreen trees grow, and to make a waterfront visible. But we had professional people phoning in to say that they were murdering trees and doing wrong. They did not know what they were talking about from a practical viewpoint. More than that, we get the educated people who walk down across the sand dunes in Prince Edward county, that were proposed to become a provincial park, for the first time after the announcement, they had never been there before. I do not think that they had seen or heard of it before, but they walk across it and they say that "it should be left in its natural state. You are destroying things." But since the 1930's, The Department of Lands and Forests had been maintaining those sand dunes, and they had been protecting them. They have been building up, and they knew what they were doing. But these experts, these people of great education knew so much. They knew everything. By the same token, the hon. member for Sudbury (Mr. Sopha) will appreciate this fact about wolves. Now there are two types of wolves: there is the timber wolf, written about by Farley Mowat, and there are also brush wolves. Now, I am not going to deal with the timber wolf, I do not know about them and have no comment to offer, but as far as the brush wolf or coyote is concerned, they originated in the prairies, and have spread all across this country. The fact that people say that they kill only for food is a fallacy. I have had nine sheep killed in one night by them, and they do not come back to eat the carcass. They do these things. But these are the experts that you believe. I am going to say that it is a very good thing that in these school areas you are combining your urban and rural municipalities in the county set-up because I am telling you, well maybe, in technical training and one thing or another, the urban municipalities have the advantage right now. There is an awful lot of things that these superior people with the greater education of the cities can be taught by rural people, and I think that it is a good thing that they go out and get some practical teaching instead of carrying on from texts alone.

That is why I say it is good that we should be on a county basis and there should be an equalization across the board, and there should be understanding between rural and urban people, and that mixed members of boards should get together. Why should one township compete against the next township or town for industry? Let us work together for equalization. Some people might get the industry, some might get the housing, but this is a move in the right direction of equalizing costs and opportunity. I am 100 per cent in support of the Minister introducing this legislation in the Legislature.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): That does not do much about wolves.

Mr. Stokes: Mr. Speaker, as I rise to speak in this debate, as a result of the introduction of Bill 44, I think a good many of the previous speakers, have already stated my sentiments with regard to the general principles of the bill. I agree with it and I agree with the objectives and I am somewhat apprehensive whether the objectives, as outlined, in the re-organization of school jurisdictions in northern Ontario, will be attained. It says that the prime objective behind the proposal to establish county boards of education is the desire to provide equality of educational opportunity for every child in the province of Ontario. That is a very commendable goal and it says that at the secondary level a comprehensive school programme incorporating a wide variety of academic business, technical and special vocational courses, leading to all types of further education or to gainful and satisfying employment, is the objective of every board.

In northern Ontario and in the riding of Thunder Bay, in particular, that I happen to represent, this is much easier said than done. I think the Minister is well aware of the geographic difficulties that we experience in northern Ontario and I would like to draw his attention in particular to two municipalities in the riding of Thunder Bay. A very good example is Manitouwadge, which is 130 miles from the nearest school unit, and it has been excluded from any re-organization. I have a letter here with me from the editor of the Manitouwadge *Echo* in which he states his apprehension, his misgivings, about the re-organization and the objectives of the consolidation of school districts.

They are apprehensive, Mr. Speaker, for the simple reason that they do not think they have been given the assurances that are necessary to provide the equality of educational opportunity that this legislation presumably will bring. If, in fact, we are to get the same opportunities for all the people all over Ontario, it is going to mean that this government and this Department of Education is going to have to put enormous sums of money into areas such as Manitouwadge and areas like Armstrong, in order that they may be assured equality of opportunity in the educational field in this province. It is going to be difficult for another reason. At the present time we have to pay competent teachers anywhere from $2,000 to $4,000 a year more to attract them into the more isolated areas of the province, particularly in northern Ontario. This programme is going to aggravate that situation even further, and while I am in complete accord with the objectives of the legislation, and if the Minister can assure the people in the north that those objectives will be attained—and I think they can only be attained by consultation with members of his staff who are responsible for the administration of education—and assure the people of northern Ontario through them that sufficient sums of money, and the necessary planning is done in advance, to give them the assurances of equality of opportunity in the field of education, I for one am going to support the amendment put forth by the hon. leader of the Opposition for one reason, and one reason alone. That is that it go to committee so that briefs and recommendations can be presented to that committee to point out to the Minister and his staff the unusual position that the northern part of this province finds itself in with regard to the huge distances that have to be travelled in providing this education, and the extra sums of money that are necessary to ensure educational equality. I think it is not too much to ask the Minister to refer the bill to committee before a vote is taken on second reading for the reasons that I have put forth.

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): Mr. Speaker, I want to address myself as well to part of the northern problem. I, too, support the principle behind this bill, that it will give equality of educational opportunity to all sections of the province. I think this is probably a relative statement, but it is a step in the right direction, and I think that it will bring improvement to the northern part of the province. One thing I would like to have the Minister assure us is that the present division of districts in Northern Ontario is not going to be rigidly fixed. Because, speaking from my own riding, I think that if the present divisions are fixed, there will not be a furtherance towards equality of opportunity in education—but that there will be, in some aspects, a restricting of it. I think that because the people of the Iroquois Falls-Ansonville area have written me a considerable number of letters and have prepared a brief pointing out that their area is considerably different than the Timmins-Porcupine area and that if this division remains fixed that certain inequalities are bound to take place.

There was a consultative committee at work for some three years in that area. They had certain recommendations to make, but they were not heeded by The Department of Education and I would like to point out how, in some aspects, the equality of opportunity will be impeded by the present district as seen by the people from Iroquois Falls. There will no doubt be a board of some 14 to 16 members, and of these there will be probably two or at the most three from the Iroquois Falls-Ansonville area, and this would mean that their voice would carry not too much weight as compared to say the eight, or nine, or ten from the Porcupine area.

Now the Iroquois Falls-Calvert area has certain drawbacks that make it a little more difficult to attract teachers there. There is a housing problem, and at the present time the board of education is negotiating to construct a certain number of houses for high school teachers who are to come in there. There is a lack of theatres in the area. There are limited shopping facilities; they are cut off from air travel and most of the teachers have to be hired from the south. Now when they come into this area, they become aware of these

conditions and the result is that a higher salary schedule or scale is necessary to hire and to keep a teacher in that area, than it is in the Porcupine. But the minute there is a uniform salary scale in that particular area, then the people will be more inclined to move into the Porcupine, and it will make difficulties for that area.

The kind of area that is there is more in connection with the wood products, whereas in the Porcupine area it is more in connection with mining, and they are concerned that the type of technical education might be influenced too much by the Porcupine area and that the courses may not be to their advantage. They are spending more money now than any of the other areas, and they feel if they have more taxes levied against them in a larger school area, that they will not be benefiting from it.

Now they would like to have the Minister give consideration to dividing the area in two, and have the new board include Val Gagne, Matheson, Black River township, and certain other adjacent areas already served by the Iroquois Falls and Calvert district high school, and they feel that this would give them the educational opportunities that the principle of this bill is attempting to achieve.

I hope that the Minister will give us some assurance that these divisions, as they are now set out, will not be rigidly enforced, but that the recommendation of the consultative committee up there, which was really concerned about this problem, will be given some weight. If this is done, I feel that the principle and intent of the bill will have a much better chance of being achieved in this area than it will under the present conditions.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. E. A. Winkler (Grey South): Mr. Speaker, I wish to say a few words in regard to the bill that is before us. First of all I think that it is significant in the course of the debate that we have not had too many contributions from members of the urban areas. This is simply because they enjoy precisely the type of opportunity for the school population in their area that we are endeavouring to achieve for other areas of the province.

We must recognize first and foremost that it is the student population that is to be served. This is precisely why the bill is necessary. I cannot state from my memory, but certainly on a permissive basis this type of opportunity has been available for a considerable period of time. Consequently, because some areas have taken advantage of it, and others have not, it would seem to me then that some particular move was to be made.

Mr. Sargent: Now you are going to force them.

Mr. Winkler: We have heard quite a number of people in this chamber this evening say that they support the principle of the bill in broad terms. We have heard others come down on the critical side of the question on the basis of the representations that have been made to them. Particularly do I suggest that the contribution that was made by the member for Grey-Bruce had that intonation for me. He referred to the lack of opportunity in our particular area and he referred to the economic status of the area, and yet he would not take advantage of a bill such as this, to promote it for the future benefit of the people who will occupy positions of authority in that particular constituency—

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

Mr. Winkler: —as well as others.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Sargent: Will the hon. member for Grey South point out where it mentions community colleges in this bill? Where is equality of opportunity in this bill? Name one point.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. The member is not to ask a question of the member. Unless he has a point of order—

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, he challenged my veracity, my statements.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Grey South will carry on.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, he mentions the fact that in our area we have equality of opportunity. Now I ask him to name one point in this bill where we have community colleges or equality of opportunity. Name one point.

Mr. Speaker: The member does not have a point of order, he merely has a question of the member speaking.

The member for Grey South will continue.

Mr. Winkler: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is typical of the member for Grey-Bruce. He does not recognize—

Mr. Speaker: Order. The member will please continue his address with respect to the principle of Bill 44.

Mr. Winkler: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The equality of opportunity exists in the terms of this bill. I did not make any reference to community colleges and if in due course—

Mr. Sargent: Yes, you did.

Mr. Winkler: I did not.

Mr. Sargent: The Minister did.

Mr. Winkler: I made no reference to it whatsoever, Mr. Speaker, and I will stay to the course of my remarks but he likes to come down on the critical side of every question. Now, the opportunity here, as I said, Mr. Speaker, is for the student population of the areas which it will serve best—and we are one of them, and there is sufficient flexibility regardless of what the members of the Opposition say in the course of this bill. I refer to section 96 on page 25—

Mr. Sargent: That will cost you a vote.

Mr. Winkler: —which will recognize the present flow of student population beyond or out of the territory of any given county and protect them until the full jurisdiction of the board is in command and then of course it will be their decision.

Mr. Sargent: You are wandering.

Mr. Winkler: Wandering? There is no sense in wandering. You either agree with the principle of the bill or you do not and obviously the member for Grey-Bruce does not want to agree with the principle of this bill. He is not in the aggressive stage of his life. I think he should join some other body.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The humane society.

Mr. Winkler: As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, in his remarks the member for Grey-Bruce made reference to the number of people, if my memory serves me correctly, who attend post-secondary education and suggested that it was a small number. It is my firm belief that the implementation of the terms of this bill will provide a better standard for the pupils that are attending those secondary schools now so that that percentage will in fact increase.

Mr. Sargent: How?

Mr. Winkler: I believe that it is quite a ridiculous thing that we in the province of Ontario—well, maybe you will go back to school and learn.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that in the province of Ontario we can learn from our brothers in this great Confederation, where in the province of Alberta such a scheme has been in effect now for quite a number of years, where in B.C. such a revision has taken place to the advantage of the system, and to the advantage of the students of those particular provinces, and I believe that it is high time that we wake up to the needs, particularly in the rural areas, of the students, in this 1968 era. I believe that the member for Kingston and the Islands had his finger on the nub of the question, so that we can prepare them for that with which they will be faced when they leave secondary school, whether it is to a higher standard of education, or whether it is a qualification they receive at that level of their academic life. Certainly the terms of this bill are bound to bring into being a system where many of the pupils who find themselves dropouts now in the grades from 10 to 13, will be better qualified and make a more useful contribution on the Canadian scene.

I think that in the area of responsibility, Mr. Speaker, those who vote against the terms of this bill, are endeavouring, not only to act in a political sense, but to put in jeopardy the lives of people who can be more useful than they are under the present system and I would like—

Mr. Sargent: You are talking complete nonsense.

Mr. Winkler: That is your view but you view everything nonsensically. Mr. Speaker, I want to conclude my remarks by quoting from Sir Edmund Burke who made this statement some 200 hundred years ago, when he said—

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): You are improving.

Mr. C. G. Pilkey (Oshawa): You are moving up.

Mr. Winkler: That was an intelligent contribution too.

Mr. Pilkey: You are talking like a real early dropout.

Mr. Winkler: What did you leave for?

Certainly gentlemen it ought to be the happiness and glory of a representative to live in the strictest union, the closest correspondence, and the most unreserved communication with his constituents. Their

> wishes ought to have great weight with him; their opinions his high respect; their business unremitted attention. It is his duty to sacrifice his repose, his pleasure, his satisfactions to theirs, and above all ever, and in all cases, to prefer their interests to his own. But his unbiased opinion, his mature judgment, his enlightened conscience, he ought not to sacrifice to you, to any man, or to any set of men living. These he does not derive from mere pleasure. No, nor from the law and the constitution. They are a trust from providence for the abuse of which he is deeply answerable. Your representative owes you not his industry only but his judgment, and he betrays instead of serving you if he sacrifices it to your opinion.

And I hope, Mr. Speaker, that providence will guide all members of this House to use their good judgment.

Mr. Kerr: Mr. Speaker, I would like just to add a few words to this debate and then no doubt the hon. Minister will wind it up.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that Bill 44 is the greatest step in educational reform since Ryerson. As has been said over and over again, Mr. Speaker, the main objective is to improve the quality of education in our province, and particularly in special courses in those areas in the north, and the rural areas where they are not available now—where highly trained teachers and instructors are necessary, and they are not available now.

I think it is no secret that most rural students at present in our rural schools will be competing in urban areas for jobs, and they will be competing with young people who have been educated in towns and cities, where at the present time they are getting a better quality of education.

I suggest also, Mr. Speaker, that the teaching profession will not be adversely affected by this bill. I do not see how they could be. How does the reorganization of school jurisdictions detrimentally affect school teachers? Is it because possibly they will deal with less boards? Surely the teachers are interested in a high quality of education, and certainly their services will be more in demand than ever. Why not county school boards? I cannot understand why there is such an objection to this. What other boundaries would you use? Certainly we cannot take a little bit of one county and a little bit of another county and come up with a school jurisdiction. Can you imagine the howl and the criticism?

Mr. Deans: Why not?

Mr. Kerr: Well, who would draw the boundaries? How would you agree to these boundaries? Would you take 117 members and decide where the boundaries would be? What is the matter with the county boundaries that have been in existence for 100 years, Mr. Speaker, with the whole apparatus of a county to work with?

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): This is not my idea of regional government.

Mr. Kerr: Certainly, it is regional government.

There is another facet of this bill that has not been mentioned too much; as a matter of fact it might be a secret to most hon. members, and therefore I will tell you what it is. In my opinion the elimination of approximately 1,300 school boards will mean that there will be a great saving in money. Now I think this should appeal to most hon. members.

Many hon. members irrelevantly, I think, in this debate, have talked about the high cost of education. Certainly this bill will mean economy; it will mean less school boards and less people involved in the administration of our educational system. Now I do not say, Mr. Speaker, that the cost of education will not continue to rise. But what I do say is that the rise will not be as great if we have a reorganization of our school boundaries.

I think the provision in this bill whereby the school boards' tax bite will be made quite clear to the taxpayers on their tax bill—either separately or in conjunction with the municipal bill—will make it clear to the taxpayer what education is costing, and I think it will help trustees to sharpen their pencils. Moreover, most municipal councils will not be subject to the unfair criticism that they are receiving at the present time as far as education costs are concerned.

Now the Opposition, Mr. Speaker, particularly the hon. member for Downsview, has criticized us over and over again for not moving fast enough in the field of regional government, of municipal reform. Well, this is the greatest step in municipal reform—

Mr. Singer: You force me into the debate.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Kerr: You cannot entirely separate municipal reform and regional government from the reorganization of school boards and school administrative units.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Kerr: You cannot. It is the first obvious step in municipal reform. I think you can use it as a form of a guinea pig, and I am sure it will be a successful one.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Kerr: That is my personal opinion. I think the hon. members of the Opposition have to make up their minds whether they are for reform—municipal reform—whatever you want to call it—or not. In my opinion this is a form of planning—regional planning that we have been talking about in this House year after year, certainly since 1963, and I think if you are for this type of planning you are for progress, high quality of education, and economy, and you will support this bill.

I do not think, Mr. Speaker, the local autonomy is an issue. I cannot see how there will be any less influence at the local level. There will be fewer school boards, but there will be representation from all areas of the province, and possibly that school board, because it is larger and representing a larger area and more people, will have more power. So I would not worry about local autonomy. I do not think it is an issue. Quality and efficiency are an issue, therefore this means economy.

One final secret, Mr. Speaker, is that the overwhelming majority of people in this province who are connected with education—school administrators, directors, the professionals—are all in favour of this legislation. I suggest that the hon. members of this Legislature vote against the amendment that has been proposed. I do not think the debate on the principle of this bill at this stage makes this amendment necessary. As a matter of fact, I think it is irrelevant. This amendment can be effectively dealt with when we get into committee, when we discuss the bill clause by clause.

I would like to conclude, Mr. Speaker, by saying that in spite of all the moaning and groaning, waxing and waning, I think all the members in this House really believe that this is good legislation, and will eventually support it.

Mr. Speaker: The member for St. Catharines has the floor.

Mr. R. M. Johnston (St. Catharines): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of this bill that has been so feebly attacked by this group of people bogged down by parochialism and dragging their feet across this floor.

I have listened with interest, Mr. Speaker, to the first four words uttered from every speaker across this room: "We support the principle." But they are bogged down, and I repeat, parochialism.

Mr. Sargent: What does that mean?

Mr. R. M. Johnston: We will tell you some day, Mr. member for Grey-Bruce.

May I say this—along with the parochialism, the small thinking, we even had a suggestion made earlier this day with a lack of courage tingling from that phrase to "phase in" this amalgamation of school boards throughout this province—an utter lack of courage.

Mr. Pitman: Nonsense! Orderly development requires more courage.

Mr. R. M. Johnston: The truth hurts, my friend. And may I suggest, Mr. Speaker, speaking of parochialism and I know from where I speak—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. R. M. Johnston: Have fun, boys, I am with you, all night if you choose to stay here.

May I repeat, I know from where I speak. The small thinking that went on in an area, a great part of this province, the Niagara peninsula, the focal point of that peninsula, the city of St. Catharines, an amalgamated area, six or seven years ago, when people talked like some people across the floor tonight, where the statements were made that in that small town, the former town of Port Dalhousie, that I had the privilege of representing for so many years, the statement was made that that town would never be represented on that city council. That person became the mayor of that community, and those people saw fit to send him here tonight. And if you think that you have a battle on now within yourselves, that was the battle of the century. It still goes down in history.

May I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that we get away from the small thinking. Time after time, member after member, for the past few weeks suggest that this government does not move. Here we are moving, and I pay tribute to the Minister of Education and I believe we should all stand and salute him for his courage for bringing this bill—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. R. M. Johnston: That is fine with me. —for bringing this legislation before this group in the interests of the true small people. We hear such things as small people; there is no

such thing as small people, but we are looking after the children, and this for their betterment.

Just as soon as this legislative assembly gets down to business and passes this legislation and gets on with the job as compared to the delaying action, the small thinking, it will be better in the service of all the people of this province.

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Speaker, I intend to address myself to a rather narrow segment of this debate, which may nevertheless be the Achilles heel of the Minister's programme. The area in question is the separate schools of this province. The legislation does not directly effect the separate schools, as it stands, for constitutional reasons, but the separate schools in this province for many years have considered themselves to be put down, not to be given their fair share and just rights within the province and this particular legislation very well could be the death knell of the schools as such.

I will even go so far, Mr. Speaker, as to say that if the hon. Minister had devised by design aforethought, a means whereby to destroy the separate school system in this province, he—

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Oh nonsense. Shame.

Several hon. members: Shame, shame.

Mr. Lawlor: —he could not have taken more venal measures. The separate schools have attained their rights under The Scott Act of 1863 and they are entrenched rights under The British North America Act. They have been affirmed time after time by the courts and the legislation in its ramifications can have no other effect but to detrimentally upset that whole equilibrium as I shall prove in due course.

Mr. Winkler: You do not know what you are talking about.

Mr. Lawlor: The very basis of the Minister's entering into this scheme, the animadversions made by various members throughout the day about the lack of consultation by the Minister and this government with respect to the schemes which they do introduce, a fair theory of democracy, I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, would call into assembly, and would call into consultation prior to the bringing down of legislation, the interested parties involved.

I know that that sort of thing may be an irritation to the Minister. It may delay legislation. It may be a bore to have to consult with those affected. Nevertheless, such is the regime under which we live, such is the democratic principle, I suggest, as it comes into view and into greater recognition in our time. And whatever the irritations may be, perhaps in the future you on the other side of the House, who have the power to dispose of the rights and privileges of the individual, would consider giving that individual some say before you did so, before you introduce your *faits accomplis,* before you introduce your half-baked measures based upon arbitrary schemes without having made proper consultation with the individuals most likely affected.

I wish to refer first of all, before launching into the brief of the Ontario separate school trustees association, which has been submitted to the Minister on March 29, I just wish to read a bit of a column from "Help Wanted" by Ron Haggart in the Toronto *Daily Star* of October 25. I will not read the question. Haggart in reply to the question said, Mr. Speaker:

> Catholics may choose which school system they want to support but non-Catholics cannot. This often works to the disadvantage of the separate school system. Frequently for example, non-Catholic fathers in a mixed marriage send their children to the Catholic schools but pay their taxes to the public school system. The separate schools accept the children but get no money to pay for their education. The same thing frequently happens—

An hon. member: That is a great source.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Who would you prefer, Lubor Zink?

Hon. T. L. Wells (Minister without Portfolio): Yes, rather than Ron Haggart.

Mr. Lawlor: Would you please be quiet and listen?

—when a non-Catholic person—

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. When the Speaker asks for order, all members will please resume their seats.

Now, I am not too well acquainted with the bill, but I do not find—

Mr. Sargent: You have not missed anything.

Mr. Speaker: I am not sure that the member is speaking to the principle of the bill and I would ask him to indicate that first so that he may then put this ancillary matter in.

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Speaker, I feel I am. I am giving background material leading into this county system.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): More relevant than the member for St. Catharines.

Mrs. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Or brush wolves and other related matters.

Mr. Lawlor: Yes, I think it is rather more relevant than other things, Mr. Speaker.

> The same thing frequently happens when a non-Catholic parent in a mixed marriage separates and obtains custody of the children. The separate school system takes the children but there is no way the non-Catholic parent can pay taxes to support the separate schools. Mrs. Leona Kennie need not worry too much about the bill from the separate school board. R. J. Bergen, senior assistant superintendent, told Help Wanted, "no people have ever been removed from a Catholic high school because his parents were unable to pay the fees. We may hound them for the fee, but we never threaten them with removal of their children." It is of course highly unusual for the separate school system to accept pupils when no one in the family is Catholic. Normally it does not happen but Mr. Bergen assures us Mrs. Kennie's boys will get their education, taxes or not.

That is the sort of thing in the background that goes on in the inequity of the grants, and in the general disposition by this government and by the Minister of Education, of the separate schools. It gives an inkling of what the mentality is.

Now, the brief of the Ontario separate school trustees association, on the whole—how can you help it—accepts the principle of the county units with grave reservations; and, on reading the brief carefully, transmogrifies the creature.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lawlor: In other words, they say that it does not work, it does not fit their purposes, it is not tailored to their needs. The thing on the whole, according to their own text, is completely reformulated. They cannot adapt themselves to it. It just does not work and it is in the process of destroying their system. They are too nice to say so and when they are offered a half-baked scheme, since they are in favour of larger units to start with, they recognize the specialized needs and economic benefits to be derived. At the same time they think that these peculiar units are set up arbitrarily and, as they put it, they are mandatory county units imposed by the Minister upon their heads. And so, they go on, on page 8, to revert to something called an adapted plan, and they are going to have to do some squirming and wriggling in order to adapt themselves to the efficiencies and perdilections of the Minister in this regard.

Now the Minister, everyone knows, is one of the most vital, energetic and imaginative people in this House. Why on earth can this Minister with all that imagination not come up with something that happens to have a bit of imagination in it? The thing is completely devoid of any imaginative instinct. It sets up county units which are over 100 years old as the basis for his establishment.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Just what has this—

Mr. Lawlor: I cannot hear you Mr. Minister.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I am just very curious what the hon. member is trying to determine. I understood he—

Mr. Lawlor: The issue, Mr. Minister, will go on for a while yet. You will learn in due course—part of your education.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, I would just have to point out, in fairness to the other members of the House—

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Minister, at the moment I do not accept questions.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —who have not had an opportunity, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Lawlor: I am giving all the answers.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order—on a point of order, I think the hon. member wants to be fair to the other members of the House. Article 25 of the brief says very specifically: not only would a mandatory procedure be in harmony with this normal growth but it would also flow from the central responsibility of the provincial government for all education in the province. This is what they specifically say in the presentation to the government and I think, in fairness, the hon. member might bring that to the attention of the members of the House.

Mr. Lawlor: I dare say, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister is quite capable of taking—

Hon. Mr. Davis: I will read it all—

Mr. Lawlor: You may read the whole brief to your chagrin and disillusionment—

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): Now you are transmogrified.

Mr. Lawlor: The fact of the matter is that the Catholic trustees association are deeply disturbed and radically in disharmony with your proposals in this thing, the whole constitutional set-up of the separate schools. How do you work the business of a three-mile limit, which is written into the statute in The Separate Schools Act, into this scheme? I want to refer the Minister, in that regard, to section 49 of the Act—and he well knows that one cannot become a separate school supporter of that particular separate school unless he lives within three miles. Here you are diversifying units. The Catholics cannot get within your Procrustean bed; either that or they are going to be stretched to death.

If the good Minister will look at page 11 of the brief, section 29, he will see what they have to do to accommodate themselves to his dirigations, or whatever they are. There are ten units here out of the southern part of the province which they had to bring together in what they call county-combined boards. Grey-Bruce is brought together, Frontenac, Lennox and Addington—

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): No more big words—wait till I get "Procrustean".

Mr. Lawlor: —Hastings and Prince Edward, Peel and Dufferin, Norfolk and Haldimand. They have to go through the whole works of the county units bringing these county units into some kind of unity. When they get down to the former Glengarry and Stormont counties to be operated as separate units—split away from Dundas. The former Prescott and Russell counties to be operated as separate units. Oxford and Elgin to be brought together. Perth and Huron to be brought together. A whole slew of them to be brought together; they simply cannot accommodate themselves to what you have set out here—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I do not want to interrupt the hon. member. I have heard him for many years, on many ocasions with very lucid dissertations that sometimes are relevant and sometimes are not, and with great respect I suggest that these remarks are not relevant. We are discussing the principle of the bill to establish boards of education on a county basis in the public school system and there is nothing inherent in the legislation that says that the separate school system must conform to the same guidelines that exist for the public school system. That has not been historically the position in the province of Ontario and it is not the position as far as this legislation is concerned. This is why, Mr. Speaker, this brief was presented. We asked for their views and recommendations and I am sure the hon. member is well aware of this fact. To try and compare what is being suggested here with the general principle of what we are discussing in Bill 44, Mr. Speaker, I say with the greatest of respect, really is not relevant and I think the hon. member must know this.

Mr. Lawlor: That is just the rub, Mr. Speaker. That is just the rub—that is just the point, it is terribly relevant. You are presenting the separate school with a *fait accompli.* You have laid down your terms and in doing so—

Hon. Mr. Davis: That is just the point, we have not.

Mr. Lawlor: —in doing so, your Act also—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Speaker, if I may, I will speak to the matter of relevance right now.

In concert with the Minister's white paper—in several sections of the white paper—there are sections setting out how the Catholic school system may operate within this scheme and may not operate within this scheme, and he set up a torture chamber in which those Catholic schools are going to find it very difficult. He invites them to operate within this scheme. The point is that the scheme, once in operation, will force their hand. They have no alternative. They must bring themselves into accommodation with this thing and at the same time it does not accord with their best interests so to do.

As I pointed out in the brief which is a relevant part of this document—which is central to the argument tonight—I would refer the Minister to his own brief on page 9 where he speaks about the ward system for separate schools. Again he speaks on page 18 of the separate school system and brings up the legal problems. The legal problems, namely, being that within your scheme it is extremely difficult to accommodate section 49 of The Separate Schools Act and the three-mile limit within the ambit of the scheme and secondly, that their problem, with respect to setting up new school units is deeply dis-

advantaged. Nothing is provided for within the scheme of your legislation on the public school model—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, Mr. Speaker, apart —with great respect again—apart from the mandatory provision which is the one that has upset some members opposite, under the existing legislation for the separate school system quite frankly, there is nothing technically to prevent the entire separate school system in the province of Ontario from forming one single board, if they so desire, by the combination of zones and the principles that were enunciated in the separate school legislation. This, in fact, can be done. And I think what the hon. member is saying, with great respect, Mr. Speaker, not only is irrelevant it is contradictory and does not factually present the information to the members of this House. And I think, Mr. Speaker, on a matter of this importance that really should be debated if legislation is to come forward relating to the separate school system, this is the relevant time to do it.

Mr. Lawlor: You have already prejudged the whole separate school system in this legislation.

Hon. Mr. Davis: We have not prejudged—

Mr. Lawlor: If the school system is to be at any time defended, it must be defended now or never.

Mr. Speaker: Order. Order. The member for Lakeshore certainly at times, in my opinion, has been in order but he is not in order when he is discussing the separate school system as a school system. If he wishes to discuss the impact on it generally, of the principle of this bill, because the separate school system is mentioned in the bill, I think he is order. But he certainly is not in order carrying the debate to the end that he has been doing. So, I would ask him that he confine himself to the matters of principle of this bill as it affects the matter that he is discussing.

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Speaker, in section 27 of this brief, it reads as follows:

> In working out the new larger units for separate schools, it was felt that if the board—

Mr. Speaker: Order. The Speaker did not request the member just to continue reading the brief and dealing with the matters he was dealing with. He pointed out to him, and I do so again, that many of the matters which he has raised are not matters in connection with this bill or its principle at all. Now, would the member take a moment and reconstitute his thoughts and get back on the principle of the matter and stay there?

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Speaker, my thoughts are reconstituted. I am talking—"In working out the larger units—"

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Transmogrified.

Mr. Lawlor. Did not Mr. Speaker hear me say "in working out the larger units," the very units that are being discussed here. What else could it be? It is the most relevant thing to the matter I can think of. If I may, Mr. Speaker:

> In working out the new larger units for separate schools, it was felt—

Hon. Mr. Wells: Out of order.

Mr. Lawlor: To continue:

> —it was felt that if the boards presently within a county were merely expanded to take up all the territory not only would this embrace needlessly non-organized space, which is just as relevant to the public school system, it would also infringe on the right to the establishment of future new boards. For much the same reason we had to take into consideration present boards, often united, which overlapped county lines. We were concerned about the relationship between trustees and ratepayers which is more intimate in the system. We feel that this problem can be met without prejudice by having the maximum permissible number of trustees elected on a ward-like basis. A consideration of the general nature of the county plan, as applied to most of our boards, made it clear that the advantages sought for would require in some instances, that the boards of more than one county be combined, that in a few cases an exceptional arrangement be made in view of the language situation and finally that three major urban centres be declared school zones.

What it comes to is this, that if the Minister, instead of setting, of taking, completely unimaginatively, the existing pattern of counties in Ontario, and having everybody force themselves within its confines, had proceeded on a pragmatic basis, in consultation with the people involved to find the natural organic, and geographical regions, and which boards might formulate themselves—forget the map, you draw the lines—there then would have fallen into place the various

organizations. It would have taken more time and trouble. That is what you are being paid for. Over and above that, then you would have got units which were organic, functioning units instead of the truncated animal that we have got today. We were gradually phasing out the whole county structure, getting rid of that. Now you are reaffirming it, now you are bringing it back, and giving it emphasis and stress, the whole concept of regional government as it was beginning to develop, ploddingly as it may be, Stygian as the darkness was in the minds over there, nevertheless, there were little gleams of light in the distance, and with that we felt none of the Ministers ought to be reaffirming the antediluvian; and for you of all people, Mr. Speaker, shocks us. We would think, and expect better of you, sir. But in any event, I say that the matter might have been taken rather more piecemeal, and pragmatically in devising these units, and that then you would not have the numerical, financial, monetary, and other discrepancies with which you are faced today. Some having 2,000, and some having 16,000 students. Surely the grossness of the situation must have struck home. And if your investigatory staff had spent any time at the thing before coming up with this rather arbitrary scheme, you—

Oh, the hon. member has left the House. He can see that I am not going to speak too well of the county system; that if your investigatory staff had come up with a more reasonable, intelligent, and consultative scheme, then the problems faced by the separate schools in this province as a result of this legislation would not have to be met.

Mr. Speaker: Did the member for Downsview wish to participate?

Mr. Singer: Not for a moment or two. I will give way to my colleague.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): Mr. Speaker, the hour is getting late and I might say that I have a lot of material to work with, and most of it is material that I have gained over the last number of years in my background in working with local school areas through our own municipal councils, and I might say, Mr. Speaker, we have excellent education facilities for all people, all pupils, and I might say that I have been very happy to have had some part in seeing that our area has had these. We, of course, are helping to pay for them, and we expect to do this. I think that there is one thing. I often think of the first composite school that we were asked to approve in our area, and there was an awfully large expenditure, and the federal government, and the provincial government, were sharing in the cost, and I think that one of the fellows hit the nail pretty well on the head when he said it is like giving a fellow an elephant, and then you have to feed him. And we are finding out now, now we have the school, that our tax structure is getting rather unbearable now that we have to feed him. But we do have fine educational facilities for our children, and this we are quite happy about.

I might say that it is not perfect though, Mr. Speaker, but everything is not perfect, I guess, and I think that the famous school plan—we might call it the Robarts plan for directing you on certain levels of education—has not turned out 100 per cent perfect. We have had occasions where we have had people, directed by people who should know, I guess, in placing these pupils. But they directed them in certain lines of education, and after they got to the end of that line, they found out that they were not suitable for that line, and where do they go from there? So, we have problems in that, too, so that it looks like they are going to have to go back a year or two, and start back where they should have been the first time. So it is not all that simple to make up a plan that is going to work completely.

I might say that with regard to the announcement of this plan last fall, it was rather odd, I think. I, myself took it to be a little strange, because coming from the Premier at that time not too many years ago, I had occasion to deal with the then Minister of Education, in 1961 through my good offices in the local council. Our council passed bylaws 2106 and 2107 for the instigation of a new central school in our township, including nine small school areas into one large one, and we happened to send the bylaws to Toronto for approval. Of course there had been, years before that, an upheaval and so forth, and everyone had this problem, and we had it as well. But we got things settled down, and the council passed the bylaws, and put them all into one area, because the people had voted for a new central school, and lo and behold, the hon. Minister sent the bylaws back unapproved. So there we were, authorized to build a new central school, but with two small schools sitting right in the middle of the township with the buses going back and forth picking up kids on each side, and no, these two were going to stay by themselves.

Well, I do not know, I guess that the hon. Minister, at that time, had different thoughts than he had in Guelph, when he said that they are all going to be in the county area. I do not know, it appears that way.

Mr. H. Worton (Wellington South): That was in Galt.

Mr. Ruston: But anyway, I will say that the hon. Minister at that time—

Mr. Worton: We always like him to come, though.

Mr. Ruston: —agreed to listen to some representation, and since I was the only—I do not know—the foolish one or what not, in the council, I wrote to him by registered mail and asked if I might talk to him over our problems.

I might say that they responded promptly and I was allowed to have an audience with him—with, I believe, three of his deputies and they were very cordial. Four of them to one and I might say that we did get along very well and after my return home I found that the hon. Minister did approve one of the bylaws, but still left one of the schools out. So we went ahead with the new school and about a year later, through strong representation by some political friends who had the right side of the party on their side, I guess we got things back to normal. Now we are going along fine. We have a wonderful new school and we are quite happy.

So we have to work at these things to get them done, and I might say that I have enjoyed my work in seeing that we have proper education. I, myself, have four children who have been going to all these schools, so I know a little bit about what it is like. There is only one thing that bothers me a little; sometimes when they do graduate some of the pupils cannot always find employment —but thanks to some of our good federal government legislation there is ample employment in our area through some new factories being built.

Now, just to be as brief as I can, here, I made a short speech, Mr. Speaker, of about two minutes, but I felt that it would not be ample for my feelings and I may go down to the text of it now and then wander back a little bit on some other things.

And the consolidation of all school boards in the county—in the one county board could very well mean that many children now travelling to township central schools for up to one hour on a bus may find themselves travelling twice this distance as the policy of larger units is carried out.

The larger units of administration do not guarantee equal sharing of costs and this alone is one of the basic faults of this bill, as it does nothing whatsoever to have all segments of our population sharing in the costs of giving everyone the opportunity to have the best of education. If we take the county assessment as a whole and the total cost of education in the county and *pro rata* on a tax basis on a farm in Essex county, I will quote here, a school tax rate on a 200-acre farm with suitable farm buildings is $928.

Mr. Speaker, this is appalling—$928 of tax whether you make a single dollar of taxable income. It is high time this government either controlled the spiraling cost of education by stopping the unnecessary frills in school construction, and at the same time assume a larger share of this cost in forcing all segments of the economy, especially the very people that have benefited from higher education with their ability to earn a higher income.

Mr. Speaker, I doubt very much if extra large units are as economical as we are led to believe. I notice in the report of the Ontario association of school business officials on a four year study of costs per pupil, the most economical units operated under a school board are listed for 1965. The average daily attendance of 1,500 to 3,000 elementary schools is shown at $365 per pupil and it goes up to $370 per pupil with an average daily attendance of from 3,000 to 6,000 pupils. It then goes up to $444 per pupil when the average daily attendance is over 6,000 pupils, so bigness is not necessarily less costly.

The secondary academic school costs are $747 per pupil with average daily attendance of 1,500 to 3,000 pupils, and with over 3,000 pupils the cost per pupil goes up to $772. We notice that it does not vary so much in the secondary schools—the cost does not vary so much as you get a little larger.

Secondary vocational schools cost per pupil with the average daily attendance of 1,500 to 3,000 pupils is $751, and in similar operations with over 3,000 pupils these costs go up to $945—$195 more.

So, Mr. Speaker, we are going to increase the cost of education to the already overburdened land and home owner with this proposed bill. I say if we are going to advance our education, and I am for advance of educa-

tion, we must advance our method of paying the cost and at the same time this bill does not do this.

Retarded school associations are not included in this bill and this phase of education, I believe, should be included in education as a whole. The present method of financing these schools leaves much to be desired. I know in our own case we got a grant through the city council and I happened to be on there at the time. We arranged to have this paid by the county council plus the grant from the provincial government. And then each municipality is billed for each pupil attending.

There are a few things in the bill, Mr. Speaker, that I am a little worried about. One is the arbitrators—section 84, 3 and 7. If a municipality has a new school they just built two years ago and have a large debenture debt, they go into the county area. In an adjoining municipality or some other place that built a new 30-room school, are the people that built it going to have to pay part of their own as an arbitration figure or accept the liability?

These things are a little bit vague at the present time. And the tax demands, they say, shall be sent out with regular municipal tax demands as long as they show a separate amount. Well, this is fine. We show a separate amount now, so really that does not mean anything there—I mean we have no objections to that. I think anybody that can read how much a total tax demand is can read how much the school taxes are, so I do not think that that means very much.

Section 86, paragraph 8, has some things into it that I am a little worried about, but I think that when the proper time comes, when this goes through section by section, we can take care of these. But I just want to say, Mr. Speaker, that I appreciate the opportunity to speak on this bill and my record shows I have been in favour and I have worked hard for progressive education, but if we are going to have progressive education we must have a progressive method of paying for that cost.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to unnecessarily prolong this debate. However, I think I should register a strong protest for myself and my constituents of Rainy River district against the manner in which this bill has been presented to us. It has been presented to us as a *fait accompli*; we hear through the press that we are going to have this regional system of education.

Now this, Mr. Speaker, is contrary to all aspects of democracy. The people most concerned, the school boards and through them the parents, and the people that are going to be educated were not consulted on this bill. And this, Mr. Speaker, I believe is a prime example of the arrogance of this government. It is a misuse and abuse of the power of government.

I believe that the government can still rectify this mistake in not consulting those people most intimately involved in this particular bill, by first sending this bill to the committee of education before second reading takes place. Thank you.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I just have a very few remarks that I want to add in this debate. I am concerned about the government's lack of intention, apparently, to co-ordinate regional organization. Now this fact has been stated and repeated during the course of this debate.

We have looked for guidance, as you know, sir, to the Premier's various announcements about plans for tomorrow—design for development—and then when the Premier spoke in the Throne debate he was going to explain how this was evolving. Unfortunately, the method of working these details out never has quite come forward. My colleagues have described the many, many different systems of organization that we have in this province and now we are adding yet another one.

I would have thought, sir, that when Carl Goldenberg brought in his report dealing with Metropolitan Toronto, and when he made the somewhat unusual recommendation for educational reorganization, that the government might have learned a lesson about that kind of suggestion in view of the public outcry that arose at that time.

You will recall, sir, that Mr. Goldenberg suggested a borough system for Metropolitan Toronto, but an educational system that had no relationship whatsoever to those boroughs. And I vividly remember the hon. Minister without Portfolio, from Scarborough, rushing out the chamber and telling all who wanted to listen that this was the greatest educational reform he had ever seen. It was only a few weeks later, after public opinion caught up with him, that the present Minister without Portfolio, along with his colleagues, began to draw their horns in. Because they recognized, in the largest city in the province, where there was an ability to muster public opinion through the newspapers and through the close access of those

persons concerned with education and municipal administration, that this just could not and would not work properly.

It was only at that time, sir, that the government discarded the recommendations put forward by Mr. Goldenberg and adopted a borough system of education which had the same relationship to area boundaries as the new boroughs have. The Minister was interjecting "that is not right"—the Minister knows that it is right because that recommendation of Goldenberg's, when it came forward, was hailed by others as well as the member for Scarborough at that time.

And it was only when public opinion rose to the extent that there was a near revolution in this metropolitan area from trustees and from ratepayers and from the municipal politicians, it was only then that they drew their horns in and changed the whole plan. And I know, and I am sure the Minister knows with me, where those suggestions of Goldenberg's came from in the first instance and I would suggest that he should have learned the lesson, because the same sources that evolved this scheme, I would suspect, evolved the recommendations that the Minister now brings forward.

Hon. Mr. Davis: That is entirely wrong.

Mr. Singer: The hon. member for Halton earlier today suggested that I had spoken many times in this House about regional government and this is quite true. I have been very critical in my remarks addressed to the government because they have not moved quickly enough or logically enough or reasonably enough to achieve this.

What I have always said, sir—and you know with me, because we served on the same committee relating to municipal affairs—is that I have always believed that in any reorganization of local government, whether it be municipal or educational within this province, I have always put forward the view that the boundaries must be the same. You cannot really bring about the kind of reform that the government thinks they are bringing about, if you are going to further fragment the various jurisdictions, if you are going to add to the multiplicity of different jurisdictions.

What sense is there, sir, in suggesting that these counties which were set up—as my colleague from Welland said earlier this afternoon—120-odd years ago now, should be the sacrosanct boundaries on which you base a new educational system? Regional government, yes; but regional government with some logic. The present county boundaries have no logic at all. They were determined 120 years ago, on the basis, I am told, of how far a man could ride on a horse in one day. What sense has that got in the context of present life in Ontario? None at all, sir.

The former Minister of Municipal Affairs, Mr. Spooner, recognizing this kind of difficulty in recommending to his colleagues on the government front benches a form of regional government, embarked upon a series of regional studies. Out of those studies, reluctantly and very slowly have begun to emerge a few changes and the Ottawa bill is one of them. But that Ottawa bill is only being brought forward after a very detailed study of the local problems in the Ottawa area. How far should the boundaries extend, should they be in one county, or two counties or parts of a county, or what form should they be in, and this is how the Ottawa study has come forward and will eventually be reflected in legislation. But here the Minister comes in and says, "We are going to have counties."

Why counties? You have heard member after member stand in his place in this House today and say, "In our area there is something different." In the Niagara Peninsula, for instance, where the hon. Minister knows full well there are shelves and shelves of reports dealing with kinds of government that might be evolved in the Niagara Peninsula, there are a variety of problems. What possible sense does it make that Welland county be one unit? My hon. leader referred earlier this afternoon to the problem in the Kitchener-Waterloo, Galt and Guelph area. Does it make any sense that you now solidify the boundaries in that particular area?

As I say, sir, and I hesitate to refer to you, but you sat with me through the many, many meetings of the select committee on municipal affairs, and you, sir, a gentleman who has had substantial municipal experience, shared the view that I did, and it was as a result of your thinking and mine, and the thinking of several other members that the report of the municipal affairs committee was so worded in directing the thoughts of this Legislature towards the new form of regional government. We foresaw that it did not strictly tie itself in to county boundaries. It left room for flexibility after study, and that was the whole theme.

That recommendation was sufficiently well thought of by Smith to incorporate that recommendation into his report, and my leader read that this afternoon. I say simply,

sir, to the Minister, why, with all this sudden haste and all the zeal for reform that has been missing from these government benches for 25 years, have you suddenly adopted these county boundaries as though there has been nothing better, or no better idea that ever can be thought of? Why do you fly in the face of all of the better type of thinking that has been done in these chambers and through the various committees and in the various reports, over a period of the last half dozen or ten years? Why? And there is no answer.

It is no answer, sir, for the government to have many of the back-bench members get up and say, if you are against this bill, you are against progress. Now that just flies in the face of the arguments that my colleagues and I have been putting forward over the years. We believe that there should be a logical system of regional government evolve in Ontario. We believe that it must come from the top down. Unless there is decision made here it will not come about, but we believe, and most importantly, sir, that this can only come about if there is consultation, so that there can be a reasonable understanding of what the problems are.

This is why, sir, it is not just as simple as black and white. Are we in favour of progress or not? We certainly are in favour of progress. We certainly are in favour of equality of educational opportunity, but we think that if a major step such as this is going to be taken, it must be based on proper research, on careful research, and after substantial consultation.

Why does this Minister differ so much from the aproach that Mr. Spooner had in municipal affairs? Why does he differ so much from the whole approach of the front bench of government to regional problems? Why suddenly has he got a solution that no one else has had? That the county system is the be-all and end-all for educational purposes? Should it not be the be-all and end-all for municipal purposes, for development purposes, for welfare, for highways, and so on? This plan makes no sense at all, sir.

So my simple plea, and I will not extend my remarks any further, is that before we take this step, which once taken will almost be impossible to upset, we should stop and pause and consider and listen at least to the voices of those people who will come before the committee and will express views which are most important to them and to the people of Ontario, before this bill is approved in principle, so that if there is a better way of doing it, we will know about it.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, I had not intended speaking in this debate, but my colleague from Downsview has drawn attention to what he claims are perhaps some changes in my thinking in regard to the Metropolitan Toronto bill, which prompts me to say a few words on this bill.

Mr. Sopha: There is nothing reprehensible about a person changing his mind.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I agree, but I think that the very fact that led me to change my mind, Mr. Speaker, points up exactly why this legislation is based on the county system. Now in Goldenberg's report, he suggested that for education in Metropolitan Toronto there should be a central board of education which should have the overall responsibility for school finances and to develop a uniformly high metropolitan standard of public education. Then he went on further and he said in his original report, which was not adopted, that there should be local districts whose boundaries would not be coterminous with present municipal boundaries. At first glance, Mr. Speaker, this looked like a good idea, but as those who are experienced in this studied it, as we listened to people who were knowledgeable in the area, we found it became more and more difficult to do because any time you start moving into areas that are not coterminous with present municipal boundaries, you are running into trouble.

Mr. Singer: That is my very point.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Well, fine. I am glad that he accepts that, Mr. Speaker, because I think he will find when he talks with people as experienced as he will find in The Department of Education, and others in this province, that it is all very well to stand and talk in this chamber about regional government based on some other idea, but every time you work on it you come back to one thing, the county unit, and I hope my friend attended the conference held on January 12 down in the Royal York, by the bureau of municipal research, and the Canadian tax foundation. They spent a Saturday morning talking about regional government and even those who had drawn up the plans for the regional government section in the Smith report, seemed to waver as person after person got up and talked. And it seemed that it was evident to them that even if we had

regional government, it should be based on the existing county lines or perhaps two existing counties drawn together.

I think, Mr. Speaker, the very experience with the bill on Metropolitan Toronto showed us that it is all very well to talk about working out some great plan, that does not contain existing municipal boundaries or conform to them but when you study the proposition, you come back and find that local pride and tradition, and various other things, come in and no matter what other type of arrangement that you might arrive at, if there are inequities in the present county system, there will be just as many or more in any other system that you could work out, and so you arrive right back at this particular point.

Now, I think that once we accept that, Mr. Speaker, as of course all our hon. friends have agreed with here in principle except for a few of them—they agree with this idea. However, many in this debate have missed the very point. The principle of this legislation is equality of educational opportunity for the children of this province. This can be accomplished only by taking this forward step at this time—an extension of our programme of consolidating township school areas. It is only through this type of legislation that we can have programmes that can identify the emotionally disturbed, programmes that can provide reading services, programmes that can provide opportunities for children with learning disabilities, programmes that can provide enrichment, programmes that can provide non-graded educational systems. It is only through this kind of legislation that we can have the integration, a point which I think has been missed by a lot of people, of the elementary system with the secondary system. No longer is it possible for a student to gain a proper education if there is no co-ordination between the elementary school system and the secondary school system.

Mr. Singer: Is not the introduction of The Ottawa-Carleton Act, 1968, the negation of the Minister's praise of the county system?

Hon. Mr. Wells: It may not, Mr. Speaker, conform to a complete county system, but it does not break the existing municipal boundary lines. I am sure that there will be provision in the future for two counties to amalgamate their school system if they so desire. There will be provision for certain arrangements, but it does not break existing boundary lines.

Mr. Singer: Oh, now he is saying that it is not true because it is true.

Hon. Mr. Wells: No, I am not, Mr. Speaker, I am saying that the more you get into it, the more you become aware that it is very difficult to arrive at anything that does not conform to existing boundaries.

Mr. Bukator: Then you have the Mayo report.

Hon. Mr. Wells: The county system is, Mr. Speaker after great examination, the one that will work best at this time for this progressive step. The principle of equality of educational opportunity is more important than wasting time to try to devise some system that I say, Mr. Speaker, would not in any way be better than the county system.

Of course it is impossible to convince those who wish not to be convinced, as many as the speakers on the other side do. This is one of the most forward-looking pieces of legislation that has been brought into this House in a long time, and those who will thank us are the young people of this province.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, it was my intention until about the last five or ten minutes to speak only to the amendment, and I shall certainly not speak to the substance of the bill other than to deal with a rather disturbing point that has emerged in the last five or ten minutes. As I listened to the hon. Minister who has just sat down, my mind went back to the days of listening to Leslie Frost and the problem of redistribution. He said, "We cannot have redistribution unless it sticks to the old boundaries." The result is that we have no redistribution; just the phoniest kind of reshuffling to try to give genuine representation by population.

We are indulging in exactly the same kind of thing. In fact, Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister, wittingly or unwittingly, seriously misled the people in his speech in Galt, if what the last Minister said is true. The Prime Minister very carefully added that because we had chosen county boundaries here, this did not mean that we were opting in favour of county boundaries for regional government. But the whole thrust of the comment of our hon. friend in the Cabinet who has just sat down is that county boundaries are the only ones that will work.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: As a matter of fact, every WASP from the other side was exercised, if I might put it bluntly. The hon. Minister, too. But every WASP was also exercised. Now, what he was saying was that the members were prejudging the situation—

Hon. Mr. Davis: I did not say that at all. I just believe in telling the facts, that is all.

Mr. MacDonald: The Minister will get a chance to speak later.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes, okay.

Mr. MacDonald: But he was saying that the members were prejudging the situation, and were going to force on the separate schools, the boundaries that have been fixed in here. Moreover, you are going to do it for the regional government. It is going to be infinitely more difficult to move into any other regional government once you have concretized or solidified county boundaries. Our minds were operating in much the same line, once you have frozen the lines. The Prime Minister was rather coy a moment ago; he said that it leaves him with an option.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): I was not being coy, I stated it clearly that one should not draw the wrong inference in another area from what I said in that speech in Galt, that is all.

Mr. MacDonald: All that I am saying is that immediately that the Prime Minister made that speech—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: The members have all been trying to make something of it ever since, I am quite aware of it.

Mr. MacDonald: I have made the comment that you are opting for county boundaries for the schools, and that you were going to fix yourselves into those boundaries for regional government, and now we have had a member of the Cabinet get up and read it into *Hansard*, and say that, in effect, in the last ten minutes.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: It is not so.

Hon. Mr. Wells: A point of order.

Mr. MacDonald: Oh well, Mr. Speaker, we all heard the hon. gentleman.

Mr. Speaker: Order, the Minister has a point of order.

Hon. Mr. Wells: All I did, Mr. Speaker, was to draw the attention of the House to a conference that took place at the Royal York where a certain type of discussion occurred and where they came around to this idea. I made no suggestion as to what is the policy of the government—

Mr. MacDonald: I shall read *Hansard* very carefully, Mr. Speaker, because he very clearly said that when you looked at the boundaries, you had to stick to the old boundaries; these were the ones that were the best, and would serve the purpose. I am paraphrasing it but it is in *Hansard*.

Mr. Speaker, let me get to what I intended —and only this did I intend to say in getting up. I want to make a special plea to the Minister of Education, which he should seriously consider overnight—I hope that the Prime Minister is not going to thrust the Minister of Education on to reply to all this tonight—to accept the amendment that is before the House. That amendment, in essence, says that before we adopt the principle of this resolution, we should refer to the standing committee to give opportunity for everyone to make his representations.

One of the things that has puzzled me about this whole issue, is that the Minister of Education appeared to be flying in the face of the facts—by contending many times that he had consulted everybody. All that I can say is the Minister's capacity for communication has deteriorated even more than we suggested on this side of the House. Everybody that he presumably consulted did not get the message, whether it is teachers, school trustees, parents, teachers, counties, or the rest.

Hon. Mr. Davis: You mean agreement.

Mr. MacDonald: You will have your chance to speak in a moment. Please do not get so excited, I know that it is late in the night, but I do not need any help, may I assure you of that. The Minister did not communicate effectively with these people

My colleague from Peterborough, in phraseology that I cannot recapture at this hour of the day, said that "the means that the Minister has used are destroying the objective" that he has put forth in this bill. We all agree that the objective is a very noble and desirable one. I suggest to the Minister that if he wants to recapture some of the serious ground that has been lost, if he wants to repair some of the bad means that are threatening the fulfilment of the objective, he has nothing to lose in postponing second reading. You have a majority on that side of the House; do not be so pathetically fearful on occasion. When you bring

the bill back from the committee, you still have a majority, unless an epidemic strikes on the other side and half the members cannot get here. They can pass it at that point, Mr. Speaker.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: Look, will that empty vacuous noise over there, if it has nothing to contribute—

Mr. R. M. Johnston: Well, is that not pathetic?

Mr. MacDonald: Right.

Mr. R. M. Johnston: All we hear is tear down, going on all day, seven days a week.

An hon. member: Seven days—my goodness!

Mr. MacDonald: I do not know how, Mr. Speaker, he escaped from Port Dalhousie, or wherever it was he escaped from.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: Oh, he got into St. Catharines and that is how he rose to the heights.

An hon. member: Quit posturing.

Mr. MacDonald: I am not posturing, but I am just waiting until order is restored, either voluntarily or otherwise.

Mr. Speaker, before I was interrupted in the plea that I was making to the Minister, I was trying to suggest to him: You have the majority on the other side of the House. If you take this bill out, having used your majority to steamroller it, so that it is a *fait accompli,* take it out to all the people whose views you say you want to hear, and whose views until now you have not got, and not provided an opportunity to be heard—

Hon. Mr. Davis: He has.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, Mr. Speaker, the Minister is too intelligent a person to ignore the fact that if he sought it, he did not seek it effectively. Read all your own correspondence. You certainly did not seek consultation effectively. Surely the Minister, more than anybody else, would want to repair the sense of exclusion from what he contends to be one of the major pieces of legislation brought before this Legislature for quite some time. When you take it to the standing committee as a bill that has been discussed here, but not voted on, the principle is still open to discussion. You have the threat of your majority to pass it when it comes back. But at least take it out to the people who want to come and make their representation, who have been deluging us with briefs and letters. Let them view it in an open fashion. Let them make their representations. Conceivably in the process of making their representations we will find a more effective way to implement the principle which, I reconfirm, we at least in this group unanimously endorse.

Let me conclude on that note. I am not going to be like the leader of the Liberal Party who gets up and says "I endorse it" and who then has one colleague get up and say "I will oppose it at every stage until mining assessment is brought in"—an irrelevancy in this bill.

Mr. Sopha: It is not irrelevant at all.

Mr. MacDonald: Or like another member who gets up and says, "I oppose it until we get more money put into education." Or like another member who gets up and says "I will oppose it under any circumstance." That is the kind of four voices we have had from the front bench of the Liberal Party. But we are supporting the principle of the bill.

Mr. Nixon: And you are supporting our amendment.

Mr. MacDonald: And we are supporting your amendment. Yes, as a matter of fact I know why you brought the amendment in; it was the only possible common ground you could find for the moment.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: But we have another common ground. We support the principle and we plead with the Minister: Do not present a *fait accompli* on the principle to the people who are coming to the standing committee. Give them an opportunity to present their views.

Hon. Mr. Davis: You have accepted the principle.

Mr. MacDonald: Right. But there are an awful lot of people out there whom you want to persuade to be on your side and for the moment they have not accepted the principle. Look, Mr. Speaker, the Minister—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, there is a consensus that is beginning to emerge on an acceptance of this bill among the people

who were passionately opposed to it and they were passionately opposed to it because they were not given an opportunity to participate. They were presented with a *fait accompli* in a most incredible fashion. It was presented in the first instance by the Prime Minister who just said it was going to take place.

Mr. Sopha: We should send him to Stratford.

Mr. MacDonald: Ten weeks, Mr. Speaker, went by before we got any details, then we got a white paper, and then were presented with a *fait accompli* in the form of this bill. I asked the Minister if he would permit representations before the standing committee on education before the bill came down. He said it was not necessary, that we had had enough consultation. The fact that an overwhelming majority of the people involved did not think this the case was ignored. You have now brought your bill down. For the moment, take it as a draft bill to the committee. I hope the Minister will be open-minded enough to listen to all the pleas that are made in the hope that he can find a more effective means of implementing the underlying principle, I suggest that you psychologically will invite that kind of participation and you will likely get the greater consensus, if you take the bill to the standing committee as a bill which has not yet had second reading, and give them an opportunity to express their views.

Mr. Sopha: He is right, you know, but for the wrong reasons.

Mr. Speaker: Order. Is there any other member who wishes to participate in this debate before it is concluded by the Minister?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, I am going to suggest that the Minister adjourn the debate until the House resumes tomorrow.

Hon. Mr. Davis moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, of course, tomorrow we will resume this debate and there are other second readings on the order paper—the ones that are presently in the books that I would like to deal with. If we complete that we will resume the estimates of The Department of Highways.

Mr. MacDonald: Where do we go after that?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: It will depend—there are several Ministers who are not well at the moment. We will start with order No. 3 and work our way through them. The Minister of Economics and Development, I think, is not available at the moment and we will not deal with the taxing Acts, but we will deal with those in the name of the Attorney General and the 14th order, 15th order, 16th order—let us go no further than that. If we get that far we will go back to the estimates.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 11:40 o'clock, p.m.

No. 47

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

First Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Wednesday, April 3, 1968

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1968

5

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Wednesday, April 3, 1968

Question to Mr. Randall re construction statistics, Mr. Nixon 1581

Question to Mr. Robarts re the Mackay commission on religious education, Mr. MacDonald 1582

Statement re provincial assumption of costs of administration of justice, Mr. MacNaughton 1582

Questions to Mr. Randall re the Ontario development corporation, Mr. Trotter 1583

Questions to Mr. Gomme re the Stoney Creek traffic circle, Mr. Deans 1585

Questions to Mr. Stewart re cheese marketing, Mr. Gaunt 1585

Questions to Mr. Randall re thrift stores in Ontario housing projects, Mr. Braithwaite 1585

Questions to Mr. Dymond re air pollution, Mr. Burr 1586

Question to Mr. Gomme re the UN conference on uniform road signs, Mr. Innes 1586

Question to Mr. Gomme re Highway 535, Mr. Martel 1587

Question to Mr. Stewart re the milk marketing board, Mr. Martel 1587

Questions to Mr. Robarts re employment of summer students, Mr. Sargent 1587

Questions to Mr. Robarts re subsidies for transportation systems, Mr. Sargent 1588

Question to Mr. Bales re employees at the University of Guelph, Mr. MacDonald 1589

Secondary Schools and Boards of Education Act, bill to amend, Mr. Davis, second reading 1589

Judicature Act, bill to amend, Mr. Wishart, second reading 1604

Evidence Act, bill to amend, Mr. Wishart, second reading 1605

Community Centres Act, 1966, bill to amend, Mr. Stewart, second reading 1611

County of Renfrew, bill respecting, Mr. R. G. Hodgson, second reading 1614

City of Hamilton, bill respecting, Mr. R. G. Hodgson, second reading 1614

City of Ottawa separate school board, bill respecting, Mr. R. G. Hodgson, second reading 1614

City of Peterborough (1), bill respecting, Mr. Stokes, second reading 1614

Community foundation of Ottawa and district, bill respecting, Mr. R. G. Hodgson, second reading 1614

City of Peterborough (2), bill respecting, Mr. Stokes, second reading 1614

County of Peel, bill respecting, Mr. Kennedy, second reading 1614

City of London, bill respecting, Mr. White, second reading 1615

Township of Vaughan, bill respecting, Mr. Deacon, second reading 1615

City of Oshawa, bill respecting, Mr. Pilkey, second reading 1615

Town of Palmerston, bill respecting, Mr. Root, second reading 1615

City of Kitchener, bill respecting, Mr. Breithaupt, second reading 1615

Cardinal Insulation Limited, bill respecting, Mr. B. Newman, second reading 1615

City of Toronto, bill respecting, Mr. Price, second reading 1615

County of Welland, bill respecting, Mr. Morningstar, second reading 1615

City of Welland, bill respecting, Mr. Morningstar, second reading 1615

City of Windsor, bill respecting, Mr. B. Newman, second reading 1615

Board of education for the city of London, bill respecting, Mr. White, second reading 1615

City of Ottawa, bill respecting, Mr. W. E. Johnston, second reading 1616

Township of Pelee, bill respecting, Mr. Paterson, second reading 1616

Ewart College, bill respecting, Mr. Price, second reading 1616

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to 1617

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 3, 1968

The House met at 2:30 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: Today we have as visitors to the Legislature, in both galleries, east and west, students from Riverside secondary school, Windsor. At 3:30 p.m. this afternoon we will be joined by more pupils from this school. In the east gallery and in the west gallery we have pupils from Welland high and vocational school, Welland; and also in both galleries at that time, students from St. Michael's college school here in Toronto.

Hon. R. S. Welch (Provincial Secretary and Minister of Citizenship): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I would like to introduce to the House 26 civil servants from many parts of the world, who are at present seated in your gallery at the north of the chamber. They have been attending a three-day seminar arranged by my department in co-operation with the external aid office, The Department of External Affairs, and six Ontario government departments which have provided seminar speakers. The departments are those of Education, Health, Labour, Municipal Affairs, the Treasury board and of course my own department, all of which have described to these students the procedures which govern the operations of their departments.

All of these officials, Mr. Speaker, have been chosen by their respective governments to learn as much as they can about Canadian methods of administration. We are happy that Ontario has been chosen, for the fifth consecutive year, to conduct this seminar.

I should explain that these young people are in the midst of a course in public administration at Carleton University in Ottawa. Our guests in the chamber today represent 17 countries in Asia, Africa, the Caribbean and South and Central America, as well as the Mediterranean island of Malta. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that I speak for all members of the House when I wish them every success in their studies here and even greater success when they proceed to apply what they have learned to the greater advancement of the countries from which they have come. To each of them we extend the hand of friendship and goodwill.

Mr. Speaker: Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Economics and Development.

Will the Minister explain why Ontario is the only province, according to *Southam Building Guide,* not to show an increase in all sectors of construction during the first quarter of 1968? In fact, it showed a decrease of 2.7 per cent.

Hon. S. J. Randall (Minister of Economics and Development): Mr. Speaker, the figures for the first quarter of 1968, recently released in a statistical bulletin by *Southam Building Guide,* represent construction contracts awarded. These figures do not necessarily reflect actual construction undertaken for the quarter, but lacking actual performance figures for the same period are an indication of a trend in the industry.

Overall contracts awarded for the first quarter of 1968 in Ontario showed a decrease of 2.7 per cent over the same period of a year earlier. A major reason for this dip was the impact of declining industrial contracts awarded, which were down 33.2 per cent for the whole of Canada. In fact, in March eight of the ten provinces indicated a decline in the industrial contracts awarded. All other major sectors of the construction industry, particularly the residential and institutional sectors, recorded increases during the first quarter of 1968 over the same period a year earlier.

The decline in the industrial sector is an aftermath of a huge investment boom in recent years, reflected mostly in the manufacturing industry—particularly the automotive manufacturing segment—which had begun to taper off last year.

Since approximately 53 per cent of Canadian manufacturing activity takes place in this

province, it is natural that the decline would be more noticeable in Ontario. We were aware of the impending decline in the industrial construction. In an effort to offset this decline, we had given priority to such government construction programmes as housing, schools and hospitals, so that for the first quarter of 1968, construction contracts awarded in Ontario in the residential sector were up 33.6 per cent over the same period last year. Similarly, awards for the institutional sector were up 22 per cent over the last year.

The hon. member may be assured this government will continue to examine these trends in all sectors affecting the economy of the province. The introduction of our greatly expanded housing programme, and the Equalization of Industrial Opportunity plan to encourage new industry to settle in this province, are but two examples of the measures taken by my department to offset any decline in the private sector of the economy.

Mr. Nixon: The private sector should be going ahead.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Sounds like the Minister of Education!

Hon. Mr. Randall: Always looking forward!

Mr. Speaker: The member for York South.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, I have three questions.

My first queston is to the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. MacNaughton), but he has informed me that it more appropriately should be directed to the Minister of Labour (Mr. Bales) and it is in the process of being so directed. I shall ask it tomorrow.

My second question is to the Prime Minister. Is the Prime Minister in a position to indicate when we can expect the report of the Mackay commission on religious education in schools?

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): No, Mr. Speaker, I am not. I have no information upon which I could base any firm indication when this report will be received.

Mr. Speaker: Has the member for York South another question?

Mr. MacDonald: Yes, I have a question, Mr. Speaker, that I submitted yesterday; but in the absence of the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs, I withheld it.

It is a four-part question. How much insurance was bought for coverage of property owned by the provincial government or agencies thereof through the insurance committee under the direction of the Minister? Second, what were the total premiums paid? Third, does the insurance committee handle all insurance for property of the provincial government or agencies thereof? And fourth, if not, what is the breakdown of coverage and premiums by departments or agencies of insurance bought directly?

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I think this question should be taken as notice. I also think it should be placed on the order paper. The answer is now being compiled.

Mr. MacDonald: I have no objection to that, Mr. Speaker, particularly if we can have the answer before the Minister's estimates.

Mr. Speaker: The Provincial Treasurer has the floor.

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Provincial Treasurer): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce today the third and last stage in the Ontario government's programme to relieve our municipalities of the costs of administration of justice.

This final phase undertakes compensation to local municipalities and counties for the facilities they have provided for administration of various aspects of the judicial system in Ontario.

It completes the most complex portion of the programme. Involved are some 400 buildings, including county and municipal jails, county court houses, registry and land titles offices, juvenile and family court buildings, detention homes and other municipal structures.

The government has given careful consideration toward the development of the most equitable formula for taking over this accommodation. A province-wide survey was undertaken by The Department of Public Works in an effort to consider all aspects of compensation. In arriving at a formula, the government has kept foremost the fundamental purpose of the programme itself, which is to shift the financial burden of administration of justice costs from the property tax revenue base of the municipalities to the more general revenue sources of the provincial government. As a result, the decision will involve payment by the province of about $1 million more

than had been estimated previously. The total cost of the programme will be closer to $19.5 million than the $18.5 million anticipated in February.

This will give the municipalities a total benefit 30 per cent greater than the original $15 million advocated by the Ontario committee on taxation, on whose recommendation the government agreed to assume the costs of administration of justice.

In previous developments, the government has outlined the method by which it will apportion the revenue from fines between the municipalities and the province, and has incorporated into the Ontario public service the municipal staffs engaged in the administration of justice and operation of local jails.

This final stage recognizes that compensation for facilities is only one portion of the benefit municipalities will receive from the programme.

Since there obviously can be no simple formula which will cover all considerations, the government feels the fairest approach is to provide equal compensation to all municipalities, based on the amount of space provided for justice functions. The major exceptions will be where debenture charges are in excess of the basic rates of payment, in which cases the province will assume the higher cost. Where a building is used exclusively for the administration of justice and will continue to be required for that purpose, the province will purchase the facility on the basis of $10 per gross square foot, for above-grade space—$5 below-grade. Payment will be made in annual instalments of one-tenth of the total amount over a ten-year period.

If there is an outstanding debenture debt, the province will assume the remaining payments and provide the municipality with any difference, should the debt retirement payments amount to less than the purchase rate over the ten-year period.

Where buildings also house other services, the province will pay the municipality $1 per net square foot of above-grade space—50 cents below-grade—used for justice functions each year for a 10-year period. If a debenture debt exists on such shared accommodation, the municipality will receive debt retirement payments proportionate to the space used for justice administration. Again, if these debt retirement payments total less than the rental rate, the municipality will be entitled to the difference.

In all cases of shared accommodation, the province will also pay normal operating and maintenance costs for justice accommodation in proportion to the total space of the building. Where accommodation is rented or leased, either for full or part-time use, the province will assume all obligations, as indicated in previous correspondence with the municipalities. This approach of equal treatment for the municipalities is consistent with the formula for apportionment of revenue from fines, under which every municipality will receive an equal increase in the per capita unconditional grant as its share of that revenue.

While this formula for compensation will cover most considerations, the government recognizes that some situations will require special consideration because of the varying types and ages of buildings and differing costs involved.

Full details concerning the compensation for facilities, including the method of deducting amounts for capital grants paid by the province toward justice facilities and the provision of furnishings for such accommodation, will be provided in a comprehensive outline to be distributed to muncipalities immediately. Determination of the benefits for each municipality will be undertaken by The Department of Public Works.

With the completion of arrangements for taking over administration of justice costs, our municipalities can not only reduce their expenditures accordingly but can also anticipate increased revenues for a ten-year period from these accommodation payments, as well as the increase in per capita grants. For its part, the province will concentrate on greater efficiency and uniformity in the administration of justice for Ontario.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Parkdale.

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Economics and Development.

Is the Minister prepared to change the forgiveable loan regulations under the Ontario development corporation to assist industry to purchase new machinery and slightly used machinery that is not bought direct from the manufacturer, and will the Minister establish an appraising committee for this purpose?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Speaker, in answer to the hon. member's question, we are not prepared to make grants for other than new machinery that has been purchased directly from the manufacturer. We have had a number of applications from companies requesting grants for machinery which they

have made themselves for their own use. In addition to being almost impossible to put a reasonable value on this machinery, it has been our experience that the machinery in most instances had little or no resale value. With regard to used machinery it would be very difficult to ascertain what is slightly used machinery and what is more than slightly used machinery.

Among the reasons why we insist on new machinery for the purposes of the grant are:

1. New machinery is in most instances more up-to-date and efficient. The grant programme not only stimulates employment and economic activity, but also helps in many instances in the moderization of the industry.

2. This policy enlarges Ontario's stock of new, efficient, productive equipment.

3. It provides additional employment in many instances for Canadian machine manufacturers. Even in those instances where the machinery is not produced in Canada, many of the ancillary items are ordered from Canadian firms.

4. In order to qualify for a grant, a company has only to have 75 per cent, by value, of its machinery new; 25 per cent can be used machinery. This is a much more generous provision than that which prevails in the federal programme where 95 per cent of the machinery has to be new.

Since used machinery has a lesser value than new machinery, it could be that up to 50 per cent of the machinery in the plant can be used machinery. And I might suggest here that when I say 75 per cent, the federal authorities insist before any grants are given that the plant be 95 per cent new insofar as equipment is concerned, otherwise they do not qualify for a grant. But we in our programme lowered that to 75 per cent because we felt it was a fair approach to granting new equipment and helping industries put in better equipment to do a better job of production. That is the reason why we have stayed with the 75 per cent.

The answer to the final question: There would be no useful purpose, we believe, served by establishing a committee since the Ontario development corporation already has on its staff highly qualified and well experienced professional engineers.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Speaker, I was wondering if the Minister would permit a supplementary question? It is in this regard: Are not the regulations too strict when in some cases machinery that has been used only for 100 hours is disqualified, and yet it is practically new machinery and can be used? Can the regulations not be changed to take care of that situation?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I did not understand. What equipment did the member say; creamery equipment?

Mr. Trotter: I did not specify any kind of equipment. It is a general question. I am not trying to specify a particular area but I know instances, and one in particular, where the machinery has been used only 100 hours and can be used, and it is not—just as if it was second hand cheap stuff. Yet the regulations are so strict that they cannot even cover a situation like this. I think that the Minister could amend the regulations.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I would just suggest this: If the hon. member has any specific cases he should send them in to me. The programme is now under way. We find, as I said, that the programme is flexible; we are quite prepared to change it if there is good reason to change it; we do not want to be too restrictive, but at the same time we have found instances where a man, we will say, spends $75,000 for a piece of new equipment and he may be able to buy five pieces second-hand for that same amount of money; but he may not get the same kind of production or be able to rationalize his production as we would like him to. But we are quite prepared to look at it, so if the member has any cases like that send them in, we would be glad to look at them.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order may I direct your attention to the 28th order on page 3. I have been most anxious, sir, to see Bill 64, which was introduced by the Attorney General on Friday last; today is Wednesday, some five days later, and the 28th order says it is printed. It is not printed, it is not in the books, it is not in the hands of the senior attendant.

Mr. Speaker: I can advise the member for Sudbury, as the Clerk has advised me, that that bill did not arrive from the printers, although it was printed and was so labelled when the order paper was made out. There is nothing very much one can do if it does not arrive from the printers.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Let me assure the hon. member that it will not be called until there has been ample time to examine it.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Wentworth.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Highways. In the light of the Minister's statement that the Queen Elizabeth Way will be reconstructed between Hamilton and Lincoln county line, will this programme include reconstructing the intersection known as the Stoney Creek traffic circle?

Hon. G. E. Gomme (Minister of Highways): Mr. Speaker, the reconstruction of the Stoney Creek traffic circle is all part of the overall programme for reconstruction of the Queen Elizabeth Way.

Mr. Deans: May I ask if that is an affirmative to the question—it will be part of this particular programme?

Mr. Speaker: Does the Minister wish to answer?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: No, I do not.

Mr. Speaker: Right. The member for Huron-Bruce.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Agriculture and Food, notice of which has been given.

Is the Belleville cheese exchange going to be closed? If so, what are the plans of the Ontario milk marketing board toward the marketing of cheddar cheese?

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): Mr. Speaker, in answer to the question, I would have to say that there has been no decision reached as yet. The whole matter of the future of the cheese industry and how it will be handled, how the cheese will be sold in the province of Ontario, is under discussion with the Canadian dairy commission and the Ontario milk marketing board at the present time.

Mr. Gaunt: Would my friend answer a supplementary question?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Let us hear the question.

Mr. Gaunt: Would the Minister have any idea when this type of decision is going to be reached?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: No, I am afraid I have not.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Huron-Bruce has a further question?

Mr. Gaunt: Mr. Speaker, I did not receive a copy of it. The secretary in our office told me that it had been accepted. It is in reference to the Balderson cheese plant, I believe, and the ARDA grant. Is it true that ARDA has refused a grant toward Balderson cheese factory in Lanark county? Are there more cheese factories producing natural cheese which have requested ARDA assistance? If so, could the Minister indicate how the applications stand and could he specify those refused and the counties in which they are located?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, I would ask the hon. member if he would allow me to take this as notice because this requires a great deal of research. I have not the answers offhand.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Etobicoke.

Mr. L. A. Braithwaite (Etobicoke): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Economics and Development, notice of which has been given.

In view of the dire need on the part of many residents of low rental housing projects in the suburbs and elsewhere for used articles such as clothing, furniture, and so on, will the Minister make space available in the larger Ontario housing projects so that residents, with the help of churches and other volunteer organizations, may set up thrift stores?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Where communal space is available in Ontario housing developments, it is utilized for the benefit of the tenants and with the co-operation and assistance of various community agencies. To quote specific examples, in Lawrence Heights, the family service association operates a used clothing depot from a store in the neighbourhood shopping centre. This also services Scarlettwood and some other developments in the immediate area.

In South Regent Park space is made available for this purpose in one of the high-rise buildings and the programme is organized and run by the May court club.

At Rayoak and Parkwood Drive the same facility is provided and is operated by a combined interdenominational church group. This centre also serves the corporation's Willowtree and Flemingdon Park properties. At O'Connor Drive a combined church group operates a similar service from church premises adjacent to the development. A similar service is about to be instituted in the newly completed Tandridge Crescent building through the auspices of a church

ministerial association, and the Thistletown area will be served from here.

This type of service is actively encouraged by the field staff of Ontario housing corporation and will continue as other developments are added to the corporation's portfolio.

Mr. Braithwaite: Will the Minister answer a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker?

Would the Minister be agreeable to meeting with a delegation of citizens from the north Rexdale area who seem to feel that they are in need of such facilities but cannot get them? I have listened to the explanation given by the Minister and there seems to be some confusion. I understand that in north Rexdale they have been unable to secure adequate space to set up a store and I would like the Minister to speak to some of these people at a convenient time.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Speaker, I would be delighted to speak with them and if they are not being serviced we will find some way to do it. If the member will arrange for them to get in touch with me I will be glad to see them.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Sandwich-Riverside.

Mr. F. A. Burr (Sandwich-Riverside): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Health. Would the Minister indicate when we may expect a report on the air pollution investigation in the Dunnville-Port Maitland area?

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, I have no information that would help me to make such an indication.

Mr. Burr: Mr. Speaker, would it be safe to say not within two weeks?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I have no idea how one might define safety under such circumstances, sir.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Timiskaming.

Mr. D. Jackson (Timiskaming): Will the Minister of Highways table the agreement between The Department of Highways and Canadian National Railways on the matter of the GO transportation system?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. member would permit me to answer this question when we return to the estimates relating to this matter? The reason for this request is that I have a number of points I wish to deal with, and they will require more time than we can devote to the question here.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Oxford.

Mr. G. W. Innes (Oxford): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Highways, notice of which was given yesterday. In view of the significance of the United Nations conference on the standardization of world road signs, which will be held in Vienna in October, will the Minister be represented at this conference and will the department be presenting a brief?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Speaker, the United Nations is sponsoring a conference entitled, international protocol for signs, which is to be held in Vienna in October-November of 1968. The Department of External Affairs and The Department of Transport of the federal government will be represented at this conference, and have asked the Canadian good roads association to supply two advisers to the Canadian delegation. The Canadian good roads association have arranged for the chairman and the secretary of the Canadian uniform traffic devises council to attend this conference and advise the Canadian delegation.

As the uniform traffic devices council of the Canadian good roads association represents all the provinces, the Canadian position will be well stated.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Kitchener.

Mr. J. R. Breithaupt (Kitchener): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Financial and Commerical Affairs, notice of which has been given. Under The Used Car Dealers Act, 1964, are hearings before the registrar, and reviews appearing before the director considered administrative or judicial in nature? Second, will the Minister define the difference between these two, and third, under the Act, is the onus on the applicant for registration to prove that he is worthy of being registered? Or is the onus on the administrative authority to prove that he is not worthy of registration? Is registration a right or a privilege?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Mr. Speaker, I will take the question as notice.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Sudbury East.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): I have a question for the Minister of Lands and Forests. Can the Minister advise the House

whether the road known as Portelance's Road off Highway 545, north of Capreol, was built with government assistance or whether it was built as a private road by a company? (b) If it was built by or with the assistance of public funds, is the company responsible for installing a gate and charging campers a fee for use of land beyond the gate? And (c) if campers' fees cannot be charged by the company, will the Minister ensure that the practice stops?

Hon. R. Brunelle (Minister of Lands and Forests): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. member if I may take this question as notice, and I will have the full reply tomorrow?

Mr. Martel: I have a question for the Minister of Highways. Will any work be done on that portion of Highway 535 which was brushed last year between St. Charles and Noelville? and (b) will that portion of Highway 535 where construction work took place last year be paved this year?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Speaker, the answer to the first question: the brushing and clearing of the right of way for the secondary Highway 535, from eight miles north of Noelville, northerly, was commenced in 1967-1968. The work will be completed in the winter of 1968 and 1969 after which a contract for road reconstruction will be called. In answer to the second question, the asphalt surfacing of the section of secondary Highway 535 from five miles north of Noelville, northerly, which was constructed under contract 67-16, is included in the future construction programme.

Mr. Martel: I have a question for the Minister of Agriculture and Food. Will the Minister remove the northern member from the milk marketing board in the Warren area since he is no longer a producer, and will the Minister have this vacancy filled by an election rather than by another appointment?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, the regulations of The Ontario Milk Act provides for the election of the members of the Ontario milk marketing board, and sets out the qualifications of such a member. These regulations state specifically that to be eligible to sit on the board, the member must be a producer of milk. Now, these same regulations make provision for the orderly transition of this board, and the method of election. If the member of the Ontario milk marketing board, by reason of selling his milk herd or otherwise, ceases to be a milk shipper, he is no longer eligible under the regulations. The regulations provide that he will continue in his office until the end of the current year, at which time he will be replaced by a properly qualified producer who is elected at a duly constituted meeting of the producers in the region that he represents.

The Milk Act sets out a schedule of elections, Mr. Speaker, which provides for the orderly election of the board. There are 12 regions in the province and the members are elected on a rotational basis, three each year, for a term of four years. The elections in the region take place in November under the supervision of the Ontario milk marketing board, and the elected members assume their seat on the board at the beginning of the new year.

In the case of the member who was referred to by the member for Sudbury East, now representing northern Ontario, his term would normally expire in 1971. However, should he fail to qualify by reason of a change of status as a milk producer, he would be replaced this fall by an election in his region. This, in effect, could mean that there might be four new members elected rather than three, as provided in the schedule.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Grey-Bruce.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): I have a question for the Prime Minister. He was not here the other day when I asked it. Will the Prime Minister state whether he is making any special arrangements for the employment of high school and university students this summer in view of the many cutbacks in the economy, as there will likely be a large excess of students on the Ontario labour market, seeking unsuccessfully to provide themselves with funds to continue their education. Will the Prime Minister consider a crash programme to give them summer employment?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, a very similar question was asked by the hon. member for Humber on February 23, and at that time I told the House that it is becoming increasingly difficult to provide summer employment for all the students who require it, simply because there is an increased number of students in our school system. Apart from the absolute increase in numbers, they are staying in school longer. However, as far as this government is concerned, we do our best to provide as much employment as we can for students in the summer.

It is handled on a departmental basis; each department makes its own arrangements. Some departments handle more than others.

The Department of Education employs a good many students. The Department of Lands and Forests, The Department of Highways, The Department of Public Works, The Department of Health, The Department of Labour and The Department of Agriculture and Food, all have programmes for summer students. I do not think that it is the responsibility of this government to provide summer employment.

We accept the responsibility as carried out by The Department of Economics and Development to ensure that our industry is continually expanding. This is why we have such things as our trade crusade and our missions abroad, in order that we may ensure that industry is expanding fast enough to provide employment on a broad basis for the other people who are leaving our educational system and taking their place in the world of affairs.

I would point out that in other years, The Department of Manpower, through its employment offices throughout the province, has set up bureaus of summer employment. We would hope that through the example we set in our own practices, we would encourage industry to make use of summer employment to the greatest extent possible in order to permit these young people to help themselves in the matter of their continuing education.

Mr. Sargent: Will the Prime Minister explain to me how private industry is encouraged to do this in the summertime?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, as I have said, in those areas of employment that we as a government control, the various departments mentioned employ in the summer as many students as we can economically justify. But we hope that private industry will profit from our example and recognize the problem which is quite definitely with us; there is no doubt about it.

Mr. Sargent: I have another question for the Prime Minister. Considering the fact that the GO system will cost over $3 million this year, could he advise what subsidies he has planned for the transportation systems in the rest of the province?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: That is a very good question, Mr. Speaker. I had not heard of this question before, and I have no notice of it, but I can only say that our programme of subsidization will appear in the Budget as it has been presented to this House.

Mr. Sargent: For transportation systems, sir?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: All our programmes of subsidization.

Mr. Sargent: Well, will you answer my question?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I have had no notice of the question here and I am not able to give you any specific—

Mr. Sargent: That is just the trouble, you do not have an answer.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: The hon. member is becoming angry, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Sargent: I am getting fed up with this double talk. The government is spending this money for Metro and not for the rest of the province.

Mr. L. C. Henderson (Lambton): Order, it is time for a rest.

Mr. Speaker: Order! I would point out that the last few questions placed by the member, together with a third one, were placed with the Speaker's office on March 21 and on several occasions both offices have been advised they were still outstanding. I would inquire of the member whether he has the third question which Mr. Speaker has, also addressed to the Prime Minister, in connection with an ombudsman?

Mr. Sargent: Yes, I have.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps that question should be placed tomorrow and it would give us an opportunity to make sure that there is an answer.

Mr. Sargent: It is on the Habitat situation; have you an answer on that one?

Mr. Speaker: That is on the order paper. The member has a further question in my hands, directed to the Minister of Health.

Mr. Sargent: On the question to the Minister of Health: In view of the fact that a feature article in this morning's *Globe and Mail* says that the Ontario government alcoholism and drug addiction research foundation is lagging in its programme, and that their attitude still persists in labelling alcoholics as violators of the law, will the Minister advise what progress has been made on a detoxification centre and are we going to continue to fill our jails with drunks instead of giving them medical attention?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, I will take that question as notice.

Mr. Sargent: I have one more question. May I ask the Minister of Health, are we still going to be stalled on detoxification? Is he going to give us an answer on that this year?

Mr. Speaker: Order. The Minister has dealt with that question as he is entitled to do. The matter is now closed.

Mr. Sargent: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question to the Minister of Tourism and Information (Mr. Auld).

Mr. Speaker: May I point out to the member that his office was advised by my office that the question should more properly have been directed to the Minister of Energy and Resources Management (Mr. Simonett). It was so directed and the Minister is not in his place.

Mr. Sargent: I am sorry, I did not know that. Thank you.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, the question which I was going to direct to the Provincial Treasurer has been redirected to the Minister of Labour and he indicates to me that he is in a position to reply to it, so with your permission, Mr. Speaker, I shall put it.

What action if any is government taking directly or through the civil service commission—that portion may be redundant—to deal with an impending strike as outlined in a press release to all members of the Legislature, called for April 10 by branch 10 of the CSAO, representing trades and service employees at the University of Guelph?

Hon. D. A. Bales (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, in reply to the question from the member for York South, in this case the civil service association is certified as a trade union under The Labour Relations Act for certain employees at the University of Guelph.

A conciliation board report was released last week and on Friday a conciliation officer met with the parties to discuss their respective positions. The officer has been in touch with the parties since Friday and will continue to discuss the issues with them with a view to resolving the dispute as quickly as possible.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): Mr. Speaker, prior to the orders of the day, might I advise my colleagues that in Mr. Speaker's gallery now sits the mayor of that great and vital community, Sarnia, to which a controlled access highway, we hope, will be built within four years.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The 13th order; resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the motion for second reading of Bill 44, An Act to amend The Secondary Schools and Boards of Education Act.

THE SECONDARY SCHOOLS AND BOARDS OF EDUCATION ACT

(Continued)

Hon. W. G. Davis (Minister of Education and University Affairs): Mr. Speaker, in rising to participate in this debate, I shall endeavour in as pragmatic a way as possible to discuss some of the issues raised by the members opposite, trying to be as non-controversial as possible, and at the same time explain to them, I hope, in a way that I am sure makes some sense, why not only should they support this particular bill, but that they should do so with enthusiasm, because it represents, Mr. Speaker, in my view, one of the very progressive steps with respect to the development of the educational system of this province.

I also state, Mr. Speaker, that I recognize, perhaps more so than anyone else in this Legislature, that this is not easy legislation. This is a tough piece of legislation. Perhaps to a degree, Mr. Speaker, it is the kind of legislation that separates the men from the boys, and it will be interesting to see when the vote is taken just how mature the members opposite have become with respect to this particular bill. There has been much said over the past number of weeks, there was much said yesterday—

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): That is a little provocative.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —with respect to certain aspects of the bill. I have to be very frank, Mr. Speaker, and suggest with respect, that there was a great deal of repetition, and yet I was encouraged because I sensed in most of the hon. member's remarks, at least, an acceptance of the principle of what we were attempting to do with the legislation.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): The Minister said there were five principles.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I sensed this. I sensed that they were accepting this and that they were in support of it.

At the same time, Mr. Speaker, there are two or three areas that must be dealt with, I think, in a very specific way and I want to get the one item cleared up at the outset, so that there will be no misunderstanding and so that it will not perhaps muddy the debate or the rest of my remarks. I refer, Mr. Speaker, very specifically to the contribution made by the member for Lakeshore (Mr. Lawlor), when he endeavoured—and I think in a way that did him very little credit, in a way that added nothing to the debate last evening—when he introduced the problem as it relates to the separate school administration in the province of Ontario.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor: Has the Minister read the brief?

Hon. Mr. Davis: And I think, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. members who have served in this House know me well enough that it is not often that I become provoked, and I have had an evening—or at least since midnight last night and this morning—

Mr. Lawlor: It will do the Minister good once in a while.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —to relax a little bit. I am not provoked and I shall endeavour in as constructive a way as possible, to explain to the member for Lakeshore just how invalid his contribution was last evening.

Mr. Lawlor: Nonsense!

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, when this bill was introduced, when the Prime Minister made his statement and the guidelines were produced for discussion by the people of this province, it was very specifically stated that it related to the public system of education in the province of Ontario. It very specifically referred to the problems inherent in the public school system, and Mr. Speaker—and I say this categorically—there is nothing in the legislation that is meant, or can be interpreted to be detrimental to the separate school system in the province of Ontario. I think the hon. member must be aware of this fact.

And I think, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member has done himself and his party a disservice by attempting to interject this element into the debate. Mr. Speaker, if he reads carefully the brief presented by the official organization of the separate school trustrees association of Ontario, it points out conclusively that we asked this organization to submit to us, because of the very real problems that exist in bringing about larger units of administration within the separate school system, their thoughts on this subject. And I say in frankness, Mr. Speaker, I regard their brief as being a very constructive one.

Mr. Lawlor: Tell us what the qualifications are.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I do not believe it in any way conflicts with the principle we are establishing in Bill 44. I think, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member should recognize that we are attempting in this legislation to establish the principle of larger units of administration, equality of educational opportunity. And because the separate school brief does not relate exactly to the designated boundaries, or what have you, in Bill 44, it does not mean that it is not in accord with what we are attempting to do.

Mr. Lawlor: Force it down their throats.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Now, if the hon. member will look carefully—and this is the part that disappointed me; I do not think he really read the brief, or read Bill 44, or really is as knowledgeable as I anticipated he would be, with respect to the traditions of the separate school system in this province. The unit of administration, the legal concept behind the separate school legislation, has never been the same as for the public school system. We do not anticipate it will be the same if we are able to legislate it in this session.

The hon. member referred last night—and I really lost him—he referred to my statement on page 9 as to the wards. Well, Mr. Speaker, with great respect, my reference to the wards and the guidelines related to the separate school supporters who will be elected to the public board of education for the county. It does not refer to the separate school system, it does not refer to it at all and I ask him to look at this statement and look at the brief. I am not going to read the brief; I am sure there will be some members opposite who might accuse the Prime Minister and myself of helping to write the brief because it really takes a pretty positive attitude to what we are attempting to do.

We recognize the zone concept. The hon. member last night, as I read his remarks, referred to those areas that exist in counties that are not now part of the separate school system. We also said that they were not part of the public school system. Well, for his own edification, there is not any section of southern Ontario that is not now part of a public school system. There are parts of the province

in southern Ontario, perhaps, that are not in the separate school system. What they are suggesting in their brief, and it makes sense, is that they be left the right to voluntarily establish a board—a separate school board in an area that is not presently organized by the five heads of families in that area. Then, in a mandatory way, this new board must be coupled with an existing combined board for separate school purposes and, Mr. Speaker, perhaps this is a concept that will work. He also referred to the situation where they are providing or suggesting a combination of counties. Mr. Speaker, this may make sense.

We have not rejected this. As I say, we are very encouraged by the response we have had from the separate school organization, and I think, Mr. Speaker, it ill behooves the member to try to interject a matter that is not basically relevant to Bill 44 when he knows, as the hon. members opposite know, who have been here for some time, that the government of this province, the Prime Minister and the Minister, have made every effort to equalize the opportunities in the separate school system of this province. I think you could go to most of the trustees in the separate school system and find this to be accepted by them. I think—

Mr. Lawlor: May I ask the hon. Minister a question?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I think the progress that has been made—

Mr. Lawlor: Will the hon. Minister not permit a question?

Hon. Mr. Davis: —in the separate school system in the four or five years speaks for itself. Mr. Speaker, I will accept some questions—

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Lawlor: That is three times.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I will accept some—

Mr. Speaker: Will the member please resume his seat?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I will accept some questions when my remarks are over.

Mr. Speaker, I say this most sincerely, I am very hopeful that we can bring forward legislation that relates to the separate school system. Until such time, I hope that we have put the position of this government, and I would like to think of this assembly, with respect to separate schools, in its proper perspective as far as this debate is concerned. I hope that I have not been provocative but I think it is essential that the record be set straight.

Let us deal in general terms with some of the aspects of this legislation as were raised by the members opposite yesterday. I will have to apologize in advance that I may miss some of the observations made by the hon. members, and if so, if I can help them at the conclusion of this debate over the next number of weeks, I will be delighted to do so.

Mr. Speaker, as I sensed the debate yesterday, I think—I hope I am right in this—there are two or three areas of concern as expressed by the members opposite. I really was very intrigued by the member for Peterborough (Mr. Pitman). I think he endeavoured to be helpful yesterday in his contribution. I sensed, and I cannot help but say this, that philosophically, Mr. Speaker—and I would say this if the Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) were here—philosophically I think he must feel, on occasions, he is with the wrong group. I think he must feel that. This attitude he takes in some of these—

Mr. MacDonald: The Minister is not being provocative this afternoon?

Hon. Mr. Davis: —situations really perhaps is not in keeping with the philosophy practised by some of those gentlemen who sit beside him or behind him, and I say this in a very kindly fashion. But I was intrigued because I noticed a degree of contradiction in some of his remarks. I noticed a degree of contradiction.

He was concerned, Mr. Speaker, and I think it is a valid concern. You know, how do you bring about such a massive reorganization? He talks about democracy, a permissive situation, and says, "Let us involve everybody in making these decisions."

He then read a speech—and I thought it was a very good speech, Mr. Speaker—of the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. MacNaughton), where the Provincial Treasurer is saying with respect to some aspects of govenment, "What are your constructive ideas; how can you help in the determination of these situations?" He made light of the suggestion that the Provincial Treasurer made. He said, "You know, this is what you are elected to do; you fellows solve it."

Mr. MacDonald: This was the programme for the last ten years or so—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Here, Mr. Speaker, we are coming up with a programme whereby we think we can, in fact, solve very significant problems in the educational sphere of the province of Ontario and the hon. member for Peterborough says, "Mr. Speaker, you know I think it is all right, it may be all right. But let us do it slowly, you know, let us wait another ten years; let us wait until the generation of children have gone through the school system and then let us see, perhaps, if we can bring it about in this very slow, hesitant, and I think negative fashion."

Mr. MacDonald: Orderly, but not slow.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I think, Mr. Speaker, that I recognize his hesitancy. I recognize the problem and I think this is true of many of the members opposite—

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): He wears a couple of hats, you know.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I know that. However, Mr. Speaker, I have some sympathy with the hon. member in that he wears two hats. I wear two hats, sometimes three hats, and I like to think, and I speak for the hon. member opposite and myself, that at least our head sizes have not gone beyond any proportion because of the fact that we wear these hats. Mr. Speaker, I am not suggesting that anyone else's has.

Mr. MacDonald: There is no conflict in the hats.

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, I think this is true, I think this is true. But, Mr. Speaker, I recognize the problem the member for Peterborough has and I think it is true of the hon. members across the House, that you have individual situations within your own ridings. It is tough legislation, but let me tell you this, the fellows on this side of the House have the same problems but they have the intestinal fortitude to support this knowing it is the right thing to do. They know, Mr. Speaker, it is the right thing to do.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Listen, I will come around to the position of this party in a few minutes—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: The hon. member's comment is biologically misplaced.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order!

Hon. Mr. Davis: But I just want to clear up two or three things with the hon. member for Peterborough first.

He suggested that if we wait long enough perhaps the residential and farm assessment or the assessment base that we are using for representation—and we know this is one of the controversial areas and yet we have not had any constructive suggestions as to how we alter it—will be such, or the programme will be such in the county around the city of Peterborough, that we can more realistically bring these groups together. Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member wants to come to the education committee and say to the committee members, "Will you alter the representation to see that there is a much better or higher degree of representation from the city of Peterborough?" If he can live with that with the constituents outside, Mr. Speaker, perhaps the committee will look at it. My own view is that they will have great difficulty in conscientiously rationalizing this—

Mr. MacDonald: The Minister is really playing politics this afternoon.

Hon. Mr. Davis: But maybe, Mr. Speaker, he wishes to do so. I could not help but read his observations at the time of the OEA. I do want to interject here—and I know it is out of order but I do this most sincerely—I congratulate the member for Peterborough on being elected president of the OEA. I think, Mr. Speaker, this is a very singular honour and one that should be recognized by all members of this House, and I sincerely hope—

Mr. Sopha: Is that the same as being treasurer of the law society?

Mr. MacDonald: It was a meaningful appointment.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Oh no, no, I will not say what I was going to say, I will not say what I was going to say. I will say this: I think the member for Peterborough can make a contribution to that organization, and I am sorry I am out of order making that remark. But, Mr. Speaker, I must say this, I was also concerned—this is a bit of educational philosophy, I guess—about the observations that may have been accurately interpreted in the press, maybe not, where he raised the question of shall we say the democratic approach—that perhaps the local people should be determining to a greater extent the areas of administration.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think there is a person in this House who has been more closely associated with the trustees and the teachers of this province than myself. I do not think there is a person who feels more deeply the problems and personal involvement of the trustees who will no longer be trustees after January 1, and I think, Mr. Speaker, and perhaps I should not say it, this is why this legislation is tougher for me, I think, than for anyone here. I know these people, I recognize their contribution; but at the same time surely we must accept the principle, that in this day and age—and I do not think the member for Peterborough would dispute this—surely it is the responsibility of the educational authority, which happens to be The Department of Education, at least to provide the leadership and the direction in the field of curriculum.

Surely it is the responsibility of the department or some organization to determine the question of teacher qualification or certification. Surely we have reached a period in the educational history of Ontario when we recognize the structure that relates to education is part of the educational process. Surely, if the hon. member recognizes the basic responsibilities in the two areas, he must accept the fact that this government, this department, has a responsibility to create viable units of educational administration to see that in fact we can accomplish some of the objectives that we pursue.

You cannot dissociate the structure for educational administration from the educational process any more. I think this must be understood by the hon. member and the members opposite. It is extremely relevant in this year and, of course, for the future, and I think it is important that we keep this in mind.

Mr. Speaker, there has been some discussion and I think there has been some criticism of the decision to use the county boundaries as the basic unit for educational administration. I do not purport to be an expert in municipal affairs. I listened to the member for Downsview who contributes a great deal in these things and I have to be very thankful to him; I do not know all that he is talking about, I do not understand it all, but I do know this, that in the field of education—while you must have boundaries, while you must have areas to determine just what the administrative area will be—surely we have reached a point where we recognize that the boundaries themselves are not the significant things, that it is the function that goes on within that specific geographic area that is relevant.

Surely this is what matters, and Mr. Speaker, when the members opposite attack the county boundaries—and I find it very difficult to understand how this particular group can do so—I do not know of any legislation, Mr. Speaker, whereby we have been more accommodating to the Liberal Party than the introduction of this bill that is based, for southern Ontario, basically on county boundaries. I do not know, I think I do have it, somewhere here I have—

Mr. Nixon: Of course the Minister has it, he said he had it yesterday.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes, I have it. A very excellent pamphlet, a very excellent picture —I do not know whether this was taken in a dialogue with Jack Benny at Expo or where it was.

Mr. Nixon: We are out front talking to the farmers on the track.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Was that it? It is a very good picture, and here is the slogan, Mr. Speaker, the slogan is "now".

Mr. Nixon: I must get my teeth straightened.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Now, I have not canvassed all the dictionaries but I have several definitions here with me today and "now" means immediate, right at once—not like yesterday, not like tomorrow, or six months from now or six years from now. What the Liberal Party has suggested — and Mr. Speaker, I believe they are right and I give them credit for it—is this:

> In addition, a Liberal government will combine elementary and secondary school boards on a county basis where practicable.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Where practicable.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Oh yes, Mr. Speaker, I recognize that the members opposite here say, "Of course it is not practical now where it causes us particular concern." But, Mr. Speaker, they can argue all they like. The fact is simply this: that the Liberal Party in its election manifesto for the people of the province of Ontario on October 17, said conclusively," "We believe in boards of education, larger units of administration; we believe in using the county system" and, Mr. Speaker, they are right, they are right,

I give them full credit for it. But, Mr. Speaker, you wonder why they did it.

Mr. Nixon: The Minister was in that campaign somewhere.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Oh yes, I was around, Mr. Speaker. I spent a little time in my riding. I have no apologies to make for the very encouraging support that we received in the county of Peel North. I have no apologies to make for the result of the vote. Mr. Speaker, let us get back to the county boundaries for a minute if we can. I think there is a very valid reason why the Liberal Party suggested it, and I say this to the members who were not present and participating as members of this Legislature some four years ago just about now.

Mr. Nixon: Now!

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I am using that term—I think it is a wonderful word. Mr. Speaker, a bill was introduced then—Bill 54—this bill received the approval of the then leader of the Opposition; it received the approval of the member for York South, although I can recall so well how, while he supported the bill, he was just hoping—and I think he said this—that this would lead to mass demonstrations or marches, or what have you to Queen's Park by the people from the rural areas over the matter of costs—

Mr. Nixon: It led to mass appointments of superintendents.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Oh yes. We could not achieve equalization in the rural areas through the consolidation of the school sections. I think that we can conclusively show that the township area consolidation really moved very effectively.

Mr. MacDonald: The Minister is quoting one of his backbenchers now.

Hon. Mr. Davis: No. Mr. Speaker, I suggest to the hon. member to check *Hansard* very carefully. He did not do it in an unkind way, I mean it was a natural political instinct. Mr. Speaker, if you look into the history of the legislation Bill 54 was passed, I would think, unanimously by the members of this House and I cannot fault the members who are not present. Then if you go to the year 1966, I believe, section 88—which, incidentally, for the benefit of the leader of the Opposition, went to the education committee—received very little, if any, debate.

Mr. Nixon: That was a *fait accompli.*

Hon. Mr. Davis: No it was not a *fait accompli*—it was open for discussion, and the hon. member really did not perhaps appreciate its significance. I am saying that progressively right back really to the educational beginnings in this province, and certainly since Bill 54, the amendments in 1966, and now this legislation, have been related to the county areas—they have been related to the county boundaries, and for the members opposite—

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): How?

Hon. Mr. Davis: How is very simple, Mr. Speaker. The member for Downsview asks how he should read the legislation. It provides for the combination of township school areas within a county into a county area board.

Mr. Nixon: Some of them chose to do it.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Some of them did. Others were on the way. It provided for a board of education and Mr. Speaker, the part that I find very intriguing is that over this four-year period, there has been no objection raised by the members opposite to the concept of the county area consolidation.

Mr. Nixon: No one thought the Minister was imposing it inflexibly, that is why.

Hon. Mr. Davis: It has not been raised at all in this past four years.

Mr. MacDonald: Why did the Minister not test us during the election by raising the issue?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, there was no need to test. The people knew that this was the long-term policy of the department of the government to bring about county boards of education.

Mr. Nixon: Why was the Minister not brave enough to tell us?

Mr. Singer: What happened to his courage?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Let me, Mr. Speaker, read to you a resolution from the trustees' council in their brief to the Minister in October, 1967. This will perhaps indicate that certainly the thing came as—I do not like the word "shock"—I do not think it was a shock, but then any time a major decision like this is made, particularly if there are some who disagree, they are going to say

it was a surprise, it was a shock, and so on. But here is the resolution from the trustees' council of the province of Ontario—a group of people who make a very real contribution to education and they say this:

> Whereas the Minister of Education at the plenary session of the seminar on policies, purposes, and procedures, on county and district educational development held in 1966, intimated that legislation was being considered for the mandatory establishment of larger units of educational administration at the expiration of the first two years of operation of the county consultative committees—

Mr. Speaker, where have these members been when the county consultative committees have been in operation in their own ridings? What do they think they have been endeavouring to do? What do they think they have been attempting to do? Let me finish the resolution.

> —and whereas it is deemed undesirable that mandatory legislation be passed in this regard at the present time, therefore be it resolved that The Department of Education be requested to postpone the effective date of such mandatory legislation until at least 1969.

Mr. Speaker, can there be clearer evidence that at least a portion of our community not only knew this was coming about but they specifically suggested it not be done before 1969, and this, in fact—

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): The people of Ontario—

Hon. Mr. Davis: In September 1967 they—

Mr. Singer: The Minister did not tell the voters.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, they tell me that I intimated to them in 1966—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Let us get back to county boundaries for a moment. As I say, I think I know why the Liberal Party—

Mr. Sopha: It is a negation of democracy.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I agree that there should be county units. So, Mr. Speaker, what are the alternatives, what are the alternatives?

Mr. Sopha: The Minister did not consult the people.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The Department of Education, Mr. Speaker, and others looked very carefully and I think there may have been two other alternatives, maybe three or four. But let us look at one. One that was very definitely considered was to take the map of the province of Ontario and by a very technical analysis just completely redraft the whole structure of the province of Ontario to relate specifically to education, ignoring any municipal boundary lines. This was one approach, Mr. Speaker, that perhaps could have been taken. I do not deny this. This is one approach that could have been taken.

The second approach was suggested by the member for Huron-Bruce and was canvassed carefully, and that is that we use the existing district high school boundaries. But let me point out to the member—and I will not go into detail—some of the obvious disadvantages of doing this. Some of the district high school boundaries, and it shows that we are really not as inflexible as the members opposite would suggest, now presently cross county boundaries; a number of them do.

I am not saying they are not working, Mr. Speaker, but what must be recognized is that the elementary system, which constitutes the majority of the total number of students within the system have, almost without exception, been confined to areas within county boundaries. So we had to, shall we say, marry the two situations. And after a very careful analysis it was felt that while there are imperfections—we are not saying the county boundaries are perfect, we are not saying that they exactly fit the needs of what we attempt to do—but we say from a practical and educational standpoint they represent the best that is available to us.

Mr. Singer: That is not so.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Downsview, who I know is an expert on all things, will tell me it is not so.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I will say to the hon. member for Downsview there are some who disagree with him and I happen to be one, and so we will have to leave it at that. And I say that after very careful consideration—

Mr. Singer: Why does the Minister not qualify his remark?

Hon. Mr. Davis: After very careful consideration, Mr. Speaker, the determination was made that you have to start from some beginning; you have to make a beginning.

We are saying that the county boundaries make as much sense, or more, than any other situation that exists. And when we accept this, and when we go back to the basic principle that it is the function that goes on within the boundary that is relevant, surely we can in some way resolve in the minds of the members opposite that the question of the county boundary really is not the relevant aspect of what we are attempting to do. It sets an area.

I will get around to Waterloo county, because this is where the Minister has problems. He hears from the leader of the Opposition that in Waterloo county there should be two, maybe three boards.

He hears that from the member for Waterloo. I did not hear from the member for Kitchener. But, I have a letter here in a representation from the Kitchener public school board to the group that is studying Waterloo county, saying that it could be a single board. I have this on file. The interim committee was in to see me the other day and these are conscientious men and women trying to determine, as best they can, really how it can effectively work within Waterloo county.

I met with them just two days ago and they have not reached a consensus. A month ago, I think it is fair to state, they were suggesting three boards. When they came to see me two days ago they were suggesting two boards. There were people there who suggested they preferred one board. There were two or three who suggested that whatever way it goes we can make it work because we know it is in the best interest of the young people.

Mr. Nixon: You are asking us to vote for one board now.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I am not asking the hon. member to vote for one board now. I am asking the hon. members opposite to accept a principle. If he wants to tie the principle to county boundaries, because he thinks this can be a political issue, that is his determination.

I noticed his remarks to the OEA, and I really did not mean to bring this up, where he suggested the government and the Minister had put political considerations ahead of education. When I think that there has been any single piece of legislation before this House that is non-political in nature—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Davis: When it is non-political in nature this is it—this is it. Mr. Speaker, if we wanted to be—

Mr. Nixon: They are afraid.

Mr. Singer: You were afraid to bring it into the election campaign.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, if we wanted to be political, we would not do anything.

Mr. Singer: Oh, nonsense.

Hon. Mr. Davis: However, I will get back to Waterloo county in a minute. I just want to relate two or three other matters that relate to the county boundaries. I listened with interest to the observations of the member for Welland South (Mr. Haggerty). He gave us a very interesting lesson in history. I told him so earlier today. I enjoyed it and I think that it was factually laid out rather well.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, no, I am quite sincere about it. I know that the member for Downsview—

Mr. Singer: No one can be more patient than—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, do you know what I find about people who make observations like the hon. member just made to me? It indicates that perhaps this is the attitude they attribute subconsciously to themselves and they try and make this rub off on others.

Let us get back to the history lesson that was given to us by the member for Welland South. And I say I thought it was very well done. I think what he was trying to say was simply this: because the county boundaries were laid out many years ago they did not relate, as I understand his message, necessarily to any municipal or, certainly, educational lines at the time. Because they are 100 years old they are necessarily outdated and not useable as far as our present processes are concerned.

Mr. Singer: That is not part—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, I do not know—

An hon. member: Let him speak for himself.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I got this impression from him and I—

Mr. Singer: The Minister is wrong again.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I sort of got the impression from him when I discussed it with him this morning.

Mr. Singer: Well, the Minister is wrong again.

Hon. Mr. Davis: All right, so I am wrong. But I think the hon. member for Welland South and I know what we are talking about. All I am saying is this, Mr. Speaker, I know the boundaries are 100 years old, but that does not make them wrong either. Look at other things in this jurisdiction that are 100 years old. I know the members over here, our socialistic friends, would say that because the Liberal Party is 100 years old that it is outdated and it has no longer any use in our present society. I would not say this Mr. Speaker, I would not say this at all—

I may say that on this legislation they have not indicated that they are in the 20th century yet, but nonetheless I would not say they are outdated. But I think we must recognize the fact that because we are using traditional avenues of administration—the hon. member for Downsview said last evening, and I recall him saying it and I agree with him, that there is merit if at all possible in sticking to existing municipal boundaries. He referred to the Metro situation. He was right. There is merit and we are doing this in our legislation.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member thinks he can prompt me into any sort of dialogue with the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. McKeough) at this particular moment—

Mr. Singer: Perish the thought that they should talk to each other.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I can only say this to the hon. member: when you see the city of Ottawa legislation you will just realize how closely the departments of this government do co-operate; you wait and see. And so, Mr. Speaker, if I can once again return to the county boundaries situation. We recognize its imperfections. We have provided in the legislation, and perhaps the hon. members have not read this, for the combining of two counties if it makes sense to do so.

It is there, and as I have said to many groups, many organizations that have been in to see me, we know their problems. No Minister or department a year from now or two years from now, when we have had an opportunity to sort these out, will refuse consideration of this situation. When board A comes in from county A and board B comes in from county B and they say to me, "Mr. Minister, we think an alteration here within a certain area and with this municipality going in here and so on is effective," and both counties agree to this alteration, Mr. Speaker, no Minister, no department, no government is going to refuse to consider it.

But, Mr. Speaker, I have to remind the hon. members this is difficult legislation. To start making exceptions at this particular stage in our discussions would not only be doing the educational system a great disservice, it would fragment the legislation to the point where perhaps there would be just no point in discussing it. I have had these people in my office.

Members of the Opposition bring their delegations in to see me, and I think that it is fair to state that we have not in any way refused to see them. I may not have been able to see all of them because there are not enough hours in the day to accommodate everybody, but I try.

Mr. Speaker, I think that I am right in this, that the delegations that have been to see me since the blueprint was issued and the bill was distributed have accepted in principle what we were doing, almost without exception. And I cannot think of any, but there may have been one or two of the interim committees that were in to see me accepted the county boundaries, but suggested that consideration be given to making some exception in their case. I think that in most instances it was to incorporate two boards instead of one. But once again, Mr. Speaker, within the county boundaries that had been established.

Mr. Nixon: Not necessarily representation for the whole county.

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, we have not had representation for a county.

Mr. Nixon: But that is what the government's bill permits, two whole counties.

Hon. Mr. Davis: That is right, Mr. Speaker, and I am not saying that I agree or disagree, or they disagree or agree with it. I say that in principle they agree with the legislation. They are saying that they want a division. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have taken this position with every organization or group that has come to see me and the officials of the department. The member for York Centre

(Mr. Deacon) and I told the group from Waterloo, and three or four others, Wentworth and so on, that I was not going to make any decision as to whether or not certain counties should be divided on the basis of population or what have you, until the education committee had an opportunity to deal with it so that everybody was being dealt with on a fair basis.

Mr. Speaker, we are not as inflexible as the members opposite would suggest. But we do have a responsibility to see that this is effective legislation. The teachers' federation—I am not saying that they supported entirely everything that we are doing. I am not saying this. One of their specific observations is that they would like to see more flexibility in the legislation. And I said to the Ontario teachers' federation, "we are prepared to consider flexibility but how, in fact, do you do it in a way that is educationally right?" And, Mr. Speaker, we were prepared, and the committee would be quite prepared, to receive the suggestions because they affect a relatively small percentage of the total population.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that with respect to many aspects of the discussion yesterday, the member for Niagara Falls—and I honestly cannot recall everything that was said—raised some concern. He went back a little bit in history to the question of the consolidation in bygone years with respect to grants. I would say to the member for Niagara Falls that this is no longer the case. He was referring to a situation where the grant structure and the rate between the city or the towns and the rural townships were not the same. They are all now on the basis of assessment and need, and the situation that he referred to just would not take place today. It is no longer part of the grant structure, and I hope, Mr. Speaker, that this resolves that part of his concern. And then, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. G. Bukator (Niagara Falls): As far as the Minister is concerned.

Hon. Mr. Davis: And then Mr. Speaker.

No. The hon. member for Niagara Falls would like to see more money put into the school system. Let us talk about finance for two or three minutes.

I am sure that the leader of the Opposition is aware that this bill—and the school legislation—does not relate to finance. The question of amount of money, the way the money is to be distributed, relates to the grant structure that is changed from year to year. I can only say to the hon. members opposite, that we recognize without any question, that the county school area plan will of necessity—and I think that this is one of the positive aspects of this—lead to the development of a much better grant structure here in the province of Ontario. It will do this, there is no question about it.

And Mr. Speaker, when I see the members opposite, and they come to me with their individual problems—you do not appreciate just how difficult it is to develop a grant plan that can relate to the specific needs of 1,500 school boards in the province of Ontario, and more than that. It is an almost impossible task, although I think that we have done a relatively good job. But Mr. Speaker, think just what benefits will flow from, shall we say, a 100-board structure in the province of Ontario, when we can have current information as to financial situations; where we can have enrolment perhaps, if not on a monthly, then on a six-month basis; where we can relate grants to programmes more specifically.

You know, I wish that one of the members from Scarborough, the one who sits behind the member for Peterborough—and here I go back to this question of compulsory or permissive situations—not too many years ago he made the speech about compulsory classes for the emotionally disturbed. This would be completely contradictory to his philosophical approach to education. And of course, how can you have compulsory classes for the emotionally disturbed if you do not have units that we are discussing here today? You cannot do it in the rural areas. But I recognize this, and I will not say any more about finance.

The member for Niagara Falls, and everybody over there, would like to have 80, 90, or 100 per cent. All that I am saying is that out of this will evolve another grant structure. It must reflect the programme—the need—for special education, and it can, I think more accurately reflect the needs of the some 100 units that are involved in the education process. It will give certainly, without any doubt, give a greater rationalization for the educational investment that is being made.

I am not here to tell you that it going to cost us less and all the rest of it as long as these are an increasing number of children—and I will take responsibility for only five of these—but as long as we have an increasing number of children going into the school system—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, well, I guess I am sensitive, because a lot of people refer to the school system as 1.8 million of them.

Mr. Nixon: Mothers and fathers?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes, is that not a sad thought? But I must say—

Mr. Singer: Here is my chance to solve the role of the father in Ontario.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Oh, I do not feel that old, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Do not be nasty!

Hon. Mr. Davis: I do not feel that old, really. So, I say to the hon. members opposite that I am not here to persuade them on costs on this occasion. There is no question—

Mr. Nixon: Although the Minister did include it as his fifth principle.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I included as the fifth principle that there can be a greater rationalization of the investment in education. No question about it.

Mr. Nixon: Its equalization should be the responsibility of the department.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Right, I am not quarreling with this. This has been our policy for years.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Oh no, it does not, it means that we bring about equalization by the distribution of money. But I am not getting into the 80 per cent factor. The leader of the Opposition could debate these figures for hours, and I do not think that the members want to do this on this occasion. I just refer very briefly to the members for Niagara Falls, Welland, and so on, as it relates to the Mayo report.

We know of the Mayo report, and we have it available to us. We do not think that it provides the educational answers for that part of the province of Ontario. It, as I recall it, recommended a two-tier system of educational administration, the system that exists presently in Metro. And, Mr. Speaker, there have been, as the hon. members know, some difficulties with the two-tier system approach. I believe that they will be resolved, and they will work, but we think that in the majority of the areas of the province of Ontario a single-tier approach to administration makes greater sense, and I think that I am right in this when I say that most educational authorities agree with this view.

When you look at the Mayo report, it does not talk about one county, it talks about a Metro board with almost absolute control of finance, determining the educational programme of the two counties. Of the two counties. Surely, what we are suggesting is more responsive to the needs of the people in that part of the province of Ontario, than the recommendations of the Mayo report. I do not think that there is any question about it, Mr. Speaker. Sure, some of the situations continue to exist in boroughs. They have certain responsibilities, but the fiscal or financial control lies, as I read the report at least, in the hands of the Metro board. This controls both counties, involves educational situations as well, and I think that the approach that we are taking—and I say this most sincerely with respect to the Niagara peninsula—really is more responsive to the needs of the people within those communities. It is not perfect, I can see that, but I think, Mr. Speaker, it probably will serve the needs better than the recommendations of the Mayo committee report.

I have a situation in the great ridings of Peel and Halton. We had a similar report—or at least a report that was not dissimilar—which divided, as the member for Halton knows, the two counties, Peel and Halton into rural and urban. It took the two large areas on the portions fronting on the lake, and combined them into the urban city of Mississauga. Then to the north they combined the rural areas of Peel and Halton into the urban county of Peel-Halton, I think that is the terminology used.

Mr. Speaker, I am not quarreling with it. Maybe it makes sense municipally. My own personal reaction is that it does not, but educationally we could not accept it, because it amounted to this—and this is why we cannot go always on these studies—it amounted to a complete divorce between the urban and the rural communities. It amounted to a complete divorce. You had your highly industrialized, residential areas, your relatively wealthy areas, in a single board unit. You had the rural areas to the north in another board unit, and without any question the majority of students who go through the school system that would have existed in the northern part of those counties, would have gone to seek employment in the urban centres to the south. Is this any way in this day and age to bring about an integration of our communities and our society?

This is one of the other things—and I recall the observations of the member for Waterloo South, Mr. Speaker. Certainly one of the philosophies—and I am not being critical of the existing structure of rural education—but surely one of the existing philosophies must be to relate as closely as possible the educational experience in our urban centres with the educational experience in the rural areas of the province of Ontario. I have discussed this with the Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. Stewart). I am not saying it is a good or a bad thing, but the fact is simply this, that the majority of young people being educated in the rural and less urbanized areas of Ontario today are seeking employment in our towns and cities. This is a fact. I do not make these situations. My responsibility, and I suggest with respect, the responsibility of the members of this House is to see that the youngsters who receive their education in the rural and less urbanized communities have the same educational opportunity as the young people in our more sophisticated urban centres. Surely this is what we are attempting to do. This is why—I was reading some material the other day of an experiment elsewhere, where, Mr. Speaker, they were trying to develop two plans for educational administration: one that related specifically to the urban centres, and one that related specifically to the rural communities. Without exception, those who looked into this question carefully took the position, as I do here, that any plan of administration that was introduced in the province of Ontario, that artificially separates the urban from the rural is outdated before it is introduced. We cannot accept that type of philosophy today.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the leader of the Opposition—and really he was constructive, I say this to him, but I want to point out just one factual situation where he was not quite accurate, where he suggested in the province of Manitoba that the question of consolidation was put to a referendum and across the board was rejected. Well, of course this is not—

Mr. Nixon: Oh, no.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I just recall the term "across the board".

Mr. Nixon: I said that it did not meet with the success normally expected.

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, no, "across the board it was rejected". I think, if you check *Hansard* it was very close to this terminology. The fact is, that out of some 33 areas that were proposed, 18 in fact accepted, something over 50 per cent. And it is interesting to notice that all parties supported it, all parties endeavoured to bring this about, in fact they are still doing so. But 18, some 50 per cent or more, did, in fact, accept the proposal that was put to the people of that province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have gone on. I have got, as you can see, a lot of other material here. I am not going into the pros and cons of the number of people who have written in support or opposed. Some of the members opposite have read some letters from township councils, I have had these resolutions. I have had copies of all of them. I also have a fairly significant number of letters, documents, editorials, in support of what is being done. Surely we do not get around to deciding how many people are in favour and how many are against, when it becomes something of an emotional issue.

Mr. Sargent: Those people do not count.

Hon. Mr. Davis: They mean a great deal, Mr. Speaker. I would say this: Perhaps we are a little more sensitive than the member for—

Mr. Sargent: Now, come on, the people are important to us.

Hon. Mr. Davis: They are important to us too. This is the part that sometimes concerns me about the member for Grey-Bruce. The member for Scarborough West (Mr. Lewis), did this on occasion too when we were discussing education last year. They try to create the impression that they are the only ones concerned about people. They try to create the impression, that the member for Grey-Bruce is so close to the people in his riding that he is the only one that is concerned. Well, Mr. Speaker, let him know this, that this government, through this legislation, through other legislation is not only just as interested in a constructive way, but is doing more about serving and helping people than the member for Grey-Bruce will ever do. Let him disagree, Mr. Speaker. I do not quarrel with this. I do not expect unanimous support for what we are doing. Let him disagree with what we are doing. Let him debate our policies, but, Mr. Speaker, let him be man enough at least to understand the motives and the desires of what we are attempting to do.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. He has asked me to explain this. Mr. Speaker—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Sargent: He has asked the point, I will give it to him now.

Mr. Speaker: The point of order, not a question, the point of order.

Mr. Sargent: Will the Minister accept this statement from me on his question?

Mr. Speaker: That is not a point of order. The member—

Mr. Sargent: He is asking a question, I will answer him now.

Mr. Speaker: It was a rhetorical question. The member has no point of order, the Minister will continue.

Mr. Sargent: The Minister is afraid of the truth.

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, Mr. Speaker, we may be afraid of some things, I am not sure what they are, but one of them is not the truth.

Mr. Speaker, as I say, I have a number of other notes here. I hope the hon. members opposite will appreciate that I cannot answer each individual situation for them here today. I have tried to deal—I see the member for Kent (Mr. Spence), who raised some concern—I have read the press, I know why he is concerned. I know he is reflecting the views of some of his constituents. I only hope he will remember these, and also the member for Essex-Kent (Mr. Ruston), when we debate the estimates of The Department of Education, because I could not help but gain the impression from those two hon. members that things were so good in their ridings educationally, things could not be better, that they do not want any change. They are tremendous, they are wonderful. I will remember this in a few weeks when we get around to The Department of Education. And the hon. member for Kent, he raised a very valid point. He says, "Mr. Minister, we think you are going too fast." Well it is not often that a Conservative government is accused of going too fast.

But Mr. Speaker, let us recognize this—and I think the members opposite recognize it: This government, this Minister, the department I administer, we do not lay down the ground rules as to the pace at which society has changed. We do not lay down the ground rules with respect to the advance in science and technology that is taking place every hour of every day of every week. I do not have the capacity to say to somebody, "Stop the world, I want to get off for a couple of years so we can all have a rest." I do not have this power.

Mr. Singer: It is the first time I have heard the Minister limit his power.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Perhaps the member for Downsview may have this power, I do not know.

An hon. member: He thinks he has anyway.

Hon. Mr. Davis: But Mr. Speaker, you cannot do this. The educators of this province today—and I give them every tribute—have to run to keep up. We are really not sure we are keeping up with the changes that are taking place in our society. It is a tough job, and we cannot say, "Stop, we want to sort of consolidate," and so on, we have a responsibility to provide leadership so that these young people can truly participate in the changing communities that we see before us in the province, and quite frankly, elsewhere in Canada. This is part of our responsibility.

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent): How about a break for the taxpayers?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I am as aware as the member for Kent as to the load, whether it be on real property, sales tax, or what have you, that relates to education. No one is more aware of it than myself, and I will debate the validity of what is being done, the investment that is being made in the estimates of the department, rather than on this occasion.

Mr. Sopha: Will the Minister tell me before he sits down, does INCO contribute?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Does INCO contribute? Mr. Speaker, I must confess to the member for Sudbury, I am not familiar with the exact relationship of INCO to the total revenues of the province of Ontario, what portions of those find their way back into the educational system. I am not sure that I can be helpful to the hon. member on this occasion. But I took note of what he said yesterday. I took note of it. I told him I would.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I cannot think of anything else—well, I can, I can think of another couple of hours of things I would like to say on this occasion, but I will not. The leader of the Opposition moved a motion that this bill be referred to the standing committee on education prior to its receiving approval of the House on second reading.

Mr. Speaker, I have discussed the question of the committee on education, and representations that should be made. I have informed maybe not all of them yet but certainly we shall. Not only because the education committee would like to have them there, but I personally would urge them to attend. I do not know how the committee will decide they will handle representation because it is going to be a very onerous task, and I say to the leader of the Opposition, I think they are now in a position to have a meeting and I think we will see just how interested the members of his party wish to become, because I think that, to do this job in a comprehensive way, they have to learn to live and completely understand the legislation.

I think it is important, before any representation is made to the committee, that the officials of The Department of Education are questioned exhaustively by the members of the committee to understand completely, not only the philosophical reasoning behind it, but the actual application of it. And I think the committee members, to do this properly, must do this first, and I make this suggestion to the leader of the Opposition that we make the committee on education an effective committee in this session. I am prepared to do so if he is, but I say to him that if we are going to do this we must do it in a very positive fashion and it will mean a great deal of time and effort on the part of the membership.

Mr. Nixon: I think we should have a chance to discuss these facts before we approve it in principle.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, Mr. Speaker, we are not approving all matters in principle, we are approving the principle of the bill, and I said to the member for Peterborough three or four weeks ago that not only was I prepared to recommend that the committee have representations—and I think you have to analyze just how you are going to do it—not only was I prepared, but I urged the committee to do this. And I say to the House on this occasion that there is no need to support the amendment by the leader of the Opposition. We are not going to accomplish any more than we will by having second reading approved here and then tackle the specific problems as they relate to individual counties—counties of Waterloo, York, Wentworth and others—who wish to make representations. Mr. Speaker, I have them all enumerated; I shall give them to the committee, and be delighted to have them make their case and make their suggestions there.

I think this is very helpful. If we had done this say three or four weeks ago it would have been an impossible situation. Some of these trustees are meeting one another for the first time. Read the press. Look at the press from Perth and other counties; there is a growing consensus and a growing feeling that they can make it work. They want to make it work. They are talking now about the new programmes that can be introduced because of the county system. There is a very positive attitude developing.

Mr. Speaker, I assure the hon. members here on this occasion that I am prepared to support the committee on education in a very exhaustive study, a very exhaustive period of—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sargent: Will the Minister answer a question?

Hon. Mr. Davis: —with those who wish to make representation—

Mr. Sargent: Will the Minister answer a question?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I suggest with respect that we will end up accomplishing exactly the same thing as the hon. leader of the Opposition has suggested. At the same time the members of this House will have the courage, I hope, to support what in my view is legislation that is not—and I say this to the member for Huron-Bruce, I have read some of his speeches—designed to benefit the trustees of Ontario. I admit this, I admit this; I know that a lot of them will no longer have positions of responsibility. It is not being designed for the professional teacher of Ontario.

This is the only other part that sort of disturbs me about the contribution of the member for Peterborough, and perhaps it is part of the philosophy of that party. They recognize that they think it is desirable but when they say, "But, you know, this may not work, that may not work, I am worried about this, I am worried about that." Mr. Speaker, we are all worried, but at the same time, if we do not take positive steps forward in an aggressive way, how will we ever make these determinations? I suggest to him, become an optimist; he has been in the political profession long enough to know that in this profession at least one has to be an

optimist or one should get out. But Mr. Speaker, I say this, it is not designed for the teachers *per se*.

I am not going to deal with some of the observations from the member for Sudbury East. I really do not think his contribution yesterday was too helpful—I say that with all kindliness, it was not. It was not really helpful.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): That is a matter of opinion.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I know it is, but he expressed his opinion yesterday, I am expressing mine today. Turn about is fair play.

So I suggest that we think this legislation will without any question provide the professional teachers with far greater flexibility, far greater opportunities, for advancement and creative—shall we say, operation—within the school system. I think, Mr. Speaker, that a growing number of teachers appreciate the potential that exists for them in the county units. I am sure they do. The leader of the Opposition is saying I have been too long and I think he is right. But Mr. Speaker, I am pretty involved in this legislation, I think it is going to work. I say to the member for Huron-Bruce (Mr. Gaunt), we did not design it for the trustees; we did not design it for professional teachers specifically; it is designed with one purpose in mind alone, and that is a realistic approach to the principle that we all—

Mr. Sargent: How much is it going to cost? Mr. Speaker, let him answer a good question.

Mr. Speaker: Order! The Minister has indicated that he will not answer questions so the member will please refrain from asking them.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I will repeat it again, as long as the member for Grey-Bruce feels inclined to add once again his very helpful contribution to this debate, and it cannot be repeated often enough, that this legislation is not for the trustees—it gives them greater responsibilities; it is not for the teachers, but it gives them greater potential creative involvement in the educational system; it is for one purpose only and that is to achieve the objective that every member in this House supports, and that is the equality of educational opportunity for each and every youngster in the school system of the province.

Mr. Speaker: In order that I may refresh the memory of those who have been members of this House previously and inform the new members, I would state that in the third session of the 27th Parliament, Mr. Speaker Morrow, with the agreement of the party leaders, announced and ruled that our rule no. 56 would henceforth be followed. Subsequently, in the next session, the fourth session, on February 11, 1966, Mr. Speaker Morrow again ruled that the procedure to be followed by this House on these occasions would be that laid down by that rule, and so in order that we may all understand how the vote is to be taken, may I suggest the following:

The first question to be decided is whether the word "now", and all the other words sought to be struck out, shall stand, and when that motion is put, if it is carried then the bill automatically has second reading. If it is not carried, then the amendment will require action. So now I will put the question.

The House divided on the question: "Shall the word 'now' and other words sought to be struck out stand"; which was carried by the following vote:

Ayes	Nays
Allan	Braithwaite
Apps	Breithaupt
Auld	Bukator
Bales	Bullbrook
Belanger	Burr
Bernier	Davison
Boyer	Deacon
Brunelle	Deans
Carruthers	Farquhar
Carton	Ferrier
Davis	Gaunt
Demers	Gisborn
Downer	Good
Dunlop	Haggerty
Dymond	Innes
Evans	Jackson
Gilbertson	Knight
Gomme	Lawlor
Grossman	Lewis
Guindon	MacDonald
Haskett	MacKenzie
Henderson	Makarchuk
Hodgson (Victoria-Haliburton)	Martel
	Newman (Windsor-Walkerville)
Hodgson (York North)	Nixon

Ayes	Nays
Jessiman	Paterson
Johnston (St. Catharines)	Peacock
Johnston (Carleton)	Pilkey
Kennedy	Pitman
Kerr	Renwick (Riverdale)
Lawrence (Carleton East)	Renwick (Mrs.) (Scarborough Centre)
Lawrence (St. George)	Ruston
MacNaughton	Sargent
Meen	Singer
Morin	Sopha
Morningstar	Spence
McKeough	Stokes
McNeil	Young—38.
Newman (Ontario South)	
Olde	
Potter	
Price	
Randall	
Reilly	
Reuter	
Robarts	
Rollins	
Root	
Rowe	
Rowntree	
Simonett	
Smith (Simcoe East)	
Smith (Hamilton Mountain)	
Snow	
Stewart	
Villeneuve	
Welch	
Wells	
White	
Whitney	
Winkler	
Wishart	
Wakabuski	
Yaremko—63.	

Clerk of the House: Mr. Speaker, the "ayes" are 63; the "nays" 38.

Mr. Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Clerk of the House: The 4th order; second reading of Bill 32, An Act to amend The Judicature Act.

THE JUDICATURE ACT

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General) moves second reading of Bill 32, An Act to amend The Judicature Act.

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Speaker, I want to say briefly that I have very grave doubts about the efficacy of the procedure that this bill adopts insofar as it might do damage to our historical sense in this province in depriving people at some future time from consulting records which the lapse of time might prove to make of very great value. Documents once destroyed, of course, are put beyond the reach of any person who might wish to make some research into a matter, which after all might seem to be very obscure and very unimportant at this time, but not in the future.

Fortunately there comes readily to mind that in the mid 1840s, when Macdonald as a young man was articled as a clerk at the town of Picton, he at one time was charged with common assault, with a group of his fellows who were out on the town of an evening and engaging in some ribaldry and fell into the hands of the constabulary that night. The process was started against him before the justices, but I must say it was later withdrawn, fortunately. He was never in peril of being convicted of the events. But it is not so long ago that that old information was located and it was removed to the archives of Canada.

At the moment of the laying of the information, of course no person could have foreseen that Macdonald would reach an unrivalled stature in the history of his country, and in a country of wide spaces like this, I must express some reservation about the destruction of papers that might form part of history. Surely like the radioactive effluent from atomic installations, some place should be found to store them and leave them available for some future researcher to have a look at them. I very much mistrust the judgment of a person attempting to be objective now in determining, in the light of the moment, what is valuable and what is not. He can be terribly mistaken.

I merely express the regret that this power is granted to any person. I do recall—things come back to one's mind—some years ago when I was first elected to this House an advertisement appeared in the *Weekly Notes* concerning the county of Frontenac, and it was intended in the surrogate court to destroy some of the old records, I think it was up to 1930 or 1935. A judge, I believe his name

was Strange—Judge Strange of the county of Frontenac, I do not know if he is still the judge or not—wrote to me and asked me if I could take any steps to persuade any person not to destroy those records of the surrogate court. I felt utterly incapable of dissuading their destruction, but perhaps a plea to the Attorney General could achieve the result of reconsideration of this matter so that documents are preserved for posterity.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, I will just say that I appreciate the concern of the hon. member for the preservation of documents which might have some historical value. I would draw to his attention—and that of the House, actually—that the language here in the forepart of section 2 is not changed. It is the same language as has existed for many years—that is, "for so long that it appears the records need not be preserved any longer," and then they are destroyed. We have simply added in that procedure the documents and records of the Supreme Court, and this has always existed with respect to the county courts and the district courts.

I would say this, that it is my understanding that the records are preserved for a very long time in any event. I have no doubt that they will be available for a long time. I think there is no one better, perhaps, to see to their historical value than the chief justice of Ontario. I would think we could entrust to him that duty with respect to Supreme Court matters, and to the chief judges of the county and district court with respect to the county courts.

There is a great deal of material in our courts which has no, or very little, historical value. There is the occasional case that has great historical value, but I would point out that of course these cases—or the judgments at least, and a great deal of the evidence recounted in the judgments—are preserved in our law reports. And I think those cases of great historical value, of great value in our progress in a legal way, will be preserved. So I think we may entrust to the judgment of the chief justice this duty of getting rid of what becomes a tremendous burden of something that is of no value, but simply clutters up the archives of the court.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): Mr. Speaker, if I might address a question to hon. Attorney General, I was under the impression here that these documents were microfilmed in almost every county. Am I incorrect in that assumption?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: It is my understanding, Mr. Speaker, that not all the court case records are microfilmed. This is so of registry office and land titles, but I think not so in the matter of court proceedings and that sort of thing.

Mr. Bullbrook: Might I ask, would it be worthy of entertaining the fact that perhaps they might be microfilmed?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I could take that under consideration, Mr. Speaker. There is considerable expense involved in the equipment, and in the training of personnel to use it, and I am sure the hon. member will appreciate this. If we did this all the courts—and you could scarcely do it for one without taking them all into account—it would be quite a tremendous piece of work. And I do not believe that for so rare an exception, it would be justified. I mean there are many many cases which are trivial, perhaps, except to the parties who are engaged in them—

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion for the second reading of Bill 32 be passed and carried?

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE EVIDENCE ACT

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves the second reading of Bill 43, An Act to amend The Evidence Act.

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Speaker, I for one am very emphatically opposed to this procedure. I do not know that the House will divide on the adoption of this bill in the second reading, but I can promise the Attorney General that if, as I expect, he will give me the assurance that it will go to the legal bills committee, then he is going to be met there with a very articulate delegation of advocates of this city and province, who are going to call trenchantly the principles of this bill to his attention.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I would give this assurance at once, Mr. Speaker. This bill will go to the legal bills committee.

Mr. Sopha: And the principle of the bill which violates the rights of a litigant, is that the right of cross-examination is deprived to the litigant. One does not know what the genesis of this procedure was, but one can only suspect that it arose out of the inconvenience to the medical profession. And the

medical profession probably made it known that some of them, or many of them, were greatly inconvenienced by attending on the courts and having to wait for protracted periods of time in order to give their evidence. Not being lawyers, but being doctors they felt that it would be a good idea that their evidence go in written form.

Well, unbeknownst to them, of course that deprives the litigant adverse in interest of the opportunity to cross-examine the proponent of the evidence. Then, of course, I am one of those who I must frankly admit is always suspicious of insurance companies, and that suspicion has grown out of experience with them.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Solicitors for the insurance companies oppose this legislation.

Mr. Sopha: I am delighted to hear it. I had thought that they would approve of it because it would give them, at the earliest opportunity, the facility of seeing over the hand of the litigant's doctor what was wrong with him.

The Attorney General amended The Evidence Act a couple of years ago, probably three years ago, to permit with the leave of the court, the filing of medical reports. Now the rules committee is an organization which I have always looked upon with a very jaundiced eye indeed, as not reflecting too forthrightly, the plaintiff's interest. It has always been rather balanced in favour of defendants. And let it be said that the Attorney General or his representatives have never been very vigorous participants in the activities of that committee. One gets the impression that they have been rather silent and pliable, if one judges by some of the rules that emanate from it.

The rules committee of course—my friend from Armourdale will remember—enacted rules which in substance, if not in word, were similar to section 2 of this bill. I believe it was the court of appeal, it might have been a judge of the high court but I think it was the court of appeal.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: The court of appeal—

Mr. Sopha: The court of appeal struck the rules down as being an exercise of legislative power, and thus *ultra vires* of the rules committee. The Attorney General let it rest for a year. I think, I am almost certain, that was two years ago, and the Attorney General did not rush to fill the breach by the enactment of this provision. He let a year go by, and now this year he seeks to slide into the statute what were the rules complementary to the filling of medical reports.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, I am sure the hon. member will permit me to say that judgment of the court of appeal was only rendered last year, in 1967.

Mr. Sopha: Yes, but it was rendered in time for legislative sessions last year, because I remember thinking is it not strange that the Attorney General does not make any move to remedy the deficiency, and I thought with relief that the Attorney General had seen the error of his ways. But I was to be disappointed. So now this year, he comes forward with these.

I say to the Attorney General—now that I have the safety of the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Connell) being out of the House; were he present I would not relate this story, because he is very critical of me talking about my own cases—that I recently had a case before the hon. Mr. Justice Ferguson involving a fatal accident, where of course the present health of the widow, the plaintiff, was germane to the matter of damages. Rather than call her doctor who gave her a clean bill of health, I felt that it would be sufficient to put in a letter from the doctor with the leave of the court. And the letter appeared to say, at least I thought that the letter said, that the plaintiff widow was enjoying good health, and she had no major physical problems at the moment. I thought that was what the letter said.

But Mr. Justice Ferguson, on reading the letter, immediately directed everyone's attention to what he called the patent ambiguity of the doctor's statement. He said, for reasons that I did not entirely comprehend, that the doctor's letter lacked clarity about the plaintiff's health. Now that could have been remedied very easily by giving the doctor the book to be sworn and letting him relate in his own words, subject to cross-examination, his views. Unfortunately, he was in Florida at the time of the trial, and that shows one of the problems. There you are: The litigant is in court and he is relying upon the written communication; if it is found to be unsatisfactory, he may be disabled from calling the doctor in person.

That is relatively less serious than the major assault upon this, and this is that it deprives the person of the right of cross-examination.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: That is still open.

Mr. Sopha: It is not open. It is not open at all. The Evidence Act says that the court, if it is of the opinion that the evidence might have been put in in written form, may penalize the party in costs—

Mr. Bullbrook: The party in costs?

Mr. Sopha: —may penalize the party in costs by calling the medical witnesses when the evidence might have been tendered in the form of a letter. Any solicitor facing, or any counsel facing, a possible penalty in costs is perfectly justified in refusing to take the risk and avoiding the embarrassment, and no counsel in front of his client and in the face of the court welcomes the environment where he might publicly be open to criticism.

Mr. Bullbrook: That's extremely important.

Mr. Sopha: Indeed. We are reminded—none of the judges are here of course, and I am sure the press won't report it—of some of the vigour of the criticism that comes from the bench from time to time, toward counsel quite gratuitously. I have noticed Mr. Justice McRuer does not deal with that aspect of civil rights in his report—the crucible in which rights are to be found. I will leave that. I am not going to belabour it, and I have not talked to my leader about this, except to say that I am opposed to the principle of this bill, but knowing that it is going to the legal bills committee, then I am going to leave it to the delegation far more qualified than I am that I know is going to come to advance the views of the legal profession on this important matter. Mr. McRuer seems to say throughout his report, and I have now finished reading the three volumes, that in doing justice between man and man there is nothing better than oral evidence. He talks about that in his boards of review and in his appellate jurisdiction, from decisions of administrative tribunals and in every other form in which the rights of a citizen are determined.

There is no substitute—you know that, Mr. Speaker, for oral evidence subject to cross-examination. The lawsuit, the great Mr. Justice Duff said at one time, is not a scientific investigation into truth. If it were, it would be unending and courts composed of judges and other officers of the court could not tarry to get at the scientific nature of the truth. The best we can do is to use our experience and our skill as far as humanly possible to try to ascertain what are the facts upon which judgment ought to be given. One of the best weapons—as you know, Mr. Speaker, in the many years you have practised in the courts is the right of cross-examination, and when practiced by a skilled advocate, then the perfidious witness, the perjuring witness, ought to be in terror of being exposed for attempting to perpetrate a fraud upon the finder of fact. The Attorney General here and his advisors retard that; they put that principle into cold storage for the purposes of medical evidence, and that principle when all is said and done is of far greater importance than the convenience of doctors.

Mr. Bullbrook: Mr. Speaker, there is not much that I can add to what has been said by the hon. member for Sudbury. I might suggest this, most respectfully, if there was a free vote on this, Mr. Speaker, and the members of the legal profession were asked alone to vote on this, this bill would go down to a resounding defeat. No one who practises in the courts can see anything wrong with tendering a medical report as evidence, nothing wrong with that at all. On many occasions counsel—for the sake of convenience and for the sake of expedition—do this.

The whole inequity in this legislation is found in subsection 4 of section 2 as I see it, at least a grade of it. Why in heaven's name—and this is why I interrupted when the hon. member for Sudbury was speaking—do you conceive a penalizing council for a decision that he might make in good faith? If he thinks it's in the best interests of his client, sir, to have the doctor there and have him available, I see nothing to be gained from that type of legislation at all. I am very pleased to hear from my colleague and from the hon. Attorney General that this matter will go before the committee and have exhaustive representation made in connection with it. I certainly hope to see that that subsection is completely extricated from the legislation.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Mr. Speaker, except for the reservation as indicated by my friend from Sarnia with respect to the sanctions imposed on counsel touching the filing of the medical report, I would feel that—not having consulted members of my party, or reached a consensus in the matter, and the matter going to the legal bills committee in any event—nevertheless, I think the legislation is good legislation with that reservation. If I may presume upon Mr. Speaker's time, I would like to run through, to place on the record, a bit of the history of the amendments to The Evidence Act in this regard. Both sections—the ones about filing

reports, and the rub seems to be concerned with hospital reports in section 35A as it then was; and then the other section having to do with medical testimony and the courts —are quite commendable sections and based upon a principle of saving time and saving costs.

One section is discussed by a solicitor or counsel by the name of Patrick S. Fitzgerald, QC, of Sault Ste. Marie, in a *Canadian Bar Journal* Vol. 10, No. 1, February, 1967, page 30:

> It seems obvious that two of the primary purposes of the rule are to speed the trial process and to avoid the wasting of professional time and skill during the wearisome delays that so often occur while the doctor waits to give his evidence. While the court and council can minimize these delays they cannot in practice be entirely eliminated. No doubt there is also behind this new rule the thought that in many cases where the medical aspects of the case are simple and undisputed, the court will learn little from the doctor's evidence that could not be learned from another good report prepared by the same doctor.

The sections 35A and 50A were both assented to on May 18, 1966, and section 50A, that is on the medical reports, came into force on January 1, 1967. Section 35A was assented to on May 18, 1966. From July 23, 1966, the rules committee of the law society passed rules 352A and B which dealt solely and entirely with the medical reports. It was passed by the rules committee, I say, and then was subjected to court proceedings in case of Circosta and Lilly. The court of appeal of Ontario then declared that rule 352A was *ultra vires* of the rules committee on the basis that it was regulatory and not procedural legislation, therefore beyond their powers.

In February, 1963, the Attorney General of Ontario appointed the hon. James C. McRuer, and another man who graces this chamber day after day and is known for his eminence and his acumen as counsel for many years in the province—I refer to William B. Common, QC—to consider a report upon the means of facilitating the presentation of medical testimony in civil cases. If my hon. friends have not had an opportunity to review this rather massive report of the province of Ontario—which has been made up, as I say, by the two gentlemen and given to the Attorney General; it is dated February 1965, but was done earlier—it is an exhaustive and penetrating study of these very things.

It goes through the law of Great Britain with considerable finesse and curiously enough—as is the British way the British won't—they refused to pass any rules on the matter and everybody does things voluntarily. But the fact of the matter is that counsel do, and themselves have been brought under some pressure from the judges in Great Britain to reach accord outside the court room with respect to medical reports and medical testimony. Surely sensible men operating in the legal profession do not have to hire two or three experts on both sides of the fence, having them kick around the hallway day after day at enormous cost to the litigants, when a rational procedure of coming together and agreeing on the facts is readily at their disposal.

May I say too, Mr. Speaker, that as far as I can see about 80 per cent of the cases in Great Britain are so determined and so brought to a close and so they do not feel that need as greatly perhaps as we do. There are numerous sections in the report about New York state and about the state of California and about Massachusetts, and as I say, an exhaustive historical rendition of how these various jurisdictions have been obliged over a period of time to come to some kind of understanding on this outstanding matter. As the law now stands, insurance companies will hire expert after expert; lawyers will get a whole series of medical testimony; they will get a series of experts, those who agree with them, and will call them to the witness stand. If they do not, they pay their fee and say, "Go on your way." The one who can pay the most gets the greatest benefits. All kinds of inequities work into the present system which this bill will help to eliminate.

There is another article which I would like to refer you to, Mr. Speaker, which is rather on my friends'—that is my Liberal friends' —side of the fence here. It is an article published in the *Canadian Bar Journal* of April, 1967. It is the report of the committee of the medico-legal society of Toronto. On the whole the medico-legal society of Toronto is opposed to these sections, definitely and decisively, and then if they cannot be opposed—as we find ourselves very often in this House because there is no way of really effectively doing so—they are inclined to bow their heads and go along gently asking for an amendment here and an amendment there.

On page 129 of this report:

> The medico-legal society must go on record to state that as far as its medical members are concerned there has not been, and there is not now, any feeling of unnecessary wasting of the time of the medical profession in attending trials. There may be occasional situations in which members of the medical profession are unnecessarily inconvenienced. By and large the medical profession, however, is quite prepared to recognize the necessity for doctors to appear in court and the medical profession does not feel that its time is being wasted unnecessarily by attending court.

It goes on and talks of problems of privilege which we will discuss in committee and it is very much concerned with—if I may just refer to what they say on 130:

> The medico-legal society, however, is strongly of the view that if medical reports are ordered to be used these reports must nevertheless remain privileged to the extent that they will not be used for the purposes of cross-examination of the reporting doctor. It is obvious that a physician reporting on the progress of a plaintiff patient may make provisional diagnoses or prognoses which are subject to change depending upon the correctness of the patient's complaints, the personality of the patient, the success or failure of the treatment, and the complications which develop. Under the new rules which do not in any way restrict the extent of purpose of the production of medical reports, a physician may be cross-examined on an interim report only in spite of subsequent examination and report. A jury particularly may be unduly impressed, for what is a normal difference between the early report and the subsequent testimony of the physician.

And it goes on with numerous arguments as to why a physician and why the medico-legal society does not feel any physician ought to be subjected to cross-examination in these matters. I offered them to the delectation and responsible comment of the member for Sudbury.

In Fitzgerald's report he pretty well goes along as the bill has now been boiled down and achieved, but as is the wont, he immediately goes off and tells the lawyers how to prepare the medical reports and how to get the doctors to prepare the medical reports, in a way which would be most beneficial to them—and of course, as much as possible to defeat the whole thing, but that is the way with us fellows, you see. With that in mind I will not flog this matter as we will have plenty of opportunity to go into the intestices at the proper time. I would simply like to say that in a matter of this kind, curiously enough, I can find continuity with what I said in my maiden speech—that high-flown philosophical stuff, you know, has a certain relevance to the actual world.

In this particular case my reasons are basically socialistic, the fundamental one being to save money and not to subject litigants to the high cost of litigation. It is just absurd, the cost of litigation. We all saw in the paper about the man on Parliament Street who was paying costs of $58,000 on a $1,500 action. This is not uncommon as we all know and anything that would be a gesture, without unfairness to litigants, to bring down the costs of fighting cases is all to the good, and I am thoroughly in favour of it.

The second thing that interests me in this regard is that this is an incursion of the state, if you will, upon the adversary process. The whole adversary concept seems to me one of those derelictions of human personality whereby they believe that, in some mysterious manner, by tearing each other up, and by fighting like cats and dogs in a courtroom, somehow mysteriously the truth will emerge. I would think that just the opposite is the truth. My experience in the courts has been that they are camouflage; and that for bringing to light the true facts of the case, the adversary system is not the most sensible way, or so it seems to me.

It has a certain relevance and I would hate to see it disappear as it gives lawyers a field day and other grounds upon which they can move and fulminate, and make noises. At the same time as in society in general with our competitive gestures and with your finding that you are going to have to cut down on the range of your competitiveness if equity and truth and a viable system is to emerge. Even as that is so, I say that this is so, in connection with this kind of legislation which introduces a wedge between adversaries and forces the lawyers to come to some kind of accord among themselves.

Mr. Singer: It is a pity that last year's effort along these lines was something less than a success. So we have this bill back again in a somewhat different form from the one we doubtless attempted to deal with a year ago. I would think the general principle behind this bill makes good sense. In order to avoid longer trials than are necessary; in order to avoid some of the legal mythology

that has grown up over the years; in order to prevent people from withholding evidence until the end and that sort of thing, substantially, the first three parts of subsection 2 are designed to deal with this and, I think, deal with this reasonably adequately.

However, I do quarrel with the Attorney General about the intent or principle in subsection 4 and I think that this unfortunately would give to the judge the ability to predetermine the action of counsel in a trial. It would eliminate the value of a cross-examination; it would put counsel in a very difficult position when he has to make the decision whether he should run the risk of costs or not if his cross-examination proves fruitless; and it would weight the trial in favour of one of the adversaries and give him an undue advantage that he should not properly enjoy. I would think that this bill would lose nothing if subsection 4 were deleted from it.

I think substantial progress will be made with the first part—the first three subsections of section 2—and it would be my feeling that this kind of amendment should be introduced by the Attorney General when this bill comes before the legal bills committee. There is a danger, Mr. Speaker, of throwing out the baby with the bathwater; in our desire to progress we sometimes throw away very valuable rights, and the right of cross-examination is not one that we can lightly afford to discard or that we should penalize people for using. It is a very important part of arriving at the validity of evidence before our courts, and I would be very strongly opposed to anything that would limit or proscribe that right. I commend this kind of thinking to the Attorney General and hope that by the time he brings this bill into the legal bills committee he will have done something about it.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, since the bill is going to the legal bills committee—and I would gather from the comments that have been made by hon. members that really they favour a considerable portion of the bill at least, one might almost say its principle; and the member for Downsview who spoke last has suggested the deletion of one small sector—I am, therefore, going to speak only very briefly. I listened, waiting to hear a discussion, perhaps, against some of the principles of this bill on the ground that we were infringing on the privilege of the medical profession. Not one word was said, yet I recall that when these same provisions were introduced into the rules, that was the great argument.

Mr. Sopha: Well, Mr. McRuer did not come down in favour of it!

Hon. Mr. Wishart: No, and I am glad that I did not hear that language today. I think I should stress that I am indebted to the hon. member for Lakeshore for saying that the great result of this legislation would be to simplify, to speed and to make less expensive litigation, particularly for the small litigant. It might be interesting to know that those who raised their voices loudest when we were discussing this legislation, when we were assessing attitudes and opinions, were those solicitors or lawyers who represented the great insurance companies. And I was rather surprised to find some of my friends on the opposite side of the House, as it were, joining with them in this debate today.

Mr. Singer: As we did last year.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: The large and well-heeled litigant is the one who can take advantage of the situation by calling the doctor and all the experts to the court, and the money means little. But a small litigant who is asserting his claim, trying to win a judgment, is greatly handicapped.

And then, beyond that, there was the attitude of the doctors themselves. As my friend from Lakeshore pointed out, a very eminent committee of doctors studied this matter along with a very eminent committee of legal gentlemen. Mr. Speaker, the credit for commencing this study belongs to yourself. Because this report which I hold in my hand came forth as a result of an instruction given by the hon. Mr. Speaker, then Attorney General, on February 7, 1963. Mr. Arthur Martin, QC, Mr. Joseph Sedgwick, QC and Mr. Brendan O'Brien, QC—

Mr. Singer: It took us a couple of years.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: —were the lawyers. And on the medical side were very eminent names: Dr. R. J. M. Galloway, Dr. W. Hurst Brown, now deceased, who had his place taken by Dr. Jaffe; and Dr. J. C. Richardson and Dr. Glenn Sawyer. And after this most exhaustive and thorough study they came forward with recommendations that this type of legislation should be introduced. We tried it first by way of the rules committee and the court held—in the case which, for the benefit of my hon. friend from Sudbury, was decided last year while this House was in session—that it was *ultra vires* the powers of the rules committee to adopt rules which really were substantive of law. So we proceed, I may say,

at almost the first opportunity to bring in this legislation.

Mr. Singer: Did I not ask my friend at that time?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: If my friend will remember, last year there was a very full agenda of legislation before this House, introduced by the Attorney General, and I found it impossible to introduce this matter.

Mr. Sopha: Maybe the government might have won the election on your legislation.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: That is possible.

Mr. Sopha: Has the Minister considered that?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Well, perhaps this will have some effect on the next one. But, Mr. Speaker, I will simply state that I think the purpose and principle of this legislation is an excellent purpose and a good principle. And I note that in the discussion today there has been no discussion to the first amending section which has to do with business records. I see no reason why the same consideration should not apply to evidence coming forth from medical experts the same way they would come from business experts.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister a question. Would you be prepared, sir, to apply the same kind of principle to expropriation procedures?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I do not quite follow the question, Mr. Speaker; same principles you say?

Mr. Singer: Yes. The revealing of records in advance.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: In expropriation procedures?

Mr. Singer: Yes. The valuator's report.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Well, I think that if the hon. member will be content to wait a very short time I will have that before the House.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE COMMUNITY CENTRES ACT, 1966

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food) moves second reading of Bill 49, An Act to amend The Community Centres Act, 1966.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Mr. Speaker, I just have a brief word about this bill. As far as our party is concerned we lend unqualified support to Bill 49. We think it is a good bill. It has been requested for the past number of years by a number of municipalities. I know that a number of municipalities have made representation to the Minister, or at least to officials within The Department of Agriculture and Food, to have the limits raised insofar as The Community Centres Act is concerned. And I am happy to see that the Minister has done this.

There is one thing that interests me and I know that we cannot deal with the bill in terms of section by section, Mr. Speaker, but I am wondering why in certain cases, certain sections are made retroactive to September 1, 1967, and then other sections are deemed to come into force when they receive Royal assent. Perhaps the Minister could clarify that point for us when he makes his comment about the bill.

Mr. B. Gilbertson (Algoma): Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words in support of Bill 49. I feel that this bill, when it goes through, is certainly going to benefit our particular area where I live. There are several small communities that cannot afford to build a community centre, but with several small groups going together this can enable them to group their grants so that we can put up a proper community centre. So, I am very much in favour of Bill 49.

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): Mr. Speaker, I would also like to lend my support to the principle of this bill. A number of years ago when I was quite active in community affairs I had the pleasure of working along with the committee that established a recreation centre in my own community. Subsequently, when I became a member of this House I assisted other communities in their endeavours in this regard, and certainly there is always the contention that people using this community centre should contribute towards it.

The principle, annunciated in section 3 of this bill, which allows neighbouring jurisdictions to combine their finances and assets to participate, is a very commendable action. I know three of my communities that have been in the planning stage of erecting such a centre are most joyous, and I appreciate this. As a member of the Opposition, these are some of the nice things that we have to deal with in the everyday business of being

a member of the Legislature, and we congratulate the Minister for this forward step.

Mr. M. Makarchuk (Brantford): Mr. Speaker, we as a party are particularly in favour of this bill today, to a certain point. I feel that it is rather limited in its scope. In the final analysis—if you examine it—this bill does provide grants to put up the building, and provides grants to put up skating arenas or swimming pools. I feel that in view of the changing nature of recreation it does not really provide a viable community recreation centre.

I think provisions should be made in this particular bill to provide other grants. For example, we have a grant that provides for an outdoor swimming pool but there is really nothing in the bill that would provide a grant to build a ski tow or fix up a hill or something of this nature for winter sports. There is nothing in here that would support a community that would like to build some teenage recreation facilities in the particular community centre—they may even get an espresso coffee machine and start a coffee house of their own. I think that this could be a commendable idea on part of this particular bill. There are no provisions for possibly providing badminton courts or equipment for use in these particular buildings.

The grant itself will put up a building; the important thing is, what you are going to do in this particular building. Unless you have a staff of people in the community who can get out and organize activities, organize events in this thing, you will find that many of these community centres remain standing rather empty for many nights of the week. I think that possibly within the bill there should be some grants made to subsidize staffs.

We could perhaps use people from the nearest urban centre YMCA's, people who can come down and organize community activities in the particular centre. In the final analysis I cannot understand why this particular bill comes under The Department of Agriculture and Food. I think that it probably would fit better under The Department of Education. In that case, the local school boards can tie these community centres in with the schools, their own recreational activities and their own community activities.

Ordinarily in the county areas, The Department of Agriculture and Food is rather limited in what it does. The local pasha or the agricultural representative generally will organize the 4H activities in summer, at which the children or the young adults can only spend so much time with the rest of the time being spent on farm work.

At other times, sir, the buildings are really empty and I feel that if these community centres are tied in with the school board and local recreation authorities you would have much better use out of the building and it would be of greater benefit to the community.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Timiskaming.

Mr. D. Jackson (Timiskaming): In speaking to this bill, Mr. Speaker, I would like, with your permission, to stray a little bit away from the principle, and I will give good reason for it as I come back to it. And I speak in favour of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Unfortunately, the member must speak to the principle of the bill on second reading.

Mr. Jackson: I will tie this with the principle. I speak in favour of the bill, and as I do speak in favour of the bill I must say that Timiskaming, my riding, has been one of the greatest producers of hockey players that this country has known. We have many other exports from that great riding but I am quite sure that everyone will agree that we have produced not only the best hockey players in Canada and the United States but the most of them.

I find in the bill the same as my colleague, that it does not go far enough. It allows a larger grant to build a new arena or a new community centre. But to go back to my own riding, we have community centres—many of them built the hard way, by the people in the area getting together and putting them up by hand. When we built them, or when these people built them, they built them with natural ice because we had the weather to freeze that ice and we did not have the money to put in artificial ice.

But let me tell you that with artificial ice we can put heat in the buildings. Today when we go to a hockey game, which is a spectator's sport, we have to be hardy northerners because it is just as cold inside as it is outside in order to keep that ice frozen at about 40 degrees below zero. It is not much of a sport for the spectators.

I feel that this bill, if it is to serve the purpose of everyone in Ontario and especially

in the riding of Timiskaming where, as I say, we are the greatest producers of hockey players in Canada, it should be extended to allow for the extension of existing community centres and to allow for the installation of artificial ice rinks in existing community centres.

Recently we had an expansion of the national hockey league and I am quite sure that it was a disappointment to almost everyone here because most of the expansion went to the United States. But in the next few years we are going to see many more teams in Canada, because it is our national sport and I think that everyone supports that national sport. And within the extension to this bill of grants to improve existing community centres and install artificial ice in existing community centres, I feel that we will have the facilities to produce these hockey players for export.

Mr. S. Farquhar (Algoma-Manitoulin): There is one point that I would like a minute to comment on. I am very much concerned that municipalities can receive these grants by virtue of the fact that the title would be vested in the municipality. What happens in unorganized areas where we do not have municipal governments? I have looked into this because certainly no area, no part of Ontario, needs recreation facilities any more than these same areas that I referred to.

First of all, these arenas or community centres are operated in many cases by Lions clubs or social organizations. However, they cannot hold title, they could not receive grants. I am wondering if the Minister would consider the possibility of title being vested, in some cases of unorganized municipalities in the ARDA directorate of Ontario, and leased back to the townships or the organization which would entitle them to grants.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Minister a question at this stage? Will the provisions of this Act be retroactive to communities that have already started projects or not at all?

Mr. Speaker: The Minister would cover that perhaps in his reply.

Mr. B. Newman: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Is there any other member who wishes to speak to this before the Minister concludes the debate?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, I am interested and pleased to have the assurance of support from members of the House for this legislation. Frankly, I think it is very far-reaching legislation and it is the kind of legislation that I think will do a very great deal of good for the development of people in the community and for the recreational possibilities in various communities.

Mention was made by the hon. member for Brantford of extending the legislation to cover various other types of activities with the suggestion that there should be a subsidized staff to carry out the programmes of recreation. These benefits already accrue from the community programmes grants of The Department of Education for work in conjunction with the community centre boards in the various places in which they are located. They provide just the programmes that he suggests, although not on as broad a basis as he suggests.

Frankly, I cannot see too much wrong with extending this to cover programmes other than those we have been accustomed to. I am not so sure that I want to go so far as to suggest that coffee houses be included in this. I do not know whether they really fit into this type of legislation. But it might well be extended to such areas as badminton courts, tennis courts—the kind of thing where everybody can take part and where it is not limited to one particular segment of the community. I am quite willing to take a good look at this and discuss it with our staff. I think it is a rather good suggestion. The other matter is already taken care of.

With regard to the member for Timiskaming having brought to my attention the extension—and I believe this was raised as well by the member for Windsor-Walkerville—in application to existing facilities, yes, in my interpretation of the policy of the bill I feel that it should. Because there are community arenas, as was mentioned by the member for Timiskaming, where there is not artificial ice, or perhaps there is not an adquate heating system or something like this. There could well be such capital expenditure and claim made against that capital expenditure up to 25 per cent or $5,000 in addition to what they already have received.

Members will recall that the old grant was $5,000; it now has been increased to $10,000. So I would think that they could qualify for another $5,000 for capital expenditure in this type of situation. The member for Algoma-Manitoulin mentioned the title in unorganized areas. This is now provided for, in that title can rest with school boards. The Community Centres Act has been amended to take care

of the interpretation of the Act that was given second reading today by the hon. Minister of Education. I feel that has been taken care of. This suggestion that it be vested in the ARDA committee might bear further consideration, although I feel that it is rather well dealt with as it is.

I do feel that the important aspect of this bill—beyond that which doubles the grants, and in the case of the swimming pools triples the grants from their present standard—is where the Act provides for a group of municipalities to come together and each qualify for a co-ordinated grant so that they can build one good sound community centre. I think that we will avoid some community centres being built, and which were referred to by some hon. members this afternoon as not being able to attract enough attention after the initial burst of enthusiasm that always accompanies the opening of these community centres.

I feel that this is good sound, progressive legislation. The member for Huron and Bruce referred to some sections coming into effect and others being delayed. The sections that come into effect as of September 1, 1967—and I have not given a lot of thought to this—apply to the increased grants available.

And I believe that the other sections have to do with the changes in the Act that are in accordance with the reference that I made to The Schools and Boards of Education Act, where ownership can be held by the new boards, that will be established, taking over from the boards that already have title to some community centres in Ontario. This is the only reason that I see. The sections are made retroactive to take care of those important principles. They are really the important ones in the bill, and the rest are just routine.

Mr. Spence: Will the Minister answer a question? This is a good bill. I am for it, but—

Mr. Speaker: I would point out to the member that the question here is that every member has had the opportunity to speak to the matter of principle, on the second reading. I gave the members that opportunity, and then when the Minister has concluded his remarks, the debate is ended, and we are ready for the questions. Is it the pleasure of the members of the House that the motion for second reading of Bill 49, be carried?

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

COUNTY OF RENFREW

Mr. R. G. Hodgson (Victoria-Haliburton) moves second reading of Bill Pr6, An Act respecting the county of Renfrew.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

CITY OF HAMILTON

Mr. R. G. Hodgson moves second reading of Bill Pr8, An Act respecting the city of Hamilton.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

OTTAWA SEPARATE SCHOOL BOARD

Mr. R. G. Hodgson moves second reading of Bill Pr9, An Act respecting the city of Ottawa separate school board.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

CITY OF PETERBOROUGH (1)

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay) moves second reading of Bill Pr11, An Act respecting the city of Peterborough.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

COMMUNITY FOUNDATION OF OTTAWA AND DISTRICT

Mr. R. G. Hodgson moves second reading of Bill Pr12, An Act respecting the community foundation of Ottawa and district.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

CITY OF PETERBOROUGH (2)

Mr. Stokes moves second reading of Bill Pr13, An Act respecting the city of Peterborough.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

COUNTY OF PEEL

Mr. R. D. Kennedy (Peel South) moves second reading of Bill Pr21, An Act respecting the county of Peel.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

CITY OF LONDON

Mr. J. H. White (London South) moves second reading of Bill Pr22, An Act respecting the city of London.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

TOWNSHIP OF VAUGHAN

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre) moves second reading of Bill Pr23, An Act respecting the township of Vaughan.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

CITY OF OSHAWA

Mr. C. G. Pilkey (Oshawa) moves second reading of Bill Pr24, An Act respecting the city of Oshawa.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

TOWN OF PALMERSTON

Mr. J. Root (Wellington-Dufferin) moves second reading of Bill Pr27, An Act respecting the town of Palmerston.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

CITY OF KITCHENER

Mr. J. R. Breithaupt (Kitchener) moves second reading of Bill Pr30, An Act respecting the city of Kitchener.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

CARDINAL INSULATION LIMITED

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville) moves second reading of Bill Pr32, An Act respecting Cardinal Insulation Limited.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

CITY OF TORONTO

Mr. H. J. Price (St. David) moves second reading of Bill Pr33, An Act respecting the city of Toronto.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

COUNTY OF WELLAND

Mr. E. P. Morningstar (Welland) moves second reading of Bill Pr34, An Act respecting the county of Welland.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

CITY OF WELLAND

Mr. Morningstar moves second reading of Bill Pr35, An Act respecting the city of Welland.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

CITY OF WINDSOR

Mr. B. Newman moves second reading of Bill Pr36, An Act respecting the city of Windsor.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

LONDON BOARD OF EDUCATION

Mr. White moves second reading of Bill Pr38, An Act respecting the board of education for the city of London.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, Bill Pr38, section 2. In most of these bills, all the sections have different principles so I address myself just to the principle in section 2.

At the private bills committee, in a previous bill where it did not refer to school pensions, but referred to municipal pensions, a representative from OMERS attended and expressed a view on behalf of OMERS which the Minister shared. As a result of those representations and the Minister's favouring the deletion of the section that was asked for in that other bill, the committee went along with it. It was the city of Windsor bill, my colleague from Windsor-Walkerville reminds me.

Now this section 2, apparently, has the same principle exactly, and I only found out after the committee had passed it, that the gentleman who represented OMERS, had he been asked, would have expressed the same objection as he had to the section in the city of Windsor bill. And his objection would have

been that the whole idea of OMERS would be defeated if, in private legislation, this kind of provision was allowed to be made.

Unfortunately, the mechanics of the operating committee broke down in that instance, because the Minister of Municipal Affairs was no longer interested in this bill which concerns the board of education for the city of London, and in fact the Minister gathered his papers and walked out of the room when this bill went through. So we were left with the representative from OMERS in the room, prepared to voice the objections, but no one in the room knew that the representative of OMERS was there and determined to voice the objections of anyone that asked him. It would, therefore, seem to me, sir, that section 2 is objectionable to the policy of the Legislature to an equal extent as a similar section was in the bill of the city of Windsor.

I do not know which of the government Ministers could be expected to adjust themselves to this immediately, but I would suggest perhaps that Bill Pr38 be temporarily removed and this point be considered. I satisfied myself after the bill had gone through the private bills committee that this was in fact so, and I think the Minister of Municipal Affairs will recognize this was so, but it was not his responsibility since this was an education bill.

Mr. White: Mr. Speaker, if I may speak to this bill for a minute. I learned from the member for Downsview about his private conversation with the OMERS representative. And if my memory serves me correctly, I was at that time in company with one of the trustees who had come to Toronto from London in support of this bill.

This particular trustee is an actuary by profession, he is the vice-chairman of the Ontario pension commission, he has been called by the president of one of Canada's larger insurance firms, the leading actuary in this province, and he and the men with whom he conferred concluded that this could not in fact be handled through OMERS. This is one of those highly technical matters, Mr. Speaker, where one set of experts may have one opinion, and where another set of experts may have another opinion. I certainly would have no objection to the department instituting some form of study.

Mr. Singer: Some Minister—

Mr. White: But I wonder if it would not be wise for us to give this bill second reading and then to deal with this particular section prior to committee of the whole House. I think that from the procedural point of view it would be better and I would not want to see the bill delayed unnecessarily in its progress through these stages.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that it be given second reading now, and then I will ensure that this point is settled and some comments will be addressed to it when this bill is before the committee of the whole House.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

CITY OF OTTAWA

Mr. W. E. Johnston (Carleton): Moves second reading of Bill Pr42, An Act respecting the city of Ottawa.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

TOWNSHIP OF PELEE

Mr. Paterson moves second reading of Bill Pr45, An Act respecting the township of Pelee.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

EWART COLLEGE

Mr. Price moves the second reading of Bil Pr46, An Act respecting Ewart College.

Mr. Deacon: Implications came up in the private bills committee, about the degree-granting powers that are in this bill. Ewart College is a division, or you might say a subsidiary, of the Presbyterian Church where deaconesses and those who are going to be working in the field of religious education can get their training. It is similar in nature to Covenant College in the United Church and the Anglican women's training college which also, in each instance, provide this training in religious education.

It is quite different in nature from the straight theological colleges of Knox or the other colleges of Trinity, Wycliffe Emmanuel, training people in theology. Because of the difference in nature, it is quite understandable why Ewart College wants to have control over the courses that provide a degree in religious education. But I submit that we are going to have other groups, including prob-

ably Covenant College and others similar to them, coming and seeking this same degree-granting power. There will be no common basis for the degree that would come about unless we required Ewart College and others to be under a similar university, or to have some other basis of standardizing their requirements for a degree.

I do not think it is good sense for us to incorporate degree-granting power in this bill until some arrangement has been made with other colleges of a similar type so that we do know that when the bachelor of religious education degree is granted, it is one that has a common standing and a high standard throughout the province. I think this is the view that the Deputy Minister of University Affairs expressed at the private bills committee. However, I think the feeling of the committee was that they did not want to deprive Ewart College of the right of granting degrees. But I do think we should take into consideration the proliferation of degree standards that could easily arise should others come before us, which I am sure they will do, seeking the same rights as Ewart College.

Mr. White: I would like to say just one word on this. I am in agreement with the hon. member for York Centre. He and I with a couple of others spoke fairly forcefully against the idea of Ewart College conferring its own degrees and we did suggest that they ally themselves with Knox College for this purpose. The representatives of Ewart College who were in the committee room spoke to the issue, and succeeded in persuading the majority of the private bills committee to give them this power, and for that reason I would not want to prolong my opposition.

My understanding from the representative of The Provincial Secretary's Department was that any institution may grant degrees anyway, so even if this was struck from the bill, there is no law in this province that they cannot go ahead and issue their own degrees. So that really does invalidate many of these arguments. At any rate, to restate my opposition in principle. I think it is a mistake to have large numbers of small colleges setting their own standards for degree purposes. I think it is not nearly as beneficial to the student as a degree from a senior associated university institution which has the power to maintain the high standards in good days and bad, even when enrolment may be off a little bit, and so on. So, with the students in mind particularly, I think it would be better if this section were not in here. On the other hand I recognize that the members of the private bills committee came to this judgment after a prolonged debate.

Mr. Sopha: Is the member a Presbyterian?

Mr. White: I spring from Presbyterian stock.

Mr. Sopha: I prefer to hear the Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond), who is a Presbyterian.

Mr. White: Well, I will declare to him now; I have spirtual alliance with the Presbyterian kirk which gives me a special interest in this matter, and as a matter of fact a great uncle of mine went through Knox College. For these several reasons, Mr. Speaker, I feel free to make these comments.

An hon. member: What is the member's problem?

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we will resume the estimates of The Department of Highways.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 6:05 o'clock, p.m.

No. 48

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

First Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Thursday, April 4, 1968

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1968

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Thursday, April 4, 1968

First report, standing committee on agriculture and food, Mr. Henderson 1621

Motorized snow vehicles, bill respecting, Mr. Haskett, first reading 1621

Planning Act, bill to amend, Mr. McKeough, first reading 1622

Statements re the maple syrup producers' association, Mr. Stewart, Mr. Gilbertson 1622

Statement re control of sewage from pleasure boats, Mr. Simonett 1624

Statement re crop insurance, Mr. Stewart 1625

Question to Mr. Dymond re the alcoholism and drug addiction research foundation, Mr. Sargent 1625

Questions to Mr. Brunelle re camping vehicle facilities, Mr. Knight 1625

Questions to Mr. Brunelle re canoe and wilderness camping, Mr. Knight 1626

Questions to Mr. Simonett re import of natural gas, Mr. Stokes 1626

Estimates, Department of Highways, Mr. Gomme, continued 1627

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Dymond, agreed to 1657

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, APRIL 4, 1968

The House met at 2:30 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are always pleased to have visitors to the Legislature, and today we welcome as guests students from the following schools: In the east gallery from Mill Street centennial senior public school in Leamington and College Hill public school, Oshawa; in the west gallery from Oakwood collegiate institute, hosting students from Colonel White high school, Dayton, Ohio. At 3:30 in the east gallery we will be joined by students from Norwell district high school, Palmerston, and Christ the King separate school, New Toronto.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Mr. L. C. Henderson, from the standing committee on agriculture and food, presented the committee's first report which was read as follows and adopted:

Your committee begs to report the following bills without amendment:

Bill 16, An Act to repeal The Transportation of Fowl Act.

Bill 17, An Act to reapeal The Threshing Machines Act.

Bill 18, An Act to repeal The Steam Threshing Engines Act.

Bill 19, An Act to amend The Provincial Auctioneers Act.

Bill 25, An Act to amend The Farm Products Marketing Act.

Bill 35, An Act respecting the marketing of cattle for the production of beef.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I move that when this House adjourns today it do stand adjourned until 2:30 o'clock, p.m. on Monday next.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: Introduction of bills.

MOTORIZED SNOW VEHICLES

Hon. I. Haskett (Minister of Transport) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting motorized snow vehicles.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Speaker, during the past two winter seasons, there has been spectacular growth in the number of motorized snow vehicles being used in the province of Ontario. As a result of their ability to operate over deep snow with ease, they are more widely employed than ever before as work vehicles. But a much more significant development has been a remarkable expansion of their application for recreational purposes. In fact, it is true to say that a whole new winter sport involving such vehicles has been built up during the past two years. While it is not possible to be sure of the exact number, I would estimate that the snowmobile population in the province at the present time has reached well beyond the 50,000 mark.

The principle of the legislation is to identify the owners of motorized snow vehicles for the purpose of applying appropriate regulatory control in the interest of public safety. Every vehicle will be required to be registered with The Department of Transport before being operated in Ontario, and any person under the age of 16 will be prohibited from operating them on any highway.

Operation of such machines is prohibited on the King's highways, except where designated by the Minister by regulation. They are permitted on highways under municipal jurisdiction, except when they are prohibited by bylaw. This provision will have the effect of permitting local governments to encourage winter sport activities involving snow vehicles, where it is appropriate that they do so, within their boundaries.

These machines will be exempt from the definition of a "motor vehicle" contained in The Highway Traffic Act, and a person operating one of them will not be required to have any type of driving licence.

Driving rules are to be established by regulation, until such time as a meaningful set of rules can be developed through practical

experience. It is then my intention to incorporate the rules into statute when they have been so formulated.

THE PLANNING ACT

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Minister of Municipal Affairs) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Planning Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, I think it would be well if I read the explanatory notes.

Section 1, the new section, will enable assessors and others who have information relating to assessment matters required in the course of their duties to make this information available to planning officials required in the course of their duties.

Section 2, subsection 1, the repealed clause, excepted from the application of a subdivision control bylaw any conveyance, mortgage, and so on, of land of 10 acres or more if all the remaining parcels were 10 acres or more. Subsections 2 and 3, the new clauses, except from subdivision control and part lot control bylaws, lands that are being acquired for the construction of oil and gas transmission lines.

In section 3 at present, the Minister may by order exercise any of the powers conferred upon councils under section 30 with respect to land that is not within the scope of a bylaw passed under section 30. The amendments authorize the Minister to make an order whether or not a restricted area bylaw has been passed and provides that while an order is in effect in the municipality or a part thereof, the bylaw is not in effect in the municipality or such part.

And section 4 is revised to delete the requirement that a member of a committee of adjustment be a resident or ratepayer of the municipality.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. Minister a question?

Section 2: Does this mean that all consents now come under the Act, that there is no limit to size?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, yes—where there is a subdivision control, where the council has passed a subdivision control bylaw.

Mr. Speaker: Introduction of bills.

The Minister of Agriculture and Food has the floor.

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): Mr. Speaker, on each desk today we have placed a sample of the very excellent product that is now being processed in our Ontario woodlots. It is here through the co-operation of the Ontario maple syrup producers' association and the Ontario food council. I would like to take just a few moments, Mr. Speaker, to tell the members of this Legislature of some of the work that has been done in the last few years to revive this industry and of some of the projects that lie ahead.

Early in 1965, I directed the Ontario food council to examine the potential of the maple syrup industry in Ontario. The council did a survey and concluded that there was tremendous potential for farm income here that was not being utilized. On the basis of this conclusion it was decided to embark upon a development programme.

In 1965 a working interdepartmental committee was established, with representation from The Departments of Lands and Forests, and Agriculture and Food, to revive interest in the maple syrup industry. Field service personnel of both departments were directed to give this project their full attention. In 1966, after a very successful season of production had been experienced, a series of regional meetings was held across the province to bring the producers together. From these meetings developed an organization known as the Ontario maple syrup producers' association, with local branches across the province.

The Ontario food council branch of The Ontario Department of Agriculture and Food now has a full-time maple products fieldman, who works with the local branches of the Ontario maple syrup producers' association and the individual producers. We are establishing official grade and marketing standards for maple syrup in Ontario under The Farm Products Grades and Sales Act. The food and drug directorate of The Department of National Health has developed regulations that make it possible to ensure that restaurants and eating places properly identify the kinds of syrup served with their meals.

Here in Ontario we have developed our own exclusive and unique label for maple products and it can be seen on the samples on the members' desks. This label is owned and registered by The Ontario Department

of Agriculture and Food, and it is provided to paid-up members of the Ontario maple syrup producers' association who enter into a written agreement that they will produce a high quality product, and that they will use uniform containers, properly labelled, in marketing their product.

In eastern Ontario's Madawaska Valley, our ARDA directorate has provided financial and technical assistance to a group of maple producers who have organized their own co-operative, and we are greatly encouraged by the experience gained in this project.

Beginning this weekend, across the province, the public is invited to attend local maple syrup festivals, dinners and demonstrations. Three such festivals, dinners and demonstrations will be held this weekend at Elmira, Richards Landing and Warsaw. More of the same will be held on successive weekends. We are expecting literally thousands of people to attend these events.

Mr. Speaker, in order that this promising industry will have the opportunity to develop to its full potential, we are undertaking a four-pronged programme of grants and loans, which I would like to announce at this time.

First, the ARDA directorate will undertake to provide an annual grant of $6,000 to the Ontario maple syrup producers' association. One-half of this amount will be allocated to finance the operation of the association, the other half for the purpose of maple products promotion which will be co-ordinated by the fieldman and the Ontario food council.

Second, the capital grants programme of The Ontario Department of Agriculture and Food has been extended to provide grants of up to $1,000 for one-third of the cost of construction, renovation or enlargement of sugar camps. This is an extension of our regular capital grants programme and the same rules and regulations apply.

Third, and again under the ARDA programme, we are setting aside a sum of $100,000 which will be made available to individual producers in the form of interest-free loans for the purchase of equipment.

These loans will be made on the basis of 50 per cent of the cost of this equipment to a maixmum loan of $2,000, repayable over a period of ten years. Application forms for these loans will be available at the offices of our county and district agricultural representatives, from the ARDA rural development officers, from the maple products fieldman of the Ontario food council, or from directors of the Ontario maple producers' association.

Finally, we will give careful consideration to the provision of direct capital grants to groups of producers who wish to establish central facilities for the evaporation, processing, packaging and selling of their maple products. We are prepared to provide these grants to the extent of 50 per cent of the cost of such facilities, with a maximum grant of $12,500. These grants would be made only after complete feasibility studies had been carried out, and both the need and soundness of such a venture established. A survey will be conducted this year in the Muskoka, Parry Sound and Nipissing area, and we are hopeful that a similar study can be carried out in the Haliburton area.

Mr. Speaker, I must point out that the ARDA involvement in this programme is a joint federal-provincial cost-sharing arrangement and the hon. Maurice Sauvé, Minister of Forestry and Rural Development, is making a simultaneous announcement in this regard. We are extremely pleased with the degree of interest and enthusiasm displayed by the federal ARDA directorate in this maple development programme.

Mr. Speaker, this programme is designed to stimulate new growth in an industry that is as old as this country itself and the potential producion of which is virtually unlimited.

I would say, Mr. Speaker, that I regret to note that certain members of the House are unavoidably not here today. I would like to suggest to someone that a bottle of maple syrup might be placed in their desks because when they return from the great national event that it taking place this weekend they might well wish to have something to sweeten their palates when the time comes.

Mr. Speaker: Order! The member for Algoma has the floor in connection with this.

Mr. B. Gilbertson (Algoma): Mr. Speaker, I am quite pleased to hear this information from the hon. Minister of Agriculture and Food. I would like to inform the hon. members that I happen to be in close contact with maple syrup. As the hon. Minister mentioned in his speech, Richard's Landing's maple syrup festival is this coming weekend —this coming Saturday—and that is from my home area. I also would like to say, Mr. Speaker, I commend the government on the steps that they have taken to help to promote the maple syrup industry in Ontario and some time I would like the members to take a look at St. Joseph's Island where they can see some of the results of this step that the government has taken.

On St. Joseph's Island we have one of the most modern, up-to-date and one of the largest maple syrup operations in Ontario. This is something, Mr. Speaker, that will grow, and they are hoping to develop the maple syrup industry in Ontario.

As one of their directors on the Ontario maple syrup producers board I am going to put my shoulder to the wheel and help to promote this industry. It is a truly Canadian industry, and we make hundreds of gallons of this lovely maple syrup on St. Joseph's Island.

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): I wish to inform the hon. member of the government's decision to delay the date of implementation of the regulations made under The Ontario Water Resources Act to control the discharge of sewage from pleasure boats. This decision was made following the recommendation to me from the advisory committee, which was established a few months ago to give the various interests involved a voice in the framing of policy.

While good progress has been made by the committee and its two technical sub-committees, particularly towards standards for boat equipment, the time available before June 1, 1968, now appears to be too short to find answers to all of the technical problems. The committee has suggested the regulation be amended to provide an effective date of January 1, 1969, and believes it can put the additional time to good advantage and be in a much better position to help make a smooth transition into the new requirements at this later date.

I wish to advise the House that I propose to recommend to His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor in council an amendment in support of the recommendation of the committee.

Within the Great Lakes basin, all jurisdictions, both United States and Canadian, have made or are in the process of making similar regulations, although the effective dates of implementation vary from jurisdiction to jurisdiction.

Because of the importance of achieving compatibility of legislation, compatibility of equipment standards and compatibility of implementation policies, I am asking the advisory committee to sponsor a joint meeting of the various jurisdictions of both countries to meet together in Toronto this summer to see if we cannot further the objectives I have mentioned in a spirit of harmony and co-operation.

In summary, I believe the delay in implementation of the regulations will enable us to provide a more effective programme of pollution control in our recreational waters and insure that these incomparable natural gifts remain unspoiled for the use of future generations.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): Would the Minister allow a question? Will the Minister assure the House there will be no further delay after January 1, 1969, in bringing in this regulation?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Speaker, that is what I said in my statement. We would hope by that time we will have the facilities to take care of it.

Mr. Shulman: I am requesting an assurance, not a hope.

Mr. Speaker: Order! The Minister has answered.

Might I ask the member for Essex South (Mr. Paterson) whether this deals properly with his question which he placed?

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): I will withdraw my question as it answers all the details of my remarks.

Mr. Speaker: The deputy leader of the official Opposition has also a somewhat similar question as placed by the member for Grey-Bruce, and perhaps you will call it to his attention, this answer of today.

Mr. Young: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. Minister a further question?

Mr. Speaker: Normally it is not customary to ask Ministers questions after statements. Would the Minister receive a question or not?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Yes.

Mr. Young: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask, through you, now that this delay is upon us, whether the Minister might also take into account at the same time the problem of the trailers and the motorized caravans that are cluttering our highways in the same way that the boats are cluttering the lakes.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Speaker, I am dealing here with boats, pleasure boats only, and I think we do deal with trailers and many other things. That will be a decision made by the commission.

Mr. Speaker: The Minister of Agriculture and Food has another statement.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, earlier in the week an announcement was made by my department providing for the inclusion of grain corn as an insurable crop under The Ontario crop insurance plan. Today a similar announcement regarding soya beans is being made.

This is a crop that is growing in importance year by year. The Ontario crop insurance commission is now prepared to accept applications for insurance on this year's crop for soya beans on the basis of 70 per cent of the farmer's average farm yield.

The deadline for applications for this soya bean insurance will be ten days after seeding, or June 20, whichever date occurs first.

Mr. Speaker: Does the Minister of Health care to speak?

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, yesterday the hon. member for Grey-Bruce put a question which I took as notice. In view of the fact that a feature article in this morning's *Globe and Mail* says, "The Ontario government's alcoholism and drug addiction research foundation is lagging in its programme, and that their attitude still persists in labelling alcoholics as violators of the law," will the Minister advise what progress has been made on a detoxication centre. Are we going to continue to fill our jails with drunks instead of giving them medical attention?

Mr. Speaker, there is no factual basis for the statement that the Ontario government's alcoholism and drug addiction research foundation is lagging in its programme, nor does the research foundation have anything to do with the labelling of drunks or anybody else.

The foundation has set out the overall programme needed to deal with the chronic drunkenness offender from the point of view of public health. A detoxification centre is but one part of this programme. An intensive programme of back-up facilities, including long-term rehabilitation centres, halfway houses and other facilities will be required.

Basic to a total change is the determination of a community at large to deal with this problem in a different way than has been the tradition over the past many years. The foundation is attempting to demonstrate the kind of programmes required, which include a detoxification centre, rehabilitation farm and halfway house facilities.

Our present plans call for the opening of a detoxification centre in May. The building is available, the foundation is proceeding with the necessary alterations. They are currently seeking staff to develop this particular programme. Metro Toronto police officials are involved with the foundation in developing the plans for this programme. A farm and halfway house programme have already been established.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Port Arthur.

Mr. R. H. Knight (Port Arthur): Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests.

In view of the expected increase to 2 million camping vehicles this year in North America, what steps are being taken to increase the supervision of provincial parks and camping grounds so that their character is not changed from one of restful recreation to one of constant activity? What precautions against noise are being taken?

Are arbor sites being developed to give individuals privacy? Will an 11 p.m. curfew be strictly enforced, particularly against noisy drinking parties and any secondary vehicle movement after arrival?

Hon. R. Brunelle (Minister of Lands and Forests): Mr. Speaker, in reply to the hon. member for Port Arthur:

1. The expected increase in camping vehicles in North America is recognized, and to this end there will be available an additional 700 campsites in provincial parks this year and more are under consideration.

It is hoped that the character of provincial parks will remain one of restful recreation. Because of the fact that we have experienced noise level by the public at some provincial parks in recent years, certain parks will be reinforcing their staff for additional control of the public at night, either within the camp grounds or at the entrance gate.

Some $15,000 additional has been assigned to this end this year. Also, the staff are being more carefully trained. There now has been developed a policy for having key park staff receive special training in handling the public. Such arrangements have been made with the Ontario police college.

The strengthening of the OPP force across Ontario in very recent years, has been of major assistance in the operation of the provincial parks.

2. With reference to arbor sites being developed to give individual privacy, I wish to inform that in developed camp grounds,

there exists a buffer zone between each tent or trailer site. The size of such a buffer zone is related to the cost of the road system, water system, and sanitary facilities justified by each camp site.

3. With reference to the enforcement of the 11 p.m. curfew, every effort will be made to strictly enforce quiet in provincial parks after 11 p.m. with only camper vehicles being allowed in the camp site area after that hour.

Mr. Knight: Mr. Speaker, I have a second question for the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests.

Has the Minister given consideration to the cost per family of a wilderness holiday or weekend season at the rates that the department has proposed?

Will there be some special seasonal rates which will not place regular weekend canoe camping beyond the reach of the average family?

Will there by a special children's rate, or a complete family rate for seasonal family wilderness camping?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Speaker, in replying to question 1, yes, I have given consideration to this subject. However, the cost of maintenance and clean up of the portages in these areas makes a charge necessary. The charge is $5 per boat or canoe, regardless of the number of occupants, for a 14-day period, and not on a per person basis.

2. The same charge applies whether or not they stay for a weekend or for 14 days.

3. Answers to parts one and two cover the operation of the entire family.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Thunder Bay has a question?

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Energy and Resources Management. Does the Minister plan to make representations to the national energy board regarding the application by Union Gas Company to import large additional volumes of American natural gas from Panhandle Eastern Pipeline Company over a 20-year period?

Will the Minister oppose this applicatoin, and if the need for additional gas supplies is established prevail upon Trans-Canada Pipelines to bring more Canadian gas to eastern Canada by looping the present line from the west to Nipigon, and then construct a new line from Nipigon along the north shore of Lake Superior to Sault Ste. Marie and on to Sudbury?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Speaker, this matter is under study by our department at the present time. When our studies are completed the matter will be presented to the government for decision, since it is a matter of policy.

Mr. Stokes: Will the Minister accept a supplementary question?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Yes.

Mr. Stokes: I understand, according to people from Trans-Canada, that the deadline for submissions is April 8, which is next Monday. In view of the importance of this to the economy of not only Ontario, but Canada as a whole, will this government take immediate action to see that no imports are allowed to eastern Canada from the United States?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: When we make our decision, we will still have time to file our application.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a matter of personal privilege. On Tuesday of this week I answered a question raised in the Legislature by the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Spence), relative to the report that Canada and Dominion Sugar Company had plans to move its beet sugar operations to the state of Ohio—

In answering that question, I thought I made it very clear than on inquiry of company officials we learned that the Canada and Dominion Sugar Company had no intentions of undertaking the contracting of sugar beets in Ohio, or the movement of their plant to Ohio for this purpose. What I did say was that officials of the Canada and Dominion Sugar Company had been requested to go to Ohio to advise certain interested persons in that state as to the feasibility of this commodity.

Two officials of the company did go there in what I am advised was an advisory capacity only, and at the request of these persons in Ohio and not with the intention of establishing a sugar beet industry in Ohio by the Canada and Dominion company.

As I said, I though I made this point quite clear. However, it has been drawn to my attention that several of the daily newspapers of yesterday carried a report that quoted me as making an entirely different statement. Not all of the papers, fortunately, carried this report, in fact some interpreted my

answer as I intended. Mr. Speaker, I greatly appreciate the opportunity you have afforded me to clarify my position.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The 47th order; House in committee of supply. Mr. A. E. Reuter in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF HIGHWAYS

(Continued)

On vote 906:

Hon. G. E. Gomme (Minister of Highways): Mr. Chairman, I have two or three statements I would like to make on this vote.

Before we resume the estimates, I would like to deal with a question by the hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Jackson). I might say, that in doing so, I shall also be dealing with the remarks made on Monday night by the hon. member for York Centre (Mr. Deacon) in respect to the operating deficit of GO-transit.

At one point, the hon. member for York Centre said that it was no wonder that no movement was being made to extend GO in the light of such a deficit. He then went on to say that we should be going after the Canadian National Railways for a better agreement. This we are doing and have been doing for a prolonged period.

By way of explanation the situation is this; the government undertook this project under terms of a proposed agreement in principle with the railway. This was done in order to avoid undue delay in the introduction of the service. However, I might say that when it came to writing the actual terms of the contract, which is to cover a ten-year period, there was a division of opinion on the interpretation of various aspects of the principles of the agreement which materially affect the government's financial position in the matter.

In some respects we have had to await the results of actual operating experience to prove our point, and where our point has been proven it has been accepted by the railway. We are coming nearer to a complete agreement, and when it has been duly executed it will be tabled. I can assure the members that we, on our side, are doing everything possible to ensure that the money invested in this operation is the best buy that we can get.

Mr. Chairman, I would prefer not to go into the details on the terms of the contract at this time, as our people are still in negotiation with the railway on this matter. I would not want to disturb the good relationship that has been built up in these difficult and protracted negotiations.

In putting this proposition to the hon. members I realize I am asking them to put me in a position of trust. I want to make it absolutely clear that in no way am I trying to deprive them of information on the matter. I shall make every endeavour to answer their questions on this vote and subsequent vote dealing with GO-transit.

Mr. Chairman, some members may be critical that we have proceeded in this matter, that is, in commencing this project without the executed contract. I would point out that there are at least a half a dozen jurisdictions in the United States that have been trying to find a way of doing the same thing that we have been doing—operating a government service on a privately held railway line.

In some cases this has been under study and under negotiation for a period of years, but not a wheel has been turned in getting the project under way. Also, I might say, that in a few cases where this has been brought about, we have found that the difficulties we have been encountering are not uncommon. More than that, in no case were we able to learn anything from these other authorities that would assist us in our particular problems.

Now, the hon. member for York Centre made a point of comparing GO-transit's operating expenses with those of the Chicago Northwestern. For the benefit of all members, I want to make it clear that there is little similarity in the two operations.

The Chicago Northwestern is an existing railway. We are leasing the services of a railway in order to provide service. Chicago Northwestern operates on a very much higher volume of passengers and the service to handle them, whereas GO-transit operates under a number of restrictions which, at present, prevent it from handling the volume that would result in a better balance sheet.

In all forms of public transportation, Mr. Chairman, there is a set cost of providing service. It was the inability of most forms of public transportation, in the postwar years, to maintain a break-even point of revenue plus costs which resulted in the discontinuance

of a very high number of such services on this continent.

When the commuter rail project was first proposed in this House, it was announced that it was expected it would operate at a deficit. I just want to make these points clear for the benefit of the new members who are not conversant with the background of the project, and to refresh the minds of members who were in the last House.

It is our aim to achieve the best possible conditions and operating costs and all other costs in this project, and we will not be satisfied until we do so. We, in the government, realize that a lot rides on the total success or failure of the outcome of our negotiations, as the financial aspect will have very serious bearing on the evaluation reports in the future of the rail commuter services generally.

Before continuing this vote, I should like to clear up a misunderstanding arising from remarks made during Monday night's sitting. This apparently resulted from an interchange of remarks concerning surveys that are being carried out regarding passenger analysis in the study programme which will result in evaluation reports, to determine possible future application of this type of service.

It has been drawn to my attention that some news sources reported yesterday that the evaluation reports would be ready in two weeks. This is not the case, Mr. Chairman.

In reply to the hon. member for Hamilton Centre (Mr. Davison) I said that a passenger survey had been carried out and the report of that survey would be available in two weeks. This would provide the answer to the number of Hamilton passengers parking at Oakville station.

In regard to the position of the evaluation reports which will be provided to assist the government in determining policy, I think it would assist all members if I reiterated the remarks I made on the subject in my estimates address.

The pertinent passages are these, and I quote:

> Also, it has been decided to carry out a preliminary evaluation which will cover the operation to the end of 1967, a period of seven months. It is expected that this will be completed shortly.
>
> More time on operating data will be required before a complete analysis can be made out with any degree of assurance. This, of course, not only means its capability of attracting sizable volumes of people off the roads, but also involves the careful assessment of the financial aspects involved in moving large numbers of people most efficiently. We shall undertake such an analysis at the end of the first year of full operation this fall.
>
> Whether additional time will be needed to provide a conclusive report will depend on the results of the initial analysis. Although a two- or three-year period was the estimated requirement to carry out various studies, every endeavour is being made to complete them as soon as there is sufficient data for the analysis.

Now, Mr. Chairman, some members questioned the need for having such an evaluation before expanding the service to other parts of this area. The fact of the matter is simply this, that the project was to be used as a test bed, so to speak, so that its application could be realistically assessed when applied to other lines. This will be done in conjunction with evaluation reports that will be undertaken in the fall.

I might say, Mr. Chairman, that some of the matters raised by the hon. members last night, particularly in respect to operating costs, point up the absolute need for carrying out these evaluations.

The hon. members on the opposite side of the House have showed spirited interest in the proposed estimates and that is their rightful function.

I am sure that the same members would be equally critical if we proceded with the expenditures of many millions of dollars in expanding this service without being fully aware of what we can get for our transportation dollar investment. Also, Mr. Chairman, I have the answers to some of the questions that were asked of me.

From the member for Sudbury, the hot-mix patching; a breakdown by regions. The London region $320,000; the Toronto region, $550,000; Kingston region, $250,000; North Bay region, $120,000; Fort William region, $260,000.

There was a matter raised about the signs on the Macdonald-Cartier freeway. I would like to tell the members the policy that we have adopted. The Macdonald-Cartier freeway signs were erected in 1965, and were located past each major interchange along the freeway. The location for these signs was selected by the importance of the intersecting roadways in the overall road network of the area.

There is a total of 65 signs, 5 feet by 12 feet in place on Highway 401, in addition to the

M-C freeway route markers which are located just beyond each interchange. Each service centre along the Macdonald-Cartier freeway has a plaque in the foyer which explains the origin of the Macdonald-Cartier designation.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): What does the plaque say?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: I am sorry, I do not have a copy of one.

Mr. Sopha: Very well, why will you not send us a copy?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: In answer to a question from the member for High Park (Mr. Shulman), re vote 905, item 2, travelling expenses: the reason for the increase of $30,000 is that there were two additional service centres inspectors to cope with the increasing number of service centres; increased travel by the document section to improve efficiency in disposal of records under new records management programmes; an increase in the number of inspections in the supply section in all districts, and the Bailey bridge storage depots, plus a general increase in the cost of travel.

From the same member, on vote 905, item 3: A change in accounting whereby costs recoverable from others were heretofore credited to maintenance will now be credited to salaries, leaving a larger net cost in maintenance. The salary item thus shows a smaller increase than it otherwise would have. The library service is now extended to include five regional offices. The new Bailey bridge depot on Highway 400 requires parts, materials, and equipment, and the use of more sophisticated equipment requires stocking of additional parts and tools.

From the same member on vote 905, item 4(c), office furniture and equipment: Our normal replacement programme over the last few years has not been sufficient to replace the obsolete office equipment, also, greater efficiency can be obtained by using improved and more sophisticated equipment. Specifically a replacement programme for typewriters, calculators, etc., $75,000; additional service contracts and such equipment as cameras, enlargers, digitizers, and plotters, $80,000; the use of photogrammetry, plus new staff and related office furniture and equipment, $43,000, and the replacement of obsolete postal machines, $12,000.

There are a few questions that I was asked to table, and I have, from the hon. member for Riverdale (Mr. J. Renwick), the list of the contractors for surface treatment for the two years that he requested, and the amounts of the contracts.

I have a request from the hon. member for Lakeshore (Mr. Lawlor) for a list of contractors who were successful bidders in the Stratford district, on prime and surface treatment for the years 1961 to 1967, inclusive, together with a list of the contractors bidding on each contract.

And from the member for High Park, and the member for Kent (Mr. Spence) a request for a complete list of the service centres, the gross revenue, the rental, the ground rental, and the total revenue to The Department of Highways. I had a request for resurfacing contracts, and I have a copy of that.

The member for Scarborough East (Mr. T. Reid) asked for details of the warehouse space available. In 1965 and 1966 there were 195,700 square feet, of which 600 feet was unused. In 1966 and 1967, 198,100 square feet, of which 1,500 square feet were unused. 1967 and 1968, 208,700 square feet, and there were 2,200 square feet unused.

Mr. Chairman: On vote 906, the member for York Centre.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): Mr. Chairman, I certainly commend the government for having got the movement of people on the GO-transit started before they had all the "i's" dotted, and the "t's" crossed. I can well understand that not everything in a general agreement would be working out exactly as they had hoped. There is a lot of experience needed in these negotiations of agreements of this type. First of all, I would like to ask the Minister if the assistance of the board of transport commissioners has been sought in working out these agreements.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: No, it has not, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Deacon: Well, Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that the government in Ottawa is very anxious to see this type of service successfully operated, and I am sure we will be ready to help you in every way possible, with the co-operation of the board of transport commissioners as well.

The next thing that I would like to know is what is the restriction at present; as you know, the limitation is, say, 20,000 passengers per day. You have talked about the restriction on trackage. What is the restriction there?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: It is mainly because of the stations. They are not able to accommodate longer trains yet, but we are improving those.

Mr. Deacon: In other words, you expect to exceed the 20,000 capacity per day when you have completed your present programme of extending the platforms in the stations?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Yes, only slightly—and of course when we receive our new coaches.

Mr. Deacon: I am sorry, I did not catch that last, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: When we receive the new coaches, along with the improvements which you suggest, we expect it to improve.

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Chairman, I notice that they are now operating with some 10 coaches of the Ontario Northland Railway, which are not new, comfortable, aluminum cars, but of a considerably older vintage. Since that is now considered satisfactory, would it not be possible to extend the length of the present trains, and thus greatly increase the capacity of 20,000 per day if they so wish?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: This is exactly what we hope we will be able to do.

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Chairman, the Minister made a statement that the capacity was 20,000 per day. It seems to me that the statement does not apply if there are lots of older coaches available to extend the trains now, if that is the limitation.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Chairman, I believe that I made the statement that we had reached a total as high as 18,000 per day, and when we have the new improvements, we expected to go to 20,000 or better per day. These are the longer station platforms and the additional coaches.

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Chairman, I am still surprised at the statement that 20,000 is the capacity per day of this system. I suggest that not only additional coaches, but perhaps a different design of coaches, would have been helpful to solve the problem. I understand that with the double-deck coaches used in Chicago, a six-car train will carry over 1,000 people, which is considerably more than we are carrying on our eight or nine-car trains. Is that not correct? Why should we not have used a double-deck car instead of a single deck?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: The railways who were helping us with all equipment advised us against it, and we believe that we have received the very best in operating equipment for this type of track and service.

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Chairman, I understand that the railway might be more interested in lighter cars since they wear the tracks less than if they had a little more weight on them. But since the agreement calls for a wheelage basis of sharing of costs, rather than a ton-mile, perhaps we should be getting a few more passengers in a given car and, therefore, alleviating that extra burden that now is being carried on the present basis of the sharing of costs. Is that not right? We should be considering getting as many people as possible in our trains—in every car.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: The lightweight cars, of course, were purchased for the purpose of fast acceleration, and we have these so that we could get the greatest number of trains on the track that was available.

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Chairman, I think that they also are able to operate at an equally fast speed with these double-deck cars and certainly they are not too high for our present railway rights of way, according to the information that I have. I suggest that consideration be given to the purchase of double-deck cars in the future, instead of the single ones, so we can get more passengers in a given length of track.

The next point that I wanted to ask the Minister, Mr. Chairman, through you, is the capacity of Union station. Is that now up to its limit, or are steps being taken to increase its capacity so we can get more people using the train, paying fares, and maybe lowering the amount of deficit we are having to cover?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Well, Mr. Chairman, this is all in the plan for a new transportation terminal which is going to be built down there.

Mr. Deacon: Well, I suggest that the new transportation terminal may take many years to complete. In the meantime, a lot of people want to use this service and do not want to be held up many minutes in leaving the train as they try to pile through the very restricted stairways at the old Union Station.

I would ask the Minister if anyone in his department has studied using direct access as would be possible by means of the con-

struction of a Bailey bridge or a similar type of construction from the station platforms to Bay Street or York Street, thus shortcutting this unnecessary twisting and turning through Union station's narrow passageways.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Chairman, we have been studying that.

Mr. Deacon: And, Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister if the results of their studies have indicated the necessity—even on a temporary basis until a new transportation centre is built—of introducing such direct access this year to increase the number of passengers getting in and out of the station?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Chairman, the studies are not complete yet. As soon as they are we will be able to reach a decision.

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Chairman, there is another phase of this that I would like to inquire into further. The Minister has stated, and one of his assistants in a meeting at which I was present stated, that there are only at the present time some 65 people using the service between Hamilton and Toronto. I was wondering on that count if the officials are at all concerned about the fact that there are presently five express or semi-express Gray Coach buses leaving between downtown Hamilton with a one stop to Toronto or no stops to downtown Toronto between 6.30 and 8.30, indicating a traffic of at least 200 to 300 people per day on that route. Why are we not attracting them to the GO-transit?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: We are quite aware of those coaches, Mr. Chairman, but as I explained before, the board of transport commissioners allowed us to take over the two commuter trains which the CNR were operating and this is all we have done as far as Hamilton is—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order! Order please! The member for York Centre has a question to pursue.

Mr. Deacon: I would like to ask the Minister if it is his wish to extend this service? If he intends to make application to the board of transport commissioners to extend this service? Or is it because of their negative approach to this request that they are not now serving these people and providing service?

Mr. Chairman: May I say to the member for York Centre that he has posed a great many individual separate questions to the Minister regarding research, and so on. The Minister has answered that all of these things are under study.

Mr. Deacon: Excuse me, Mr. Chairman, on the last question he did not say it was under study. He answered that the board of transport commissioners had only agreed to allow them to take over the existing or former CNR service from Hamilton to Toronto. I am asking him whether he has made application to take over, or to introduce, additional service between Hamilton and Toronto and has been refused.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: No we have not, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Deacon: Is it the hon. Minister's intention to apply for additional service in order to attract some of these people now using Gray Coach?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: This will depend on our studies and, of course, we are guided by the track capacity. We work with the CNR on this.

Mr. Deacon: Well, Mr. Chairman, I suggest that in the CN magazine that describes the operations of that corporation, in a recent article they describe the fact that through their computer service and operational research it is now unnecessary to have trial runs; that they can tell exactly what they can handle on the computer. Therefore, they could surely give us judgment as to whether additional trains could be handled from Hamilton to Oakville, tying in with that service.

I cannot quite understand why we have to wait for more trial and experience in that regard in view of these more modern trains that are now available.

There is another matter, Mr. Chairman, that I would bring out. The fare in a 35-mile section of the Chicago line under the new increased rates works out to about 2 cents a mile, which is considerably under the basis of fare that we now have in the Hamilton to Toronto rates.

I was wondering whether if perhaps we did introduce such a fare, the Minister would consider putting in fares that would favour the longer distance passenger on a per-mile basis, recognizing that there is a certain basic cost to handle any single passenger; if it would not be worth his while then to increase the service and make it

possible for Hamiltonians to use the convenient, reliable GO-transit instead of the bus service on our crowded highways.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Chairman, we did not intend to take business away from the Gray Coach Lines. We intended to supplement the service, and one of the things that is under study is the fare structure.

Mr. Deacon: I wonder if GO-transit is in business to attract customers and to build service for the commuter, or to keep Gray Coach Lines in business.

It seems to me that our obligation is to run a business successfully in competition; to make it as attractive as possible; and put it in competition with other modes of transportation and haul as many people over these railway rights of way as possible. I suggest that the answer from the Minister indicates a lack of real interest in building a business and giving people service. I hope that we will see results of these studies in much under the two- or three-year period he has been suggesting to us. Would the Minister give us any idea when we can expect results of these studies that have now been under way for several months?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Chairman, I have explained that at least two or three times on this particular item. We expect we will have a report within a couple of weeks.

Mr. Deacon: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I thank the hon. Minister.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Hamilton Centre.

Mr. N. Davison (Hamilton Centre): Mr. Chairman, when we were discussing some of these problems on Monday evening, one question we were discussing was the service into Hamilton. I was suggesting that instead of running the trains back each way deadhead that it would be a possibility at no extra cost of running the other way. The Minister in his reply stated that the reason they were not doing this was because the CNR was running trains at that time.

I wonder if he could tell me the schedule that is even close to that which the CNR is using now?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Our agreement with the CNR was that we would only replace their two trains.

Mr. Davison: Well, the statement of Monday night then was not actually right, because I did check to get the figures and I discovered there is no other CNR train running within three hours of this schedule.

It is costing the taxpayers a certain amount of money for this GO system, and does it not seem kind of silly that we are taking the position that we are, running trains between Toronto and Hamilton without any passengers? There are no other trains running at this time. Would it not be possible to use those trains for passenger service and double this service? Has the Minister checked into this at all with the department?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: This is one of the areas that we are discussing with the railway now.

Mr. Davison: Will the Minister let us know as soon as he has made some decision on whether they are going to do away with this idea of running the two trains to Hamilton and Toronto each way without any passengers at all?

Mr. G. Bukator (Niagara Falls): Mr. Chairman, I realize that this GO-transit system has not been operating too long, but I was wondering, about these parking areas that you have along the way, and I am making reference to one of the areas, Guildwood.

It appears that between 150 and 175 cars are parked in that area, and it is quite close to home; something between 50 and 100 feet from the back yards.

I realize that in the plans of the parking area they must have taken into consideration, Mr. Chairman, some type of barrier between the privately-owned properties and the parking areas. I am sure that this must have been brought to the department's attention. If it has not, perhaps I should stress my point further.

Along the highway on many occasions The Department of Highways wanted to blot out an undesirable view or a factory that may be advertising, taking advantage of the highway, and they planted trees along the way. They finally have topped them and they have become quite bushy and prevent drivers from having their attention detracted from driving. I was wondering whether they could not build that type of hedge or fence in these parking areas. As I have said before, it is rather soon after you started your operation.

I am wondering how many people have brought this to the Minister's attention and if any steps are being taken to plant trees or some type of fence to actually give the people of that area a break, because their properties

are affected. It is not a desirable condition at all.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: I am advised, Mr. Chairman, that there is additional work to be done at that station and the landscaping will be looked into and finished at that time.

Mr. Bukator: Does the Minister not think that would be desirable, a hedge of that type? Something that would be a barrier between the privately-owned properties and that parking lot would be desirable. Does the Minister not think that would be a reasonable request of the people?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: It might serve the purpose, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Bukator: It might serve the purpose? Well, then we will take it a little further. Does the Minister not think that these people ought to have some kind of a protection from this undesirable condition? With the stone and the dust and the parking lot, does the Minister not think there ought to be some type of construction between them?

I think a nice green hedge of a type that would serve as a buffer between the properties and the lot would be an answer to the problem. "That might serve the purpose", Mr. Chairman, is another evasive answer.

Will he not consider putting a fence up that will give these people the break that they ask for? They are not complaining. There is an area where you must park your cars; the people come in and they go out, and 150 cars a day is quite an undesirable condition. All I ask of this Minister is to consider putting in a hedge of the type that at least the people do not have to look at this ugly mess twice a day.

The Minister says, "This would be desirable". I would say I would like this Minister —and this is not a difficult thing—

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): You cannot do it without a study.

Mr. Bukator: I do not think we need a study.

Mr. Lewis: It might take a year or two.

Mr. Bukator: If the Minister or I were in that position, I am quite sure we would ask for this. I think the department ought to request that, not request, but go along with that type of request and say this will be done. This Minister could get himself a few friends that he has not got today if he goes on with this kind of thinking. Surely that is not asking too much.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Chairman, I did not want to say there would not be something done. I mean, I am not sure there is going to be a hedge, but there will be some kind of a barrier there. The other thing the member referred to, the stones and dust; that area has recently been paved and that will cure a great deal of that problem.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): Sir, I would like to ask a question in relation to the statement in regard to service centres which was just tabled by the hon. Minister. I notice there are some eight companies that have been competing for these various highly-profitable service centres. Of these companies, four are large United States concerns, one is a subsidiary. Canadian Oil, of a United States concern—

Mr. Chairman: I would ask the member for High Park if this is one of the answers to vote 905 tabled by the hon. Minister today?

Mr. Shulman: He can answer it any time he wishes.

Mr. Chairman: No, the point is that vote 905 has been carried and there will be no further debate on it.

Mr. Shulman: I am sorry, sir, this was tabled today in relation to a question. If the question is not allowed now there will be no further time during the estimates to ask it, and it is a very important question.

Mr. Chairman: But it has nothing to do with vote 906, I would point out to the member.

Mr. Shulman: Here we come to the problem of the whole matter. We ask for information; we ask that the vote be held up until the information be supplied. In your wisdom, you decided that we should have the information after the vote is taken. Something terribly important is in this information and now you say we cannot discuss it.

Mr. Chairman: No. Once a vote has been carried, it is carried and there can be no further debate on that particular vote.

Mr. L. A. Braithwaite (Etobicoke): Mr. Chairman, I am asking for the same information. I am as interested as the member for High Park in the answers to this question, because it was our understanding that

this information would be tabled in detail by the Minister and that we would have an opportunity to look at this information. It seems outrageous that we cannot question whatever has been put forward by the Minister. I beg to differ with you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: The members will have an opportunity to view the information that has been tabled. If they desire to obtain further information on that, they can do so on some other occasion but not under this particular vote. Vote 905 has been carried, and there can be no further debate.

On vote 906:

Mr. Braithwaite: Just before you proceed, Mr. Chairman, when can this information be requested by the hon. member for High Park?

Mr. Chairman: Before the orders of the day, as I suggested two or three nights ago, a question may be directed.

Mr. Braithwaite: Oh that is not fair, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Shulman: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I must point out to you—and this is extremely important—that this particular tabling showed that the four American firms all have received the same gross revenue, apparently by coincidence, while the only Canadian company has received only a tiny fraction of this. I think this is terribly important; this is the time it should be discussed. It cannot be discussed before the orders of the day.

Mr. Chairman: I regret that I cannot accept that as a point of order. Vote 905 has been carried.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, we have to strongly object to the methods used by the Minister in avoiding giving information to the members regarding his estimates. He tells us that he cannot answer the question, that he would have to get the information for us. Now, what kind of tomfoolery are we putting up with? If we cannot go back and requestion on the answers we get, we might as well not be here at all. I plead with you to let us pursue the questions that have been tabled, based on the Minister's failure to answer them at the time that they were raised.

Mr. Chairman: I would point out to the member that once the vote has been carried, the rules of this House provide that no further debate may take place. Prior to the carrying of a vote, debate may continue.

Vote 905 was put to the committee and it has been carried.

Mr. Shulman: But, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): But, Mr. Chairman, if I may speak on this point of order. We are obviously going to run into this from now until August in each of the estimates. I would like to make a suggestion to the Chairman for his consideration as to how we can solve this.

Each of the departments will come forward with its estimates, one of which will be operations—head office administration. It will be at the beginning of the estimates—vote number one, two, three or four, somewhere in the early part. I would suggest, in order that we can solve this problem and not get hung up about it—which we are about to do—that each of the departments bring forward its estimates, skips the vote on the head office administration until the end of the estimate, deal with all the matters which are itemized and come to the head office administration. At that point, the Minister would have ample time to have tabled all the miscellaneous questions that will come up along the way and then deal with the head office as a wrap-up cumulative vote, under which we can deal with these problems. It is quite useless, Mr. Chairman, for us to spend, as we will in each department, 10 or 20 minutes arguing about this point. I submit that this is a reasonable way to try and find a solution to this problem. Like all solutions, it will not be perfect, but it will be much better than we are presently operating under.

Mr. Chairman: I would say to the member for Riverdale that I would be quite pleased to consider his suggestion, if that is the wish of the Ministers and the members that this course be followed. I, personally, at the moment see no reason why it cannot be.

But, I think that the members must recognize that no Minister is required, in any way, by the rules of the House to answer any question. And, I must further point out that the rules do clearly state that once a vote has been carried there may be no further debate on that particular vote. I put it to the members that they must see to it themselves that they are satisfied

before they permit a vote to be carried or they can move that the vote be not carried.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, at the time we protested. We asked you to hold off the vote and you would not allow us to do it.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Chairman, may I speak on this point or order?

I had addressed myself to this point before. I do not think that any Minister is compelled to answer any question—he can say, "no, I have no comment," or, "I will not answer it," or, "I will get the information later." That is up to him and he takes his risk in answering a question in that way or not answering it. Every hon. member has a right to speak on a vote as long as it is open and I do not think you, sir, have any right to declare a vote passed until every hon. member has had an opportunity of expressing himself on it.

But if you carry the theory of the hon. member for High Park to its end, that would mean we would never conclude any vote. That would mean, sir—and I do not want to cut off any debate—that would mean, sir, that unless every member was satisfied that his questions had been answered, that the vote would never be over. We just cannot carry on business that way.

In regard to the remarks of the hon. member for Riverdale, I just think you are postponing the hour, because if you take the first vote, the general office vote, and put it to the last, you are going to run into the same thing at the end rather than at the beginning.

Mr. J. Renwick: No, it would be a distinct improvement.

Mr. Singer: Well, I do not see it. To my mind, it is a distinction without a difference.

I think it is the responsibility, sir, of every hon. member to ask as many questions as he wants, to comment on the answers in the way that he sees fit and, when the members have exhausted their questions on a particular vote, then the vote is either carried or not carried and that is it. We cannot go on on this thing forever.

There are many answers, particularly from this Minister, that I think are completely and entirely inadequate, but the fact that he is an inadequate Minister is a fact for comment here and in other places. If that is our opinion, there it is. But I do not think, sir, that we can keep on coming back to things out of context. We have an order to follow and I think we must follow it.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Chairman, I can understand your problem in the issue of reopening votes that have been closed. When we get to July we will all appreciate that this is a process that cannot go on forever and that, therefore, there must be some finality to a vote. There is this general problem with answers that are given by all Ministers, but in the case of this Minister a considerable number of questions were to be answered. After the questions had been put—a day or so afterwards—he seeks the information and he gives it to us.

I submit, as I think you recognized when you first listened to the proposal from the hon. member for Riverdale, the way to wrap up all these odds and sods as we used to call them in the navy—is to keep the vote open only on the first vote. Not all of them, only on the first vote. Any odds and sods that may have emerged or been accumulated in the consideration of the whole estimate can be cleaned up there.

I am a little puzzled as to why the hon. member for Downsview is throwing that out. It is not the tidiest thing in the world and it may well be that the odd question really was not directly on the first vote, but it is an office vote—an overall departmental vote—and I think it would be a way, as my colleague has suggested, to avoid getting hung up and repeating this argument in each estimate.

Mr. Chairman: I would say to the member for York South that I did say to the member for Riverdale that I would give consideration to his suggestion. It may have some merit. I must still, however, point out the rules of the House—the practice of this House which has been followed. That is, when a vote is carried it is carried and is no longer debatable. I repeat this. I say it is up to each individual member to continue his questioning and there is no time limit to the time a member may speak or the number of times he may debate a particular vote or an item in the vote.

In my opinion, it is up to the members to satisfy themselves that they have exhausted all the information available from the particular Minister, and, in view of the procedure that has been followed, I declare that vote 906 is now before the House and we may proceed with that vote only.

Mr. Lewis: It is a move—

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, on the same point of order, and specifically to the problem in this department, you have indicated that you will give consideration to this suggestion of a wrap-up vote at the end.

I will trust that the senior member on the government benches, the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. MacNaughton) would agree with the merit of this proposal and, indeed, speak to this particular motion, so that we can have it clarified. In this particular case, we would be quite prepared to yield on this particular point at this time, if you would agree, Mr. Chairman, that come the last vote in this Minister's estimates that any of the questions to which he has tabled replies can be discussed at that time and comment made.

The member for Downsview always drives things to the black and white extreme. You can never improve anything, because it always has to be the extreme situation that we will never complete.

Mr. Singer: Your point has validity. We do not need the moral lecture.

Mr. J. Renwick: If the member for Downsview would spend a little bit of time trying to solve the problem—I am simply saying to you, Mr. Chairman, will you agree that at the end of this estimate—

Mr. Singer: It is too bad you fellows have to resort to the lectures.

Mr. J. Renwick: —prior to the final vote being taken, we can have a wrap-up of the answers which the Minister has tabled to the questions previously raised.

Mr. Chairman: No, I would say to the member—

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Provincial Treasurer): Mr. Chairman, I propose to you, sir, that you really have no choice but to live within the rules of the House. The hon. member for Downsview has stated the case quite clearly. You have stated the case quite clearly yourself, but suggesting that you might take the matter under consideration. This, of course, was your prerogative. But I suggest to you, sir, that for the time being the rules of the House must be applied as you have said.

Mr. Chairman: Yes, I would say to the member for Riverdale, if I may reply to his previous remarks, that I will indeed be glad to consider his suggestions and that of his leader. I cannot, however, agree to the suggestion that we reopen discussion on any votes that have now been passed at this time. It is not my intention, nor do I think it is my privilege, to change the rules of the House half way through the debates and we must follow the rules that have been followed.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, it is very kind of you to say you will consider the suggestion, but the hon. Minister has, in fact, said that there will be no change. Therefore, we are going to be faced with the proposition that it is now going to be a very long session, because we are going to have to wait on each vote, and if necessary put up speakers to hold the vote until the Minister answers the questions. We will be here come September, come October, if necessary. To suggest that the Minister can provide information on which the members in the Opposition have spent time in preparation at a date subsequent to the time when it can be debated defeats the whole purpose of the estimates.

Mr. Chairman: No. I do not suggest, and I did not suggest that there should be or could be this procedure. I believe that the Minister brought in the answers to all of these various questions that had been asked and which he had undertaken to provide. It was my understanding that he would provide them to the individual members. He tabled them with the Clerk of the House. In no way did this leave the particular votes to which these answers had reference open for further debate.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Chairman: I make one final comment. The estimates of The Department of Highways are obviously not going to close today. I would ask, Mr. Chairman, that you consider the suggestion which we have made, between now and the reconvening of the House on Monday, for these estimates, or whatever day they come back. Let us have your decision at the opening of those estimates as to whether we can deal with the matters which the Minister has answered in this particular estimate, and your answer on the more general proposition which I have made.

We have no wish, and never do have in this House, of appealing the rulings of the Chair in this kind of circumstance. I would hope that you would be able to persuade, in whatever consideration you give to it, the government leaders, that this is eminently reasonable and eminently proper, because we just do not want a head-on collision—we have got too much work to do.

Mr. Chairman: I assure the member that it is my intention to give it full and careful consideration.

Vote 906, the member for Etobicoke.

Mr. Braithwaite: Mr. Chairman, during the October election, my Conservative opponent made a great thing of the fact that the government would be bringing the GO train from Weston northwest to the Rexdale train station, and perhaps further on to Bolton. In a way he had a good point there because Rexdale is expanding, the whole northwest part of Metropolitan Toronto is becoming quite filled with people, new houses, new plazas, and above all, we have got an awful lot of industry in the area of Rexdale.

I am wondering, can the Minister tell us whether or not my hon. opponent had any inside information as to plans for the GO train to go to Rexdale that we do not have here today? I also would like to know, Mr. Chairman, whether the Minister has any definite plans, whether his department has any plans, for extending the GO-transit northwest to Rexdale and on to Bolton and other said centres. And, if the Minister has no such plans, can the Minister tell us whether or not any research is being done by his department as to the feasibility of bringing the GO train to Rexdale.

I ask the Minister these questions because we have transportation problems in the northwest part of Metropolitan Toronto. We can go north and south on Kipling and Islington and Royal York and Martingrove, and various roads, but to get to the centre of the city in a direct southeasterly direction—

I would suggest to the Minister that a train station extension of the GO train to Rexdale and further northwest would assist people from the core of Toronto to get out to the northwest and to the industry. It would also assist those who live in Rexdale to get downtown much quicker, and it would help those who live in the old age homes, homes for the aged on Kipling Avenue, and in that general area, because these individuals have a great deal of difficulty in getting down to their next-of-kin who live usually in the more settled part of Toronto.

These are some of the things that one would think that the government would think about when they put up these homes for the aged. It is a big problem for individuals living in these places to get to see their loved ones, and for their family to get up there on the weekend. I suggest to the Minister that an extension of the GO system northwest through Rexdale would help Metropolitan Toronto, and it would help those who live particularly in the northwest part of Metropolitan Toronto.

One last thing, Mr. Chairman. The Minister probably knows he has in the northwest part of Toronto many low-rental projects, and many of these people have been brought from the central part of Toronto where urban renewal is being carried on and where housing is very difficult to get. These people have their families in the central part of Toronto, and I urge the Minister to give some consideration to some of these questions that I have put to him, and also to whether or not it would be of some assistance to these individuals to get down to Toronto to extend the GO train to the northwest.

There is a great possibility that we will have a housing project in Malvern, out in Scarborough in the not-too-distant future, and I think this is another area that the Minister might want to look into. But I would like at this time, Mr. Chairman, to have some answers to the questions that I have put to the Minister.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Chairman, first of all I wish to assure the hon. member that the man he referred to as having inside information did not get it from this department. I would not know where he got that.

Mr. Braithwaite: It was just an election ploy was it?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: I could not answer that because I have never seen the statement to which you refer.

Mr. Sopha: The candidate did not get far with his claim. The people repudiated him; as Mr. Frost used to say.

Mr. Braithwaite: Before the Minister proceeds with his answers, the point is that at no time did any official of the government make any comment. The Minister's department made no comment as to whether or not this candidate was, shall we say being reckless with the truth?

Mr. Sopha: How much did you beat him by?

Mr. Braithwaite: Nearly 4,000 votes.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order please!

Mr. Braithwaite: Could we continue with the rest of the discussion in this area?

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Chairman, just before the Minister answers.

Mr. Chairman: Is it on the same point?

Mr. Braithwaite: Well as long as the Minister is going to answer the questions, if the member for Yorkview can add some further comment go ahead.

Mr. Chairman: Order please! Is the Minister going to answer any questions from the member for Etobicoke?

Mr. Braithwaite: If the member for Yorkview is on the same point we might save some time, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: All right then, I recognize the member for Yorkview.

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, the question which was asked by the hon. member for Etobicoke is a very valid one. I think all of us in the northwestern part of Metro faced this problem during the election campaign, and evidently from what the Minister says the promises that were made were not authorized.

But just to clarify the situation, the hon. member for Etobicoke mentioned the line going up through Rexdale and on to Bolton. Now, the Rexdale line goes on through to Brampton. The line which goes to Bolton goes up north through Weston and Woodbridge; it branches there just at Weston, and I am wondering—

Mr. Braithwaite: If I might just comment?

Mr. Young: Yes.

Mr. Braithwaite: It was not a question of necessarily using existing lines, it was a question of new lines being put in. He made quite a picture of this and I understood the government had barrels of money to do this, this is why I bring this up to see where this money has gone.

Mr. Young: Well then, I quite understand what happened. Evidently the opposition to the hon. member for Etobicoke talked about a U-line that was going to loop up through Rexdale, come back onto the Bolton line, and go north at that point. This, of course, would serve many of the people in my area quite adequately.

But at the present time, of course, there is real need for the GO-transit line to go north along the regular line, up through Woodbridge and Bolton in that case. However far it went, it would serve a very rapidly developing area, also a very great industrial area at the Finch-Weston Road section of the borough. And people here are short of transportation and they are looking for the GO-transit to go up through that section.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would also point out to the hon. Minister that there is a fairly large amount of public land available at the Finch Avenue area for parking lots if it were looked at quickly, and it might be available to the Minister for this purpose.

Mr. Singer: Finch and where?

Mr. Young: The 52 acres at Finch where the railway line crosses. The hon. member for Downsview and I were both on a council when this was acquired some years ago, as you remember.

Mr. Singer: Yes, I agree.

Mr. Young: And it is, I understand, still there, a beautiful spot for a commuter parking lot. It might well be that the Minister should take a careful look at this situation before some other disposition is made of that particular land.

Again I urge upon the Minister that some expedition of this line to the north take place. Now, whether it goes as the promise was made to the voters of Etobicoke—that it would loop in a new fashion through Rexdale—or whether it follows existing lines, would have to be decided. Personally I think the existing lines are adequate, or the rights of way are adequate with proper rebuilding to do the job there. So again, I wonder if the Minister has any information for us in respect to this projection?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: No, Mr. Chairman, I have not. I have said on quite a number of occasions on this vote of the investigation and inquiry that is being made to the north. We have had representations from different groups and we are assessing all the situations.

But as for what any candidate said in the election, I am not aware of it, and he certainly did not get any information like that from the department.

Mr. Sopha: This is pretty well typical of the whole campaign as I remember it.

Mr. Braithwaite: Mr. Chairman, before the Minister—I had a couple of extra questions that he has not answered yet. He said that investigation or research is being done as far as—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. Braithwaite: As I was saying, Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister mentioned research being done prior to extending the GO train north. I am wondering if he would clarify. Is he speaking of directly north? Is he speaking of northeast or is he speaking of northwest? I am particularly interested in a line going to the northwest and, as I said, through Rexdale.

Now I would like to know if any research is being done to the north as far as extending the GO train to the northwest?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Chairman, it is being done in all three locations.

Mr. Braithwaite: Now would the Minister like to answer the other questions that I had, as to whether or not there are plans for the GO train to go to the northwest?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Chairman, I think I have answered that.

Mr. Braithwaite: I am sorry, I missed that, sir; in the repartee back and forth I missed that. I wonder if I could have your answer?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: The research is going on in all three locations as to the possibility of them. That is the answer that I have to give you.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 906, the member for Riverdale.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I have three matters I would like to raise briefly with the Minister.

The first one is on the question of liability insurance. Could the Minister explain to me whether both the CNR and the government of Ontario are on the risk for GO-transit, or is the government of Ontario carrying the prime insurance and the CNR carrying secondary insurance? Just what would happen should there be a—as we hope of course there will not be—a serious accident on the GO-transit system? Who would be primarily liable, and how is the liability shared between the Canadian National Railways and the government of Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: If it is the GO train, Mr. Chairman, we are responsible for it and we carry the insurance to cover that. The CNR process any of the claims because it is on their line, and then the costs are charged to our insurance.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I am going to pursue it. I am going to ask the Minister if he would let me have at some later date, either formally or informally, a more adequate reply to my question. As I understand it, you are using the CNR tracks, you are using CNR train personnel, the signalling system. While the equipment—part of it—was purchased by the government of Ontario, its operation is handled by the Canadian National Railways. There is a joint liability in the case of an accident, in my view, and I would like to know how the government has decided to sort out its share of the insurance responsibility for GO-transit.

The second matter I would like to raise with the Minister is one which—

Mr. Chairman: Order, please! The member for Riverdale, may I point out, has asked the Minister for answers to certain questions he has raised. Does the member for Riverdale undertake to accept these questions either before or after the vote has been carried?

Mr. J. Renwick: That was the reason why I said informally, or at some other date. I just basically want to know that the government has considered the question and to get a reasonable statement of what the government's position is.

Mr. MacDonald: We will come back under the insurance committee.

Mr. J. Renwick: Now the second question. It is indirectly related to my first question, but is of much more urgent concern. In the riding of Riverdale on Pape Avenue, just north of Gerrard Street, there is in the heart of the east central part of the city of Toronto, a level crossing, which is on the main line of the CNR. Now it has been a hazard for many years. There have been anywhere up to 20 or 30 Canadian National Railways trains going across that level crossing; but with the introduction of GO-transit, you have added to its regular service between 40 and 47 trains a day. On weekends, about 36 additional trains.

So you have about 70 or 80 trains going through that level crossing, many of them at a very high rate of speed. I am simply asking the Minister, Mr. Chairman, if the government of the province of Ontario will take the responsibility to persuade the city of Toronto and the federal government and Canadian National Railways and the board

of transport commissioners to eliminate immediately—not to study it—but to eliminate immediately that level crossing.

Now it is in the heart of my riding. I know that the Minister is not likely to be there. I know that the president of London Life is not likely to be knocked down at that point, nor is it likely that anyone in this House will be on that particular level crossing. But it is used in my riding by thousands of people in the course of a year. They have to cross that level crossing—and it is also a main street at which that level crossing exists. I do not want to fool around with the issue.

I want the Minister's assurance that immediate action will be taken to find out when that level crossing will be eliminated and to tell me that if the government of Ontario has not interested itself in it, then because they have increased the hazard at least twice of a serious accident taking place on that level crossing, that they will assume the responsibility for the initiative to eliminate that level crossing which should never have been there all these years.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Chairman, we have already written to Metro about this crossing. It is a Metro road, but I can assure the hon. member that I will see that this is followed up immediately.

Mr. J. Renwick: I appreciate the Minister's remarks. I know he understands the concern which I express about that level crossing. We cannot afford to buy time if we wish to avoid another accident or an accident on that crossing.

The third point is a matter on which I have been in communication with the Minister and with his predecessor for some time. That is that at De Grassi Street and Queen Street where the CNR track crosses Queen Street, there is the old De Grassi Street railway station. Now that particular station—if it were a GO-transit station—would service for the purposes of GO-transit the people in the riding of Riverdale who want to go to their places of employment, which are scattered all over the southern part of the Metropolitan area. It would serve to bring in and off the roads a large number of people who, in fact, travel to plants such as Lever Brothers, Dunlop Tire, Colgate-Palmolive, the Hearn generating plant, and a host of other industries rather smaller than that in the area.

I raised the question a year or so ago and was told that there were a number of problems involved. Since that time I have tried to follow it along and I know now that the Minister has received a preliminary petition from people in those plants, which shows that there are—on this very preliminary petition—at least 400 to 450 people who would make use of GO-transit to go to their places of employment. I would emphasize the other part of it as well—that there are many people in the riding of Riverdale who go to their places of employment along the Lakeshore area of Metropolitan Toronto, to whom this would be of invaluable service.

I would think that it is quite within the capability of the Canadian National Railways, with the government of Ontario prodding them, to work out a method by which the De Grassi Street station would become a GO-transit station. I am quite certain in that immediate area it would be quite possible to find adequate parking facilities for the people from Riverdale to park their cars if they had to come from the outer parts of that great riding. I am quite certain, also, that it would be possible by feeder bus service arrangement, to transport people from the De Grassi Street station to the numerous plants which lie in the south part of the Riverdale riding, and in the adjacent part of the St. David riding.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Chairman, a survey of the plants in the vicinity of Queen and De Grassi Streets produced a list of 450 employees, as the member said, who expressed a desire for a GO-transit station at De Grassi. An analysis of the home addresses of these employees showed that almost 200 lived in places such as Weston, Willowdale, Markham, East York and the areas of Toronto which would make them highly unlikely to be prospective GO-transit users for regular commuting to work. A further analysis of the remaining 250 would indicate that approximately 150 might use the service on a regular basis.

On May 10 of this year, the TTC will be extending the Bloor-Danforth subway from Woodbine east to Warden Avenue, deeper into the Scarborough territory. This extension will undoubtedly have some effect on present and future GO-transit patronage especially from Scarborough residents.

It is quite conceivable, therefore, that Scarborough employees who are petitioning for the GO-transit De Grassi Street stop will use the TTC subway and buses to commute to work, and with the opening of the subway extension a re-evaluation of the eastern area served by GO-transit and the subway will

be made to determine if any changes are necessary.

Mr. J. Renwick: Well, Mr. Chairman, you know our patience tends to get a little exhausted with this kind of a reply. I pointed out to the Minister that the survey was a preliminary statement. If the Minister's department has nothing further to do than to analyze a preliminary statement, then I suggest that there is something seriously wrong. The covering letter which sent that statement to the Minister is as follows:

> The group which has signed the enclosed petition is expressing the thought that there is a dire need for a GO train station at Queen and De Grassi Streets.

This petition, signed by 424 persons, is in effect asking that an in-depth study of the whole question of GO-transportation to this area take place. They realize that at least a fair structure in train scheduling to take care of their proposal is a matter for expert study.

It is believed that the petition will show that there are sufficient valid signers to warrant careful consideration of the proposal, but it does not exhaust the possibilities of the total potential travellers to and from the area.

It is pointed out that the signers are employees of only five of the larger firms in the area. There are many smaller firms that have not been canvassed who might add considerably to the list of prospective daily users. It appears that the proposed site of the station offers to both users and operators a profitable convenience that would also be in the general interest of the community as a whole.

I just make the point that the people in the area employed in certain of the plants had a very preliminary petition drawn up asking for an in-depth study. They did not ask for a discussion about the Bloor-Danforth subway, which is some substantial distance from the area of the riding of Riverdale that I am speaking about. They are not asking that their survey be analyzed with a fine tooth comb.

They are asking for an in-depth study of GO-transit, not what will happen when the Metro subway across Danforth is open. They are talking about an in-depth study of the people who live in the riding of Riverdale, who would use it to go out of the riding to their places of employment and of the persons who are in the plants.

Now, when I got the letter from the Minister prior to getting this particular petition, I had understood that you were initiating a scientific survey of the area to get this information, because in your letter to me you said:

> I have instructed that a survey of the plants be carried out as soon as possible in order to obtain an estimate of the potential patronage.

Now I would like that in-depth study carried out effectively, completely, because I know you will get the co-operation of the officers of the plants and the members of the trade union executives in many of those plants in carrying it out. I want the survey extended to cover the people in the south part of the Riverdale riding.

I would like to have a much more direct statement, divorced entirely from the Bloor-Danforth subway, as to whether or not the Minister will aggressively pursue the question of providing a GO-transit station within the next year at the De Grassi Street-Queen Street crossing.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: We will make that survey, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. J. Renwick: Thank you.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I am in receipt, under date of April 2, of a brief from residents of Lorne Park. I understand a copy of this brief has also gone to the Minister so he may be familiar with it. They are presenting their case with regard to the situation of service from GO-transit.

Apparently the number of trains going through has been much limited, as compared for example with Clarkson. At one point in their brief they indicate that they are deprived of 40 trains a day, but as of April 29 they are going to be deprived of the whole service of the GO-transit system.

In short, instead of having it expanded as they had requested, it is going to be eliminated altogether.

I will not read the whole brief, but the key to the thing seems to me in about two or three small paragraphs in the first page. They state that on a per stop basis the passenger revenue at Lorne Park is 176 per cent of that of Oakville; 274 per cent of that of Clarkson; 225 per cent of that of Port Credit; 318 per cent of that of Long Branch and 749 per cent of that of Mimico.

Taking the last example, the revenue of Lorne Park is approximately 7.5 times that of the Mimico revenue of 850 per stock. On a per stock basis, the revenue from Lorne

Park is 55 per cent of the total per stock revenues of the other five stations. On a per stock basis, the per household revenue in Lorne Park is 393 per cent of that of Clarkson. The above results are phenomenal when one considers the obstacles in the way of the Lorne Park resident.

In short, Mr. Chairman, if these figures are an accurate reflection of the revenue of Lorne Park, it is one of the most lucrative along the road. Now, apparently, the argument put forward to the local Lorne Park commuters committee by the management of GO-transit is that an expenditure for more rolling stock and trackage is required to fulfill the Lorne Park request for more GO train service. So from operating experience already gained, trains can stop at Lorne Park and Clarkson and there is no problem arising at Union station on scheduling, they add. Their final comment is that Lorne Park service can be provided without the purchase of additional rolling stock, installation of more trackage, or station increase at Lorne Park.

Reviewing the above revenue statistics, this looks like a highly favourable financial position for the GO train system. Lorne Park is a handy ready source for revenue to help pay off the over $1 million expenditure on Clarkson, the next station. I wonder if the Minister could explain why they are eliminating the service completely when this appears to be, on the basis of this evidence, such a solid revenue producer on the system?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Chairman, I could give the hon. member the figures which we worked it out on. In the planning of the GO-transit, transportation experts recommended the best location of stations for this type of service. On the western sector, between Toronto and Oakville, this involved an adjustment of station spacing between Long Branch and Clarkson.

The Long Branch station was relocated about a mile west of the old site, in a new site just west of Highway 27 and Lakeshore Road. Both the Dixie Road and the Lakeview stops were eliminated because they were only a mile from the new Long Branch station and Port Credit station. It was recommended that the Lorne Park stop also be eliminated and the Clarkson stop be relocated a mile to the west to provide proper spacing between Clarkson and Port Credit. This put Lorne Park 1.7 miles east of Clarkson and placed it in the prime convenience zone in the Clarkson station catchment area.

This zone is defined as within a ten-minute walk, or a ten-minute drive of the station, and is applied to all stations' catchland areas. After proposals to adjust the station spacings were announced, a delegation representing themselves as residents of the Clarkson-Lorne Park area met with my predecessor and asked that service be maintained at Lorne Park.

After being informed by railway officials that stops could not be made at those stations, due to the lack of track capacity west of Port Credit and the design of the service, it was requested that a skip-stop service be provided. This would involve stopping trains alternating at Clarkson and Lorne Park.

The effect of this would be to affect train frequency at both stations. In the peak period, this meant 40-minute services instead of 20-minute. Patronage surveys showed that this would be undesirable because of the high passenger potential at Clarkson, and the low passenger potential at Lorne Park. However, it was finally agreed that one skip-stop operation would be instituted involving a train in both the morning and evening peak periods.

This operation has been closely watched by GO-transit officials to determine its possible application and effectiveness. I might say that after the service started, there were strong protests from a large number of Clarkson residents who were unaware of what was involved, and claimed that they were not represented in the original group that approached the government.

Experience has proven the planners to be right insofar as patronage in this area is concerned. When GO-transit started in May of last year, it attracted an average of 142 passengers from the Clarkson station. By the end of December, this rose to 655 per day, one of the largest increases in the system.

At the beginning of the service, the Lorne Park attracted an average of 159 daily passengers; however this average steadily decreased to an average of 87 per day at the end of December. The peak number using the station is about 100 today. The passenger survey carried out in November showed close to 300 passengers in the Clarkson area were deprived of the use of the two trains involved in the skip-stop operation. That is three times more than the highest number of Lorne Park commuters.

A service of this type essentially presumes that most passengers arrive and leave by secondary means of transportation. And the fortunate few living close enough to be able to walk would be a small proportion of the whole. In the case of Clarkson, 88 of its

655 passengers were able to walk. In the case of Lorne Park, 32 were walking commuters out of 85.

In conclusion, GO-transit is not able to provide service to both stations without an estimated expenditure in track expansion amounting to between $4.5 million and $8.5 million. In order to do its job properly with the facilities available it must transfer the Lorne Park stop back to Clarkson to serve the largest number of people.

Mr. MacDonald: I would like to thank the Minister, and I must say that the reply seems to sound sensible. I am not personally familiar with the situation and I was making my representations on the basis of this brief that has just arrived. There seems to be some discrepancy; or at least, the information in the brief is not as complete as the Minister's. I shall reply to my correspondent and if he is dissatisfied when he gets a copy of your report in *Hansard*, I will be back.

Mrs. M. Renwick (Scarborough Centre): There are two GO-transit stations in the riding of Scarborough Centre. I am advised that they board 1,250 and 850 passengers approximately per day, Monday to Fridays. That is 2,100 passengers daily. This line dissects Scarborough Centre, thereby serving all of this riding. The immediate area houses 40,000 adults most of whom work and even allowing for the fact that they do not all work downtown, only 2,000 per day use the GO-transit. Any research the Minister can provide in this particular area may reveal some interesting facts.

For example, of the six morning trains where 2,100 passengers board at two stations, how many board the first three trains, in the first hour of 6:20 to 7:20 a.m.? How many board the other three rush-hour trains in the hour from 7:40 to 8:40 in the morning? My main question to the Minister is, Mr. Chairman: Is GO-transit primarily designed—as the Minister drew to the attention of the members of the assembly in his lead-off remarks —that the government might escape the building of roads at this time, or is it genuinely designed to assist all of the travelling public in the immediate areas of the rail lines with rapid transit at low cost? I ask this, Mr. Chairman, because it emerged clearly to me during the last election campign that GO-transit for the Scarborough areas is being used only by those who can afford it: 2,000 passengers per day.

Surely a government-subsidized transit service should be designed and subsidized in such a fashion as to provide low cost service to all persons in need of the service, rather than just those who can afford to use it as it is at this time? The fare of 50 cents each way from these stations to the downtown areas becomes $1.40 a day when it involves transferring to the TTC. Hence, I ask the Minister if any thought has been given to working out a transfer system to the lines of TTC, allowing the total fare from the Scarborough areas to become $1 per day round trip fare?

I would like to point out to the Minister that this $1 per day fare would not be in competition to existing TTC fares from two-fare zone areas, in this area of our city. As it is now, $1.40 per day becomes $30.80 per month, $36.40 per month on a six-day week.

This, Mr. Chairman, by no stretch of the imagination is low cost transportation to a great number of our working people. One needs only to look at our minimum wage laws in the province of $1 per hour to get the cost of GO-transit in its true perspective.

To use this service with transfer, the minimum wage earner must pay $1.40 of the $8 per day gross earnings, or almost one week's net salary of one month's earnings, a luxury that he cannot possibly afford.

And yet, Mr. Chairman, many of these low-wage earners may be the very people most desirous of and most in need, physically, by the nature of their work, of this fast service to keep the strain of their work day at a minimum and their production at a maximum.

Are these workers not being penalized by having a government transit system which they cannot possibly afford? Which prompts me to think of the government cost of the operation, Mr. Chairman. I wonder, has any thought been given to having advertising in the GO-transit cars to offset costs—such as our subway lines carry instead of the no-advertising policy of the CNR carrying over into GO-transit?

The question also comes to my mind, Mr. Chairman, was any computerized research done prior to the inception of GO-transit which could tell us whom they expected would be the users of GO, what income group, what occupational groups, what percentage would own their own homes or own car or cars, and what potential of users under certain fares?

I am particularly interested in which workers of our society are using GO-transit after canvassing these trains during the election campaign. On a 6:22 a.m. train at

Midland and St. Clair, three passengers boarded; 40 minutes later 12 passengers boarded, both of these trains being predominantly empty trains. My understanding of the times of peak travel from this area is a one-hour period from 7:40 a.m. to 8:40 a.m. or largely the white-collar worker.

Would this not confirm, Mr. Chairman, that a lot of people are missing the benefit of GO-transit and the GO-transit is missing a large segment of our population? Full consideration should be given by the Minister and members of this assembly to working out a transfer system to the lines of the TTC reducing the cost to the user by 40 cents a day and hopefully increase the passenger load of GO-transit.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Chairman, we have discussed that but arrived at no conclusion as to a transfer with the TTC.

Mr. J. L. Brown (Beaches-Woodbine): Mr. Chairman, I would like to address a question to the Minister with regard to the aged and GO-transit.

As I understand the figures presented here, we are subsidizing GO-transit approximately three-fifths of a dollar, and this subsidy goes for all users of the GO-transit system, whether they have a large income or a small income. The question that I raise is whether or not the Minister or his department has taken under consideration the provision of free transportation on the GO-transit, either at all times of the day or at certain times of the day, for the aged. Those who are on a fixed limited income with a high rising cost of living, makes transportation a very heavy financial burden to them.

Has the Minister considered this, what would be involved, could he speak to the point, please?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: We have not considered that, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Brown: Could I have more information from the Minister, please? I would like to hear what his position is and the position of the department with regard to this.

As I listen to the estimates debated of this particular department, it is very fortunate to hear the Minister say that he has considered it, because now he should be in a position to give us a little more information about this consideration. One of the difficult problems has been, it is very hard to get information from the Minister. If he has considered this, would he mind telling us about it then?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Chairman, I said we have not considered it.

Mr. Brown: The Minister has not considered it? I see, I misunderstood.

Mr. Gisborn: Mr. Chairman, I wish to go back to the question raised by the hon. member for York Centre regarding the route between Oakville and Hamilton.

I do not want to argue the point, but there seems to be a curious twist in reasoning as to why we only have the two trains in the morning and the two in the afternoon from Hamilton. If I remember correctly —and I would take it that the hon. Minister has checked back in *Hansard* to bring himself up to date on the implementation and the introduction of this programme—when we had quite a long dialogue as to the benefits and the reasoning for the experiment, I agreed with the then Minister of Highways that the patronage did not justify running more trains into Hamilton at that particular time, because I had noticed and had some experience on the number that were commuting from Hamilton.

But when the member for York Centre raised the question as to why not go into competition with the buses that run from Hamilton to Toronto and back on an hourly basis, and they are making it pay and are carrying a lot of passengers, the question rose in my mind that this is one of the reasons given, that we wanted to provide a safe and efficient commuter service for the people on the lakeshore and west of Toronto, from Hamilton to Toronto and west of Toronto, and also relieve the extreme congestion of traffic on the Queen Elizabeth Way and Highway 401.

The only reasoning we got from the previous Minister of Highways was that there would not be enough people using the trains from Hamilton. But the reasoning given this afternoon by the hon. Minister was that The Department of Transport had decreed that there would only be two trains from Hamilton in the morning and two in the evening. I would like him to explain just what was the reasoning.

I do not like to see us put the business out of work, but I do not think there is anything wrong with the competition that could be provided by advertising and an educational programme to get more people to use the GO trains from Hamilton.

Is it the decision of the present administration, what part did the department play in making the decision, and on what basis

was the statement that The Department of Transport decreed that we could only use the track between Oakville and Hamilton and vice versa twice in the morning and twice in the afternoon?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Chairman, I do not think I said The Department of Transport said we could only use it twice each time. I am sure that I said that we had to take over the commuter service that the CNR was using, which was twice a day. And the former Minister I think can be borne out on the statement of a lack of patronage, because their average daily pick-up there is 43 and the next week 56—I mean, it is very small from Hamilton.

Mr. Gisborn: I agree that it was not justified in the sense we are only going to be allowed the morning trains, but we have not made any effort, as far as I know, to find out if we could justify mid-morning or mid-afternoon trains for the shopping commuters, the same as we have in the other areas. If there is no legal or definite block in the way of running extra trains, then maybe we should do an educational job and make an investigation to find out if some of these people who do use the buses every hour on the hour would change their habits and use the GO train.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Chairman, I am advised that there is not capacity west of the hump yards for carrying more of the trains.

Mr. Brown: Mr. Chairman, I would like to go back to the question of free passage on GO-transit for the aged and ask the Minister if it is his intention to study the question or to consider the question in the future?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Chairman, I would think that it would be considered at some time, but I would not know when.

Mr. Brown: Does that mean that at the present time there is no plan to take under consideration specialized subsidies for the aged on GO-transit?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: That is right, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Chairman, in connection with the tying-in with the TTC and making use of bus service in the best way, maybe initially the department might consider working out an agreement with the TTC on a half-fare basis. I understand—and again I apologize for referring to Chicago, but when someone has a successful business I have always found it very useful to find out how he makes it successful—in Chicago they have found that a half-fare system pays for itself. It is very, very heavily patronized. They work out special routes scheduled to tie in with the GO-transit trains and tie into the areas where their boarding and destination counts show the traffic to be heaviest. I suggest that in negotiations with the TTC to further co-ordinate this wonderful way of public transportation the government consider this half-fare plan.

Vote 906 agreed to.

On Vote 907:

Mr. Chairman: The member for Sudbury.

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Chairman, now that we have dealt in length with Toronto, perhaps we could move out into the boondocks and I will begin by asking the Minister a fairly simple question—the perennial question I ask under this vote.

Is he able to tell me—and I am not surrendering my price by asking the very simple question—is he able to tell me the date of the completion of the Sudbury-Timmins highway?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: We are still aiming at 1969, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Sopha: What does the Minister, through you, what does the Minister mean, "we are aiming?"

Hon. Mr. Gomme: We are aiming at the date of completion in 1969.

Mr. Sopha: Well, I would invite the Minister to look at his capital construction book with me, if he will, on page 93. He will observe that the glossary of symbols, the legend I think it is called, certainly does not contain an explanation of the various markings that are to be found on that map. At the top centre, one understands the heavy line—presumably that is the mileage that is provided for in the estimates of this year—but what is the line, may I ask the Minister, immediately below the heavy line in top centre adjacent to the figures 144? The line that ends up at Benny; what is that line supposed to relate to?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: That is a present line.

Mr. Sopha: It is a line, yes, but is it a road?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Yes.

Mr. Sopha: May I take it that that part is complete?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: No, it is not completed, but there is a road there.

Mr. Sopha: I would like to find out so that I can tell the people back home, so to speak, just what the situation is.

Where is the Deputy Minister today, Mr. Chairman? Do you know where he is?

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): Sudbury!

Mr. Sopha: Maybe he is a delegate to Ottawa. I would not be surprised.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: The new alignment commences two and a half miles north of Benny, on Highway 144, and extends northerly 123 miles to Highway 201, and construction from Highway 101 started in the winter of 1964 and northerly from Benny in 1965. Approximately 46 miles of grading have been completed to date and it gives the cost of those.

Another 41 miles are presently under construction at an estimated cost of $6.5 million. Of these, 24 miles are expected to be completed this year. Contracts for the remaining 27 miles of grading to open the road throughout have been programmed so that the work will continue on a non-interrupted basis.

Other work proposed for the future includes reconstruction of nine miles of Highway 560, south of Gogama, which forms part of the Highway 144 route, and reconstruction of existing Highway 144 from Cartier to two-and-a-half miles north of Benny, and the asphalt surfacing from Cartier to Highway 101.

Mr. Sopha: That is very complex. Now may we make a brief reference to page 81, the map of the New Liskeard district? May we assume from what is shown on that map that the highway from Timmins to the border of the district of Sudbury is complete?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Some of it is still under construction.

Mr. Sopha: Well, is there passage for vehicles?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: I am advised that it is not open for good driving, but there may be some people going through there, what with construction—

Mr. Sopha: This sort of shakes me a bit because I am mindful of the fact, as I have referred to it on several occasions in preceding years, that the former Minister of Municipal Affairs attended to building of roads with considerable enthusiasm. In fact, there were many in the north that were willing to say that he was one of the greatest road builders since Julius Caesar. I do not want to injure the feelings of the present member, but—

Mr. W. G. Pitman (Peterborough): They do not last as long though!

Mr. Sopha: No. But he always saw to it that Timmins was fixed up with roads before any place achieved a priority. I am going to tell the Minister, too, through you, Mr. Chairman, this road in the district of Sudbury that he says will be finished in 1969, if that is so, that will be 45 years after the initial impetus commenced in Sudbury for the building of that road. And that road, I tell him, goes smack right through the riding of the member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Demers).

Now these people can talk all they want about the promises made in respect of GO-transit by their defeated adversaries in the last contest, but I am not letting the cat out of the bag when I say to you, is it any wonder that of the 15 members from north of the French River, nine of us are in the Opposition and six are over there? Two out of every three in other words. If John Parmenter Robarts hoped to form a government based on adherence to the Conservative Party and he met the same experience south of the French as he meets north, he would be the third Opposition party.

You see the point, Mr. Chairman, that I am making? In two out of three ridings, they are repudiated and one of the major reasons is that one of their own—a blood brother to them politically—cannot look his constituents in the face and say to them, "Look what I produced for you—this fine road to Timmins", because it is always in the dream stage; it is always in the future. It is all future and no present.

If the government demonstrated the same alacrity toward building that road and completing it, enabling people of the city of Sudbury—the largest metropolitan area in the north—to travel into the hinterland that, say, is suspended above, then there might be a little more enthusiasm for this government. But the Premier, Mr. Chairman, one gets the impression—and I do not like to talk in his absence—one gets the impression that when the member for Thunder Bay gets up, the member for Cochrane South, my friend from Algoma-Manitoulin, my friend from Nipissing,

the Premier looks at us—well, they are always crabbing, they are always pointing to discrimination, and being hard-done-by.

But it is the ballot box that counts, and if there are only six of you over there this time, your numbers will be greatly diminished the next time simply because you do not look after your own. That is the member for Nickel Belt; this road goes right through his riding. I am only at the end of the road in the great metropolitan urban hub of the city of Sudbury. Our community—here is the point about that road—our community, 80,000 people in the urban area and another 40,000 in the metropolitan area has failed to exercise its economic impact on the hinterland to the north by reason of not having the arteries of transportation.

Sudbury has been suspended on an east-west access, North Bay to Sault Ste. Marie, with far more contact with the southern part of the province than it has had with the north. And the fault for that lies right at the door of Joseph Wilfrid Spooner and no one else.

I said that to his face here on more than one occasion; and his influence and his prestige with his Cabinet colleagues and with the Treasury board.

I speak for Sudbury; the new member for Cochrane South can speak for Timmins. But Wilfrid Spooner saw to it that the road to Foleyet was completed from Timmins; then he was not satisfied with that and he got a road connecting Foleyet with Chapleau; Chapleau being, of course, in the district of Sudbury. It was interesting to note—no, it was not interesting, it was tragic to note—that when Chapleau last year—was it last year, it might have been the year before—was menaced by fire the people of Chapleau who had to evacuate on a notice from the Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Brunelle), did not go to Timmins.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Oh, yes, they did.

Mr. Sopha: Most of them came to Sudbury; the hospital patients came to Sudbury on emergency rail service. Anybody with sand in one eye and glass in the other could have seen a long time ago that Chapleau's natural connection is with Sudbury. But Wilfrid Spooner—a bit greedy I do not think that is too strong a word—a bit greedy, wanting to extend Timmins' economic influence to the west and south, got Foleyet connected up with Chapleau.

What is further evidence? Further evidence is to be found on page 81, my friend, where you will see that the road-building activity on the Sudbury-Timmins road has been far more keen at the northern end than at the southern, and that is simply of picking the giant in the Cabinet circles. I believe he was chairman of the Treasury board; if he was not the chairman he was an influential member of the Treasury board. The giant of prestige, Wilfrid Spooner, against the member for Nickel Belt, a back bench member of the government party. It was an unequal contest. The member for Nickel Belt could never get within the cloisters of the Cabinet where these decisions are made, or at the Treasury board.

Now we are at the stage where, as I have said many a time and it is true, if this were the Gardiner expressway and somebody, some responsible member—well they are all responsible—from Metro got up and asked this Minister: "When is it going to be finished?"; and the Minister was vague or uncertain in his answer that would lead to an editorial in each of the Toronto papers denouncing the Minister. He would be denounced for vagueness and uncertainty; at $14 million a mile!

But with us the Minister can get away with it. He has been getting away with it for half a century, this vagueness and uncertainty, this expression of pious hope that it will be finished in 1969.

I remember: The Minister is not nearly as skilful as his predecessor—small wonder the Provincial Treasurer, a man of great agility, was promoted to the Treasury—when I used to ask him, now there was a man who used to be able to deal with me when I would ask him when he was going to finish the road, as I did perennially.

Really this expression of optimism about 1969 will be greeted with great enthusiasm in Sudbury by many people, desirous as they have been for half a century of expanding, of making contact with Timmins and expanding their influence to the north. That will certainly by a halcyon day. If you will invite me I will certainly attend with you and the member for Nickel Belt at the opening of the road.

One does not always get an invitation to these things and often the government is very stingy about that, Mr. Chairman, as you may well recognize. The Treasurer remembers the day we opened the Killarney road—that was a banner day. I was there—yes, sir!

An hon. member: A banner day!

Mr. Sopha: A banner day, that is right. The Provincial Treasurer was not yet Minister, he was only understudy of the then Minister of Highways on that occasion. He was on probation for the job; I remember it well.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sopha: All I can do is say that the map 93 looks awfully blank to me compared to the map on page 81. I cannot sit down satisfied that all that is road. I have not got time to go and look, and I would not know what to look for anyway if I went there in the dead of winter. I have not got much help from the Minister. I suppose I could telephone the Deputy Minister and ask him about it, but the people of Sudbury will merely be aware that once again I have raised my voice in plea. Put it that way, that I am pleading with you and forget all the cajolery. I am pleading with you that justice be done to the member for Nickel Belt, because if you do not soon give him something I am afraid he is going to have a hard time the next time around. That is the situation as I see it.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Algoma-Manitoulin.

Mr. S. Farquhar (Algoma-Manitoulin): Mr. Chairman, on vote 907, on capital disbursements, I want to make a few remarks. In order to properly explain the point which I wish to make, and the request I wish to make to the Minister, it will be necessary to build a little background and I hope you will bear with me, Mr. Chairman.

I do not usually fill up pages of *Hansard* with irrelevancies but I have to wander a little bit this time. Sometime ago, Mr. Chairman, in the town of Blind River on Highway 17, the McFadden Lumber Company—better known as Domtar—with a bolt from the blue, decided to finish their operation in that town.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this may not seem to you, or to the members opposite, such a terrible calamity, but let me tell you that it is to a one-industry town which has been supported for many years by a company that was not in the habit of paying the highest of wages, and which has been populated by some 3,000 souls who have never had a chance to develop any real savings beyond possibly an equity in their homes. Homes which at this point have, altogether, hardly any value, possibly no value at all; a work force that is largely middle-aged and ill-equipped for employment elsewhere. This simply means that once again, a one-industry town in northern Ontario, with extremely heavy debenture debts and extremely burdened with education commitments, school financing, was going to be allowed to practically disappear from the face of the map.

About a month ago, the citizens in more or less an attack, sent the town council down here at which time we spoke to this Minister, the Attorney General, the Minister of Economics and Development, the Minister of Municipal Affairs, the Premier, and others. Of course, they left here with the usual blandishments and promises of effort.

Mr. Chairman: The member will relate this to highways.

Mr. Farquhar: Yes, I will, very quickly.

I feel they went home rather naively expecting that this government would come to its rescue. I will certainly be glad, even at this late date, to hear that there has been any action to amount to anything and I must say I doubt it very much.

Let me tell the members it is almost too late now. I am sure the member for that area is now being continually bombarded with requests for employment and housing elsewhere. When the local doctor decided to leave, that was the end of the local hospital and so on. However, this is another speech, and I simply want to mention to this Minister that as part of a recently compiled brief, the townspeople of Blind River have asked for some effort by The Department of Highways to develop a new road to Elliot Lake.

Mr. Chairman, just over the hill there is a town that can use this work force temporarily and keep the facilities alive in Blind River, and the housing, and the tax base, the assessment base, with direct access from Blind River to Elliot Lake. This access has been requested for many years and has been called the Granary Lake Road and would link these towns in a fashion that would save at least part of the population and part of that population's investment.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the new member for that area will join me as I plead with this Minister to at least do his part in salvaging what very shortly will become a ghost town.

Blind River has everything going for it. It is situated in the middle of all kinds of potential resources, on what has been formerly called the seaway, attractive to tourists. All the incentives available from the federal government to any place in Canada are available there. The only thing that seems to be lacking is the fact that there does not

seem to be any real initiative, or no planning effort, to take care of situations such as this one. No one has looked far enough ahead to realize that for years this town, and others like it, have been completely vulnerable when operating only at the whim of one large company. With a good honest effort, however, this Minister could provide a measure of relief in the way that I have suggested.

I have no intention of interfering in another member's riding, Mr. Chairman, but my association with that town has gone back over a good many years in both government and business. I wish I could find the words to explain the fear and the hardship that is even now prevalent and words that would prevail upon this Minister and other Ministers to take the action necessary. It is too late now for vague generalities and promises and soothing words. The only thing that would have merit would be direct and immediate action and I hope other northern members will join me in a request for this action.

Let me explain that the most recent effort in this regard is the compiling of a brief by the municipal people in that town, which goes something like this, and I will only read the pertinent parts of it, Mr. Chairman:

> Whereas the town of Blind River is located in a depressed area and whereas the town of Blind River has been dependent for its economic existence on the continued operation of one industry, namely the McFadden Lumber Company and whereas the town of Blind River has received official notice that the aforementioned mill will commence phasing out its operations and will close at the end of 1969 and whereas if action is not taken at once to offset this economic disaster our municipality will become a ghost town by the end of 1969.

Now therefore be it resolved—as I said, I will only deal with the pertinent parts of the resolution that deal with this Minister's department.

> —the town of Blind River petitions the provincial government at Queen's Park and the federal government of Canada with the following proposals aimed at alleviating the economic situation at Blind River:
>
> 1. That The Department of Highways re-establish Blind River as a divisional headquarters.
>
> 4. That The Department of Highways continue Highway 555, Granary Lake Road to Elliot Lake. This would benefit both Elliot Lake and Blind River—

This is part of the brief:

> —and would shorten the distance between these two towns by 20 miles, thus being a great boon to commuters who live in Blind River and work, and could work in the future, in Elliot Lake. This would also result in a substantial increase in the flow of traffic from tourists, hunters and fishermen which would boost the economy, not only of Blind River and Elliot Lake, but also the many hard-pressed tourist camps in the White River area to the north of here.

Now I know the Minister previously has been less than enthusiastic about this proposition, but I remind him that we now have a whole new ball game, with a whole new situation. I hope other members will support me in my request and that the Minister can be persuaded to comment favourably and that other Ministers, even the Premier, might be moved to make a donation to this debate in this regard on this matter.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Carleton East.

Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence (Carleton East): Mr. Chairman, looking over the expenditures over the last number of years for The Department of Highways for the province of Ontario, one finds for the year 1964-1965, on four-lane highways, the government spent some $44 million and about 45 per cent of that money was spent in Metro Toronto.

In 1965-1966, the government, again on four-lane construction, spent $46.5 million and the percentage spent in Metropolitan Toronto rose to 58 per cent of the total figure.

Last year, in 1966-1967, $45.5 million was spent in the province on four-lane construction and 73 per cent of that sum was spent in Metropolitan Toronto.

I appreciate, Mr. Minister, through you, Mr. Chairman, that those raw figures alone do not give a complete story as to an equitable balance between expenditures on four-lane highways in the balance of Ontario and Metro Toronto, but I notice, in this year's estimates, that the Minister wishes to have approval for spending $135.5 million. As someone who comes from an area which is keenly concerned with priority development in building of Highway 416 to the St. Lawrence and Highway 417 to Montreal, both of them four-lane highways, I would like to pose two questions at this point.

One is, whether out of that total figure for this year, the department again will be

spending what appears to be almost a fixed proportion, namely $45 million, on four-lane construction, and secondly, will the Minister let us know if he can as to what proportion we may find of that $45 million being spent outside of Metropolitan Toronto and what proportion in Metropolitan Toronto? If the Minister would answer those questions, I would like to proceed with one more.

Mr. Sopha: I wish the member for Grey-Bruce (Mr. Sargent) was here.

Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence: The hon. member is the only one who is missing him.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Chairman, we do not have those figures separated.

Mr. Chairman: The member has another question?

Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence: Yes, Mr. Chairman, if I may. As I was mentioning, the people in the Ottawa area, eastern Ontario, were extremely pleased when the announcement was made several months ago that Highway 16 from Ottawa to Prescott would be proceeded with. I think those of us in Ottawa are particularly pleased, because it meant a change in decision from taking the highway south to Brockville and the move over to Prescott, of course, linked it with the bridge to the United States.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the Minister is fully aware of the fact that in Washington and in Albany things are moving quickly for the development of the new throughway which will, when passed by the New York Legislature, link Ogdensburg through to Utica on a freeway. From there south it will terminate in Washington, which means that in a few years from now we can expect a link from the Ogdensburg bridge on the St. Lawrence straight through to the capital of the United States in Washington, all by way of throughways.

I have two things I would like to ask the Minister here. One is, is it his policy, or can he make it his policy, to insure that the building of new Highway 416 will roughly coincide with the development of the new throughway from Ogdensburg south through New York state?

And my second point is—and this is more of a suggestion than a question—and that is that we now have a situation where the two great capitals of our two countries will be joined, namely, Ottawa and Washington.

It appears to me that the uniqueness of this particular situation might provide a ground for the provincial government in good sense to approach its partner, the federal government, in the hope that Mr. McIlraith, the Minister of Transport, and the federal government, would accept some responsibility in helping to finance and, thereby, obviously indirectly expedite the linking of our two national capitals.

I have a feeling that perhaps this year, a year of austerity, might not be the year in which Ontario would get a favourable answer from Ottawa. But it does strike me that there is enough merit in suggesting federal participation in this Ottawa-Washington link; that the Minister might undertake to begin the general approaches to the federal government.

It seems to me, for instance, that this highway could become a particularly designated highway by name in the way in which the Macdonald-Cartier highway has been designed by name. One could even picture a particular name given to the Ottawa-Washington total throughway that would recognize the inter-capital and international friendship, whether it be called the "Good Neighbour Way" or some similar term, recognizing the amity which has existed.

Mr. Singer: How about the "Lawrence-Haskett Highway"?

Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence: Neither of us have the power to spend the money building this highway—

Mr. Sopha: How about the "Roosevelt Highway"?

Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence: Personally, I hope the Minister is open to any number of names, but I wish he would at this point perhaps respond to the two questions which I have raised, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member remembers the remarks I made in my opening speech in regard to 416, and we are proceeding with that. We have not approached the federal government re assistance on that road, but we can do so.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Mr. Chairman, first I would like to make reference to a question I asked the Minister, yesterday, and say that I am very disappointed in his answer. I think his evasiveness is something that really ought to be looked into by the powers in the Cabinet. I hope it was not because he does not know the answer.

I will ask it again. Does the Minister intend to rebuild, to change, to include in the structuring or the restructuring of the Queen Elizabeth Way between Hamilton and the Lincoln county line, that portion known as the Stoney Creek traffic circle at this time?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: It is not on this year's contract, but we are going to rebuild that, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Deans: The Minister could have saved me a lot of trouble by saying that yesterday.

Mr. Chairman, I am very disturbed by the attitude of this department towards those people who are unfortunate enough to own property abutting any reconstruction projects. The part that I would like to discuss, though I believe this situation probably prevails throughout Ontario, I would like to discuss for a moment the portion of Highway 8 which was recently reconstructed, that portion that runs from Stoney Creek through to Winona.

At the time this highway—I was going to say at the time it was first proposed, but it was first proposed some 30 years ago so I do not suppose I could really go back that far. But two or three years ago when they decided to rebuild this highway and the purchase of the property was made, or the offer to purchase was made, no mention was ever made at that time that the height of the highway in relation to the abutting properties was going to be changed in any way.

Yet when the highway was partially completed, it became obvious that the department had in mind to alter the height of the highway. It was brought to their attention at that time, and has been brought to their attention many times since then, and absolutely nothing has been done about it, with the end result that this highway now sits in some areas some three feet higher than it was prior to the reconstruction project, and presents to the people of the area some flooding problems which I have brought to the attention of the Minister.

Now, I recognize that during the reconstruction one could expect there would be some dislocation, but having viewed the situation, sir, and taking into consideration the fact that it was never pointed out to the people that the height of the highway was going to be changed, I feel that the department should have taken action during the reconstruction to be sure that nothing detrimental to the property was done.

I checked personally, I walked through the water with the people just to prove the height of it. There were people there with a foot of water. They had to drive onto their property in order to get onto it, they could not walk from the highway to the door. This was not the situation that prevailed prior to the reconstruction, contrary to what has been said by the department. This is one point that I wish to make, that at the time of reconstruction these people should have been notified.

I had a letter from one gentlemen who assures me—I have had letters from a number—but one in particular who assures me that he was never made aware of the intention of the department to change the height of the highway in relation to his property. Had he been aware, he would have fought it. It just created an undue hardship and it should never have been contemplated and never should have been done. I hazard a guess that perhaps it was an error.

Anyway this is one gentleman who has this to say.

Another one just down the way has the exact same complaint to make. This should never have been allowed to happen. And when it became obvious that it was happening, some action should have been taken to remedy it.

So now we are faced with business properties, properties of homeowners, in a position now that they are much below the level of the highway, and it creates flooding problems for them.

There were people who own property abutting this highway who had, at their own expense, installed drainage tile. This was broken up, it was driven over, and it no longer served the purpose for which it was intended. No action was taken to fix this, even though the winter came along and the flooding has since occurred.

It was pointed out way last fall when there was no thaw in that this was going to happen and it did.

We go on and we find the people who own a motel now in a position where before the highway in front of the motel was about a foot above the property, now it is some five feet above the property level of the motel. I can suggest to you, that if you try walking along the walkway between the highway and the motel—and, by the way, the highway was widened at that point too to some degree—if you walk along there it is a very eerie situation, to be walking along and car wheels whistling past your ears.

This need not have happened. This could quite easily have been avoided, if the reconstruction of the highway had been graded properly and brought to a level that would have done away with this situation.

We find also, along this stretch of highway, people who have a business interrupted and they expected it. They understood that during the time the highway was being reconstructed that business would be interrupted, but they did not realize that the end result would be that business would be completely stopped, and that has happened. What has happened along this particular stretch of highway is that people who previously had parking places in front of their properties no longer have them.

I suggested to the Minister some time ago how at least two of the situations could have been relieved. No action was taken. I realize, sir, that we have to have controlled exit and entrance to highways. But I also realize that the interests of people who have established businesses in the area for a number of years must be considered. This is what I mean by the attitude of this department towards the people who own property on highways. I agree that we have to control backing onto highways, but you cannot just pick special places to do it. You cannot take one person and say, "we will do it here, we will not do it there." This has happened.

It is very unfortunate and I would like to hear from the Minister. He knows a number of the things that I have been discussing; I have brought them to his attention. I went to the trouble of holding a meeting with the people of the area and did invite the Minister or a person on his staff to attend the meeting so that he might be able to avail himself of the complaints and handle them directly. But the Minister chose—and I have no reason to chastise him for this, it is his business—but he chose not to attend and the people then, of course, sent me the letters relating to the properties.

Let me, just for a moment, outline the things I want to know.

Is there going to be anything done to relieve the situation at the Crystal Motel on Highway 8? Is the Minister going to take into consideration the fact that the property is now much lessened in value from the time prior to the reconstruction? Is he going to do anything to make sure that the parking facilities that were previously in front of the barber shop at 430 Highway 8 are restored? Because a barber obviously cannot conduct a business if there is no place to park. It means he goes out of business. You cannot re-locate a barbershop just any old day of the week in just any place you want. You have to do it in a place for retail trade.

I made a suggestion with regard to the parking in front of the beauty salon at 450 Highway 8, at which time I said that if they were to locate the entrance to the property front in the centre of the property, instead of offset, they would then leave the people with sufficient parking for four or five automobiles, which was all they asked. A simple request which could have been complied with without any difficulty at all. It would not have required you even to bend the law. All that was required was that the maximum width of approachway be allowed and that it be placed in the centre of the property. A simple thing in my opinion—perhaps not in the Minister's, but in mine.

Is he going to do something about the broken-up drainage tile, all the way along the highway? The people had put it in at their own expense, and had taken care of it at their own expense. You have had it done away because of the attitude of the department—because they are not interested enough to go and see the people, to talk to them about it.

The other problem of the speed limit I discussed with you and it is a matter of opinion really, I suppose, whether the speed limit is too high or not. I feel that where children have to cross a highway in a residential area such as this—and it is almost totally residential—the speed limit should be reduced. But I suppose we will get around to that some day when two or three children are killed. I will stop at that and ask that you will answer some of the questions and perhaps we could pursue it a little further.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Chairman, the member did come and speak to me about that; it is a place where there is new construction. He referred to the flooding on the road and I immediately had someone go out—

Mr. Deans: Not on the road, only on the properties abutting the road. I am not interested in the flooding on the road.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Well, the flooding in connection with the new construction—someone immediately went out there.

The construction, I understand, is not quite complete, and I am sure that any place where we have caused trouble by flooding, or the

drainage that you are referring to, that if we have caused trouble it will be repaired.

In regard to the corner and the parking at the barber shop—it is on the corner of the highway and a town street, I believe, and there is a kidney-shaped, I suppose, flower bed put on the corner to prevent people from backing onto the corner. This is the reason this was put here.

Mr. Deans: Could I then just follow that particular point you raised? You have put in what I would term a kidney-shaped island on the corner. The portion that follows the contour of the highway—the portion that goes laterally with the highway—is not necessary. It is not necessary at that corner; I tried to explain this to you before.

An hon. member: Are you an expert?

Mr. Deans: Are you? Well, fine then, I would appreciate you keeping your remarks to yourself.

I would understand you wanting to put something to keep people from backing diagonally off the corner, but surely it makes no difference for the sake of four feet—they can back out on to the highway four feet further up. Surely that cannot make all that difference. It means the difference of a livelihood or no livelihood for a man, and it is important that you take into consideration this sort of thing.

I realize that you have to do the best you can to control the access, I said so before, but I also recognize that this gentleman who operates the business there will not be able to continue operating there unless some action is taken to help him. It is not that difficult. I am sure that if you were to personally take a look at it you would agree with me. I would ask that if you happen to be driving down that way, give me a call and we will stop by and look at it together and have a coffee or something.

The other problem about the flooding is this; that if you are going to do reconstruction work for goodness sake make sure ahead of time, take some action to make sure that you are not going to create flooding problems for the people that are along the area. If it is going to be some time in the reconstruction process—and this was some time—then surely you must take action to make sure that the ditches are kept open, that the drainage ditches are kept open ahead of time. You cannot leave it all winter; you cannot let it thaw and run into their houses while you are waiting to fix it.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Algoma.

Mr. B. Gilbertson (Algoma): Mr. Chairman, I have a few requests for the Minister of Highways. I was pleased with the hon. member for Algoma-Manitoulin, who got up on behalf of the Blind River situation which I believe the members are quite aware of now —the phasing out of the McFadden lumbering operation. We have some requests that pertain to the Minister of Highways.

One of them is that The Department of Highways re-establish Blind River as a divisonal headquarters. I understand that it was there at one time and it was taken away from there; this is a request from Blind River.

Another request is that The Department of Highways continue Highway 548—Rainy Lake Road to Elliot Lake. This would benefit both Blind River and Elliot Lake and would shorten the distance between these two towns by 20 miles, thus being a great boon to the commuters who live in Blind River and work in the mines at Elliot Lake. This would also result in a substantial increase in the flow of traffic from tourists, hunters, and fishermen which would boost the economy, not only of Blind River and Elliot Lake, but also the many hard-pressed tourist camps in the White River area to the north of here.

I have another request for the hon. Minister of Highways. I know that the people of my riding would be pleased to be informed about the St. Joseph Island bridge, and we would like to have a report from time to time on how it is coming in the planning stages. If it is possible that this project be accelerated, we would be very pleased.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Chairman, in answer to the first question, re the divisional headquarters. I think that the member is aware that this was moved from Blind River ten years ago or more into Sault Ste. Marie, for the reason that it was more central in the district. There are still some facilities out at Blind River and I may say that as soon as the delegation left, I instructed my people not to move anything out of Blind River. I think that there is still a paint shop there and two or three small facilities like this, and this will continue.

In regard to the road from Blind River to Elliot Lake; this, of course, is something that was discussed a good many years ago. The reason that the present route was chosen —I think that he is aware of the fact—is that more of the traffic was coming to Sudbury

in the south, and it was a better link to Highway 17 to place it here.

In regard to their recent proposal—and mention was made to the number of Ministers that have been seen—I want to tell you, sir, that we have had three meetings on this problem. We are trying from all angles to work out something, if at all possible, to assist Blind River.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Waterloo North.

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): Mr. Chairman, we are pleased to note that the estimates include two miles of new construction for the Kitchener-Waterloo expressway for which an amount of $8,745,000 has been allocated. It is imperative that this expressway be completed on schedule for the development of the industrial area to the north end of the city of Waterloo.

Now, there was talk of slowing down the progress of this expressway last year, but I understand that this has been resolved and the expressway will be completed on schedule.

My question is simply this, and can be answered by a simple and direct answer, Mr. Chairman. Could the Minister tell me what this expressway will cost? It had been estimated at first to cost $21 million and subsequently raised to $35, or $38 million. Do you have any final figure on the estimate of cost?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: We have no final figure on it, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Good: The last figure please?

Mr. Chairman: The Minister is providing information for the member for Waterloo North. The member for Algoma may put another question at another point.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: I have not got the figure, Mr. Chairman, but the member mentioned the fiscal year, and the estimated cost of the present value of the work is $8 million. I have not got the total figure, but I will get it. Oh, I have it now. $40 million was the last figure that we had.

Mr. Good: Thank you, up another $2 million!

Mr. Chairman: Did the member for Algoma have another question pertaining to his previous remarks?

Mr. Gilbertson: Mr. Chairman, I have. The hon. Minister of Highways did not reply fully when referring to the St. Joseph's bridge. Can we get some information from time to time on how this project is coming along?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: I will see that the hon. member gets that.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Cochrane South.

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): Mr. Chairman, as I listened to the hon. Minister and hon. member for Sudbury talk, I thought there was a good deal more eloquence than there was accuracy. I rather suspect that he is taking a very niggardly, selfish approach to this problem of the Timmins-Sudbury road. I wonder where a road would go if it did not begin some place and join two cities. The fact that there is more work being done in the northern part is no reason for somebody in the southern part to get all carried away with things not being to their liking.

I would point out that it was about 21 years ago that Mr. Grummet, the member for Cochrane South, first advocated that Highway 144 to join Sudbury and Timmins. It was also his hope that the road would go on up to join Timmins to Smooth Rock Falls.

Mr. Gisborn: Well, the Minister has gone by the way since then.

Mr. Ferrier: Now, if Mr. Spooner deserves credit for certain roads in the riding, so be it to him. The fact that there is a good deal of work being done this year in the riding is because the roads have been in such a deteriorated condition that there is no other alternative but to do this work. It is long overdue and very much needed.

I would like the Minister to comment on the request of the hon. member for Sudbury East to explain the reason for the longer route for Highway 144 than was originally proposed. Some of the reasons given in the particular constituencies probably would differ from those that would be advanced here, but we would like to hear them.

As far as the people of Chapleau are concerned, during the fire of last year I think it is a matter of record that people found terrific hospitality in the people of Timmins, that they did not all go to Sudbury as was suggested, and I think that it is an insult to the town of Timmins to suggest that we were not willing to take them in, because we did a tremendous job there.

Highway 101, west from 144 to Foleyet, is broken up and it is in a terribly deteriorated condition and this road must have work done

on it—repaving before very long. I would stress the urgency of this because the Reeves Mine of Canadian Johns Manville has just recently come into production and there are 120 or 130 people driving over that road morning and night. The road has very treacherous curves and it is full of potholes. I would like the Minister to give serious consideration to having that road paved in some kind of adequate condition before too long. Also there are hopes at Kookitash, just east of Foleyet, that an iron mine will develop there. If this is the case, then the traffic on that road will be all the greater.

I would like to ask the Minister another question. I notice that the airport road just north of Timmins is to be graded and, I forget the exact terminology—some kind of grading, drainage and granular base, I think it is. I would like to know how long it will be before it is paved. I would also like the hon. Minister, if he would, to say if there is any consideration being given to joining up Timmins and Smooth Rock Falls with a Department of Highways road.

One other question, if I might ask. Is there any consideration being given to reconstructing, or paving, or such, of Highway 577 that joins Val Gagne to the Ansonville-Iroquois Falls area, since this road is also in a very deteriorated condition and in bad shape? The work that is being done there, we are grateful for, but it is certainly necessary and long overdue. I wonder if the hon. Minister would comment on those questions, please?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Chairman, I do not know if I have all of them in order, but, Highway 101 final grading contracts between Highway 129 south of Chapleau and Wawa were completed in the fall of 1966, and the road was open to traffic. The total length of this new section is 80 miles. Paving has been completed from Wawa easterly 11.5 miles.

Mr. Ferrier: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I could just interrupt the Minister? That was not the section of the road that I was concerned about, it was from Foleyet to Timmins, or from Foleyet to Highway 144. This is the section of the road that is in such bad shape.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Along that road, Mr. Chairman, I just want to refer to the contracts that we are doing.

In 1967, contracts were awarded for 26 miles of paving from Highway 547 easterly, at a cost of $600,000, and this work is to be completed this year. This year, work is expected to continue with the award of a contract for asphalt surfacing from south of the junction of 129, westerly for 42 miles. And then, the other work will continue after this is done. Regarding the connection of the highway, Timmins to Smooth Rock Falls, that is not in the plan at the moment. We feel that we have to proceed on a priority basis; to finish the one between Sudbury and Timmins first.

Mr. Ferrier: Would you comment on the airport road, I think that it is Highway 629? When will that likely be paved? It will be graded this year—

Hon. Mr. Gomme: It will be paved after the other is done, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Ferrier: Could you give us any idea how long that might be?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: No, I cannot tell the exact time.

Mr. Chairman: The member for York Centre.

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. Minister about the section of the Macdonald-Cartier freeway between Yonge Street and Bayview Avenue; I think that it is project 65131. First of all, what is the completion date on this contract?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: The completion date was last fall, but on account of the strikes we had, it will not be finished until the end of June of this year.

Mr. Deacon: Is June 30 the completion date now under the contract?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: There is really no fixed completion date, but this is the target date, and we hope to meet it.

Mr. Deacon: In other words, there is no penalty clause if they don't get on and finish the contract? The reason that I ask is that I have not noticed much work being done on it for some time.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Yes, there is a penalty clause, Mr. Chairman, but then the strike time had to enter into it also; these are working days.

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Chairman, when will the penalty clause become operative?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: We cannot tell that at this time, but certainly it will come into effect if it is necessary. We have got to take the

days that are fit to work, and the strike time that is off—all these things enter into it.

Mr. Deacon: In other words, the penalty clause does not have much meaning in this particular contract, due to the strike? Is that the reason for it?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: That is part of the reason, yes.

Mr. Deacon: I thought that penalty clauses came into effect regardless of the weather, a matter of strikes, or something of that sort. Which would be the only basis under which the penalty clause would not come into effect?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: It is all to do with the strike, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Deacon: Since the strike was settled last fall, sir, there is not any due date set for the completion of that section? Is that correct? Under the penalty clause?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: There was not any due date created, but it was, as I tried to point out, to be completed and will be as soon as possible, taking that into account.

Mr. Deacon: I guess that the penalty does not have any meaning then, in that particular section, because you have not renegotiated due to the strike deadline, I gather? You have left it up in the air, which means there is now no compulsion on the part of the contractor to settle that, to finish it.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: We require that it be completed, but the strike has to extend the date and I cannot give you those figures.

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Chairman, the reason I am asking is that is I have noticed there has been no work going on in that section for quite some time, and I was wondering if there was some problem in that contract with the contractor?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: There was no work done on that this winter, Mr. Chairman, because the work that has to be completed should be done in good weather.

Mr. Deacon: Thank you. Highway 404—the extension of the Don Valley parkway. Does the Minister have plans for extending that, or starting construction of Highway 404 up to Highway 7, and when is that scheduled? I have noticed that the lines of congestion now are sometimes two and a half to three miles long, stop and start, every day.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: The functional planning aspect of the pre-contract engineering is in progress and the start of construction is dependent upon an agreement between Metro Toronto and The Department of Highways for the extension of the Don Valley parkway to Steeles Avenue.

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Chairman, I understand from the Metro roads commissioner that they have no plans for completion or extension of the Don Valley parkway until they have a date from The Department of Highways as to when they are going to construct Highway 404. Is The Department of Highways to move first on this chicken or the egg situation, or is Metro Toronto? Metro Toronto says that, for their own purposes, they have no need of extending the Don Valley parkway beyond its present limit until Highway 404 is under construction.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: We have informed Metro Toronto that we would like to start within a couple of years but we have reached no agreement with them.

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Chairman: would the Minister set, or give us, a date he would propose to Metro Toronto for early construction of Highway 404, at least Highway 7 between Steeles Avenue and Highway 7?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: We would like to start construction, as I pointed out to the hon. member. Does he want me to enter into negotiations with them to get an agreement signed so that we do start it? Is this it?

Mr. Deacon: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: We will try that. We will do that.

Mr. Bukator: There are three of us, and we have only one minute or so. I will require 10 or 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Yorkview.

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, I simply want to ask a question. Perhaps I can do it in the time allotted to me. A couple of years ago I was in Fort Frances and at that time met with the committee across the line anxious to build a bridge in co-operation with the province of Ontario, across from Fort Frances International Falls. I wonder whether the Minister could indicate to us the progress on that bridge?

The people up there are very anxious to have that bridge. I think the Mississippi freeway is going to terminate at that point and the bridge which is there is completely

inadequate for present traffic. It is owned by the paper company; it is a toll bridge and the tolls are very high for the services rendered by the bridge; it has been paid for decades ago, according to local information, and yet that toll continues.

The locations for the new bridge are being explored, or have been explored for many years.

I understand there is some opposition from the owners of the bridge to the west because of the fact that that bridge is not paying too well. But at the same time the bridge at Fort Frances is needed and I wonder if the Minister could bring us up to date as to the progress and planning of that bridge between Fort Frances and International Falls?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Chairman, I understand what the member is referring to is an international commission between Ontario and the United States in setting up a commission to build and operate this bridge. It is not a highway project.

Mr. Young: But, Mr. Chairman, surely—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Young: The Highway Department will have to participate in setting up the commission and the—

Mr. Chairman: Order, order!

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health) moves that the committee rise and report and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed, Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report that it has come to a certain resolution and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Before moving the adjournment of the House, I would advise that on Monday we shall first take private bills in committee of the whole House and then move back to the estimates of The Department of Highways.

Hon. Mr. Dymond moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 6:05 o'clock, p.m.

JOURNALS AND PROCEDURAL RESEARCH BRANCH
DIRECTION DES JOURNAUX ET DES RECHERCHES EN PROCÉDURE
ROOM 1640, WHITNEY BLOCK
QUEEN'S PARK, TORONTO, ON M7A 1A2